

HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY



ACADEMIC PEER REVIEW POLICY

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this Policy is to provide guidelines and ascribe responsibilities for peer review of activities of academic staff of Ho Technical University. The Policy is intended to create opportunities for academic peer review as an internal quality assurance function regarding teaching, learning and examinations.

2.0 Definitions

The following definitions apply to the Policy:

- (a) **Academic Peer Review:** The process of evaluating academic staff's teaching, learning and examination outputs by another academic staff within and/or outside the University.
- (b) **Audit of Examination Questions, Marking Schemes, Marked Scripts, Project Works and Dissertations:** Review of examination questions, marking schemes, marked scripts, project works and dissertations by External Examiners.
- (c) **Course Outline:** A document prepared and used by an academic staff as a framework of a particular course in line with the prescribed format issued by the Quality Assurance Office.
- (d) **External Examiner:** An academic staff or professionals outside the University engaged to review programmes and the work of an academic staff of the University including course outline(s), examination questions, marking schemes, marked script(s), project work(s) and dissertation(s).
- (e) **Instructional Material:** Any print or electronic teaching and learning material used by a course lecturer during teaching and learning process such as course outline, lecture note, handout, textbook, video, audio, etc.
- (f) **Instructional Material Reviewer:** Any person appointed within the University to review instructional materials.
- (g) **Internal Examiner**
 - (i) **First Internal Examiner:** An academic staff within the University who sets examination questions and marks examination scripts of a course or who supervises and marks, project works and dissertations.

- (ii) **Second Internal Examiner:** An academic staff within the University (other than the First Internal Examiner) who moderates examination questions and marking schemes, reviews marked examination scripts, project works and dissertations.
- (h) **Marking Scheme:** A guideline prepared and used by a First Internal Examiner in marking students' examination scripts or any examination output.
- (i) **Moderation of Examination Questions and Marking Schemes:** Review of examination questions and marking schemes based on course outline(s) by Second Internal Examiners.
- (j) **Observation of Teaching:** The process of observing the instruction of students of a course in classrooms, laboratories, workshops and in the field directly or indirectly by Teaching Observers.
- (k) **Teaching Observer:** Any person appointed to directly or indirectly observe and assess teaching and learning process.
- (l) **Review of Instructional Materials:** Review of instructional materials by Instructional Material Reviewers.
- (m) **Vetting of Marked Project Works and Dissertations:** Review of marked project works and dissertations by Second Internal Examiners.
- (n) **Vetting of Marked Scripts:** Review of marked examination scripts by either Second Internal Examiners or External Examiners.

3.0 Scope

This Policy applies to all academic staff of the University and the teaching, learning and examination activities performed by these staff. The scope of academic peer review comprises review of academic staff's course outlines, other instructional materials, teaching, examination questions, marking schemes, marked examination scripts as well as students' project works and dissertations supervised and marked.

4.0 Policy Statement

Academic peer review provides internal and external peer review of the academic processes of the University in areas of teaching, learning and examinations in order to:

- (a) Comply with national and global academic standards in higher education.
- (b) Sharpen the teaching and examination skills of Faculty/School through the exchange of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values among colleagues.
- (c) Improve the quality of teaching, learning and examination processes.
- (d) Ensure transparency of teaching and examination activities of academic staff.

Outputs of all academic staff relating to teaching, learning and examinations as well as students' project work and dissertation supervision are subject to peer review. Staff involved in the peer review processes are to ensure that these activities are undertaken objectively, effectively, efficiently and in accordance with this Policy.

5.0 Academic Peer Review Procedures

The academic peer review activities shall be undertaken at the departmental level. The procedures for undertaking the respective academic peer review activities are as follows:

5.1 Review of Instructional Materials

Course outlines and other instructional materials of each academic staff shall be reviewed in each semester in line with the following procedures:

- (a) The Head of Department shall recommend Instructional Material Reviewers to the Departmental Board for consideration and appointment.
- (b) The academic staff shall prepare course outlines according to the prescribed criteria and submit them with other instructional materials to the Head of Department at least two (2) weeks before the start of teaching in each semester.
- (c) The Reviewers shall review the instructional materials using the prescribed criteria and submit reports to the Head of Department.
- (d) The Head of Department shall give copies of the reviewers' report to the academic staff reviewed for necessary corrections before the start of teaching in each semester.

- (e) The academic staff reviewed shall consider the reports, make necessary corrections and submit the corrected versions of the instructional materials to the Head of Department before the start of teaching in each semester.
- (f) The academic staff reviewed shall issue the instructional materials to students on or before commencement of teaching in each semester and discuss the course outlines with students during the first lecture of the semester.
- (g) The Head of Department shall submit approved course outlines to the Planning and Quality Assurance Offices through the Dean of Faculty/School.

5.2 Observation of Teaching

Teaching of each academic staff shall be reviewed at least once in each academic year in line with the following procedures:

- (a) The Head of Department shall propose academic staff whose teaching shall be observed to the Departmental Board for consideration and approval in each semester.
- (b) The Head of Department shall recommend Teaching Observers to the Departmental Board for consideration and appointment in each semester.
- (c) The Teaching Observers shall observe the teaching of the teachers using the prescribed criteria and submit reports with the observed teacher's comments to the Head of Department.
- (d) The Head of Department shall give copies of the report to the observed teacher and discuss the report with him or her.
- (e) The Head of Department shall submit a report to the Dean of Faculty/School.

5.3 Moderation of Examination Questions and Marking Schemes

End of semester examination questions set and marking schemes prepared by First Internal Examiners shall be moderated internally under strict confidentiality in each semester by the Head of Department and Second Internal Examiners.

The External Examiners shall moderate examination questions and marking schemes where required by an external body.

The following procedures shall be followed in moderation of examination questions and marking schemes:

5.3.1 Internal Moderation

- (a) The Head of Department in consultation with the Dean of Faculty/School shall appoint one Second Internal Examiner for each level of a programme.
- (b) Moderators shall not moderate their own examination questions and marking schemes.
- (c) The First Internal Examiners shall set examination questions and prepare marking schemes according to the prescribed criteria and submit them together with copies of the approved course outlines to the Head of Department at least eight (8) weeks in the case of the requirements for external moderation or three (3) weeks in the case of the requirements for only internal moderation before commencement of end of semester examinations.
- (d) Within two (2) days, the Head of Department and Second Internal Examiners shall moderate the examination questions and marking schemes alongside the course outlines using the prescribed criteria at a moderation conference and write reports and give copies of the reports to the respective First Internal Examiners for necessary corrections.
- (e) The First Internal Examiners shall make necessary corrections and submit corrected examination questions and marking schemes together with the course outline to the Head of Department within three (3) days upon receipt of the reports for printing and administration.

5.3.2 External Moderation

Examination questions, marking schemes and course outlines shall be moderated by relevant external bodies where applicable using the prescribed procedure.

5.4 Vetting of Marked Scripts

External Examiners shall vet marked examination scripts together with marking schemes where required by a regulatory body or an affiliated institution.

The following procedures shall be followed in vetting of marked examination scripts:

5.4.1 Internal Vetting of Marked Scripts

- (a) The Head of Department shall recommend Second Internal Examiners to the Departmental Board for consideration and appointment.
- (b) The First Internal Examiners shall submit end of semester examination results, marked scripts, attendance sheets, examination questions and marking schemes to the Head of Department at most one (1) week after deadline for submission of provisional end of semester examination results.
- (c) For a course, the Second Internal Examiner shall vet at least 10% of the examination scripts marked by the First Internal Examiner using the prescribed criteria and submit reports to the Head of Department within two (2) weeks.
- (d) The Head of Department shall give copies of the reports of the Second Internal Examiners to the First Internal Examiners.
- (e) The First Internal Examiners shall consider the reports, make necessary corrections and submit the corrected versions of the results, if any, to the Head of Department within one (1) week.

5.4.2 External Vetting of Marked Scripts

Marked scripts shall be vetted together with examination questions and marking schemes by relevant external bodies where applicable using the prescribed procedure.

5.5 Vetting of Marked Project Works and Dissertations

Marked project works and dissertations shall be vetted by Second Internal Examiners line with the following procedures:

- (a) The Head of Department shall recommend Second Internal Examiners for review of project works and dissertations to the Departmental Board for consideration and appointment.
- (b) The Second Internal Examiners shall vet at least one (1) marked project work or dissertation supervised by each First Internal Examiner using the prescribed criteria

and submit reports within two (2) weeks with project works and dissertations received to the Head of Department.

- (c) The Head of Department shall give copies of the report to the respective First Internal Examiners.
- (d) The First Internal Examiners shall take note of the reports.

5.6 Audit of Examination Questions, Marking Schemes, Marked Scripts, Project Works and Dissertations

Examination questions, marking schemes, marked scripts, project works and dissertations shall be audited by External Examiners every three (3) years in line with the following procedures:

- (a) Each Departmental Board shall recommend External Examiners to the Academic Board through the Faculty/School Board for appointment.
- (b) The Academic Board shall consider and appoint a team of External Examiners for each programme.
- (c) The External Examiners shall audit the examination questions, marking schemes, marked scripts, project works and dissertations of the Department using the prescribed criteria and submit reports to the Head of Department.
- (d) The Head of Department shall give copies of the report of the External Examiners to the First Internal Examiners within two (2) days.
- (e) The Departmental Board shall discuss the reports and forward same to the Faculty/School Board for due consideration.
- (f) The Dean of Faculty/School shall submit the report to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor through the Quality Assurance Office.

5.7 Academic Peer Review Reporting

At the end of each academic year, Annual Academic Peer Review Report (AAPRR) shall be submitted in line with the following procedures:

- (a) The Head of Department shall submit the AAPRR covering all aspects of academic peer review undertaken during the academic year to the Departmental Board for consideration.

- (b) The Head of Department shall subsequently submit the AAPRR to the Dean of Faculty/School for the consideration of the Faculty/School Board.
- (c) The Dean of Faculty/School shall submit the report to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor through the Quality Assurance Office.
- (d) The Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall study the report and forward same to the Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee for consideration and necessary actions.

6.0 Roles and Responsibilities

The following boards, committees, offices and officers of the University shall be involved in the academic peer review processes:

- (a) Academic Board
- (b) Pro-Vice-Chancellor
- (c) Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee
- (d) Quality Assurance Office
- (e) Faculty/School Boards
- (f) Deans of Faculty/School
- (g) Departmental Boards
- (h) Heads of Department
- (i) Academic Staff

6.1 Academic Board

The Academic Board shall be responsible for giving broad directives regarding academic peer review processes in the University and appoint External Examiners.

6.2 Pro-Vice-Chancellor

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall receive AAPRRs from the Departments through the Deans of Faculty/School and the Quality Assurance Office.

6.3 Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC)

The APQAC acting on behalf of the Academic Board shall:

- (a) Discuss academic peer review reports from the Quality Assurance Office and give recommendations.
- (b) Address academic peer review issues that are beyond the Deans of Faculty/School and the Heads of Department.
- (c) Act on the directives of the Academic Board on academic peer review matters.

6.4 Quality Assurance Office

The Quality Assurance Office shall:

- (a) Liaise with the Departments through the Deans of Faculty/School to establish and implement academic peer review processes.
- (b) Prepare forms to be used by Departments in the academic peer review processes.
- (c) Offer advisory services and organise workshops on academic peer review processes.
- (d) Receive AAPRRs and report to the APQAC
- (e) Send feedback if any from the APQAC to the Faculties/School and Departments.

6.5 Faculty/School Boards

The Faculty/School Boards shall:

- (a) Consider External Examiners recommended by the Departmental Boards and make recommendations to the Academic Board.
- (b) Consider the AAPRRs of the Departments

6.6 Deans of Faculty/School

The Deans of Faculty/School shall receive the AAPRRs from the Departments and submit same to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor through the Quality Assurance Office.

6.7 Departmental Boards

The Departmental Boards shall:

- (a) Approve internal staff recommended by the Heads of Department to undertake academic peer review activities.
- (b) Recommend External Examiners through the Faculty/School Boards for consideration and appointment by the Academic Board.
- (c) Consider their AAPRRs

6.8 Heads of Department

The Heads of Department shall:

- (a) Ensure that academic peer review activities take place in the Departments.
- (b) Recommend Academic Peer Reviewers for the consideration and approval of the Departmental Boards, Faculty/School Boards and the Academic Board as the case may be.
- (c) Supervise the academic peer review processes.
- (d) Perform academic peer review liaison and reporting functions required.
- (e) Submit the AAPRRs covering all aspects of academic peer reviews undertaken in the academic year to the Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

6.9 Academic Staff

Every academic staff shall:

- (a) Subject himself or herself to the academic peer review processes.
- (b) Submit documents required for the academic peer review to the Heads of Department or the Academic Peer Reviewers on time.
- (c) Perform academic peer review duties objectively and report on such duties on time to the Heads of Department.

7.0 Regulatory Framework

The regulatory framework for this Policy includes:

- (a) National Board for Professional and Technician Examinations Act, 1994 (Act 492).
- (b) National Accreditation Board Act, 2007 (Act 744).
- (c) Technical Universities Act, 2016 (Act 922) as amended.

- (d) Statutes of the Ho Technical University (August, 2018).
- (e) Ho Polytechnic Ethics Policy (June 2011).
- (f) Ho Technical University Examinations Policy (Draft).

8.0 Monitoring and Review

This Policy shall be regularly monitored and reviewed by the Quality Assurance Office in consultation with the Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC) to ensure that it remains relevant to the mandate and academic aims of the University. The Policy shall be reviewed every five years. The date of the next review is 2024.

Authorization

This Policy was approved by the Ho Technical University Council on, 2019.

APPENDIX A

HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Academic Peer Review

Instructional Materials Review Report Form

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

Name of Staff Reviewed: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____ Level: _____

Course Title: _____ Course Code: _____

Instructional Materials Reviewed:

Course Outline Textbook Lecture Note Handout

Audio-Visual Material Others (Specify): _____

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree]

| S/N | Course Outline | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The course outline conforms to the prescribed format of the University. | | | | | |
| 2. | The course description is clear. | | | | | |
| 3. | The learning objectives are specific. | | | | | |
| 4. | The learning objectives are achievable. | | | | | |
| 5. | The topics are relevant to the course. | | | | | |
| 6. | The recommended texts are relevant to the course. | | | | | |
| 7. | The recommended texts are current. | | | | | |
| 8. | The recommended texts for the course are available. | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | Other Instructional Materials | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 9. | The other instructional materials are relevant to the course. | | | | | |
| 10. | The other instructional materials cover the course contents. | | | | | |
| 11. | The other instructional materials are suitable for the level of the students. | | | | | |

12. Overall, how would you rate the instructional materials for the course?

Excellent Very Good Good Fair Poor

13. What are the strengths of the instructional materials?

14. What are the weaknesses of the instructional materials?

15. What changes would you recommend to improve the instructional materials?

Instl. Mat. Reviewer's Name:

_____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX B
HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
Academic Peer Review
Teaching Observation Report Form

Academic Year: _____
 Semester: _____
 Name of Teacher Observed: _____
 Department: _____
 Programme: _____ Level: _____
 Course Title: _____ Course Code: _____
 Lesson Topic: _____
 Mode of Delivery: _____ Lesson Venue: _____
 Lesson Period: _____ to _____ Observation Period: _____ to _____

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree]

| S/N | Start of the Lesson | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The teacher was punctual to the class. | | | | | |
| 2. | The teacher was suitably dressed. | | | | | |
| 3. | The teacher established a good rapport with the class e.g. by exchanging greetings with the class, expressing a pleasant body language. | | | | | |
| 4. | The teacher reviewed the previous lesson with the class satisfactorily. | | | | | |
| 5. | The teacher mentioned the lesson's topic in writing and verbally. | | | | | |
| 6. | The teacher gave an overview of the lesson by mentioning the objectives of the lesson. | | | | | |
| | Delivery of the Lesson | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 7. | The mode of delivery was appropriate to the lesson. | | | | | |
| 8. | The teacher delivered the lesson clearly with appropriate illustrations. | | | | | |
| 9. | The teacher's pace of delivery was appropriate. | | | | | |
| 10. | The teacher sustained the attention of the students during the lesson. | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 11. | The teacher used relevant teaching and learning materials. | | | | | |
| 12. | The teacher allowed students to contribute their ideas to the lesson. | | | | | |
| 13. | The teacher allowed students to ask questions about the lesson. | | | | | |
| 14. | The teacher responded to students' questions satisfactorily. | | | | | |
| 15. | The teacher's delivery was ethical. | | | | | |
| | Conclusion of the Lesson | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 16. | The teacher summarized the lesson satisfactory. | | | | | |
| 17. | The teacher encouraged the students to explore more about the lesson. | | | | | |

18. Overall, how would you rate the performance of the teacher observed in this lesson?

Excellent
 Very Good
 Good
 Fair
 Poor

19. What were the strengths of the teaching observed?

20. What were the weaknesses about the teaching observed?

21. What changes would you recommend to improve the teaching knowledge, skill and attitude of the teacher observed?

22. Comments of the teacher observed about the Teaching Observer's assessment:

Teacher Observed's

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Teaching Observer's

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX C
HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
Academic Peer Review

Examination Questions & Marking Schemes Internal Moderation Report Form

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____ Level: _____

Course Title: _____ Course Code: _____

No. of Questions Set: _____ No. of Questions to be Answered: _____

Duration of Paper: _____

Nature of Examination:

Written Exam Practical Exam Oral Exam

Materials Reviewed:

Course Outline Examination Questions Marking Scheme

Others (Specify): _____

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree]

| S/N | Examination Questions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The examination paper conforms to the prescribed format of the University. | | | | | |
| 2. | The examination instructions are comprehensible. | | | | | |
| 3. | The examination questions are comprehensible. | | | | | |
| 4. | The duration of the examination is fair in relation to the tasks involved. | | | | | |
| 5. | Considering the course outline, the examination questions relate to the candidates' knowledge, skills and attitude gained during the course. | | | | | |
| 6. | The examination questions appropriately cover the course outline. | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 7. | The levels of difficulty of the questions are appropriate for the class. | | | | | |
| 8. | The marks allocated to the questions are fair. | | | | | |
| | Marking Scheme | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. | The answers provided in the marking scheme are correct. | | | | | |
| 10. | The marking scheme is comprehensible. | | | | | |
| 11. | The marks allocated to the correct answers are fair to the students. | | | | | |
| 12. | The marks allocated to correct answers of each question sum up accurately to the marks allocated to the questions. | | | | | |
| 13. | The marks allocated to the questions sum up accurately to the marks allocated to the whole examination. | | | | | |

14. Overall, how would you rate the examination questions and the marking scheme?

Excellent
 Very Good
 Good
 Fair
 Poor

15. What are the strengths of the examination questions and/or the marking scheme?

16. What are the weaknesses of the examination questions and/or the marking scheme?

17. What changes would you recommend to improve the examination questions and/or the marking scheme?

2nd Internal Examiner's

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

Head of Department's

Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX D

HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Academic Peer Review

Marked Scripts Vetting Report Form

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____ Level: _____

Course Title: _____ Course Code: _____

No. of Questions Set: _____ No. of Questions to be answered: _____

Duration of Paper: _____

Nature of Examination:

Written Exam Practical Exam Oral Exam

Materials Reviewed:

Examination Questions Marking Scheme Marked Scripts
 Result Sheets External Examiner's Moderation Report

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree]

| S/N | Correction of Examination Questions and Marking Scheme in line with the External Examiner's Moderation Report | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. | The corrections recommended by the External Examiner were effected in the examination questions. | | | | | |
| 2. | The corrections recommended by the External Examiner were effected in the marking scheme. | | | | | |
| | Marking of Scripts | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3. | The First Internal Examiner marked all questions answered in every examination script sampled. | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4. | Marks awarded the candidates were in line with the marking scheme. | | | | | | |
| 5. | The First Internal Examiner was consistent in awarding marks according to the marking scheme. | | | | | | |
| 6. | The marks awarded to correct answers of each question sum up accurately to the marks awarded to the questions. | | | | | | |
| 7. | The marks awarded to the correct answers sum up accurately to the marks awarded to the whole examination. | | | | | | |
| 8. | Marks awarded to candidates were properly recorded on the score sheets. | | | | | | |

9. Overall, how would you rate the marking of the scripts?

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

10. What are the strengths detected about the marking of the scripts?

11. What are the weaknesses detected about the marking of the scripts?

12. What changes would you recommend to improve marking of the scripts?

2nd Internal Examiner's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX E

HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Academic Peer Review

Marked Project Work and Dissertation Vetting Report Form

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____ Level: _____

Project work/Dissertation Topic: _____

Name(s) of Candidate(s): _____ Index No(s). of Candidate(s): _____

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree]

| S/N | Areas of Assessment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The research topic is well stated. | | | | | |
| 2. | The research problem(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | |
| 3. | The research objective(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | |
| 4. | The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana. | | | | | |
| 5. | The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature. | | | | | |
| 6. | The candidate(s) properly justified the sample size and sampling method(s) used. | | | | | |
| 7. | The candidate(s) thoroughly described the sampling method(s) used. | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8. | The candidate(s) properly justified the data collection method(s) used. | | | | | |
| 9. | The candidate(s) thoroughly described the data collection method(s) used. | | | | | |
| 10. | The candidate(s) properly justified the data analysis technique(s) used. | | | | | |
| 11. | The candidate(s) thoroughly described data analysis technique(s) used. | | | | | |
| 12. | The results of the study relate to the data analysis technique(s) stated. | | | | | |
| 13. | The findings of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge. | | | | | |
| 14. | The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana. | | | | | |
| 15. | The project work or dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed format and standard of the University. | | | | | |
| 16. | Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and grammatically correct. | | | | | |

17. Overall, how would you rate the project work or dissertation?

Excellent
 Very Good
 Good
 Fair
 Poor

18. What are the strengths of the project work or dissertation?

19. What are the weaknesses of the project work or dissertation?

20. What recommendation(s) would you give to the First Internal Examiner in view of the vetting of this project work or dissertation?

2nd Internal Examiner's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX F
HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
 Academic Peer Review

Examination Questions, Marking Schemes & Marked Scripts Audit
 Report Form

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____ Level: _____

Course Title: _____ Course Code: _____

Nature of Examination:

Written Exam Practical Exam Oral Exam

Materials Audited:

Course Outline Examination Questions Marking Scheme Marked Scripts
 Examination Score Sheet

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree]

| S/N | Examination Questions | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. | The examination paper conforms to the prescribed University rubrics. | | | | | |
| 2. | The examination instructions are comprehensible. | | | | | |
| 3. | The examination questions are comprehensible. | | | | | |
| 4. | The duration of the examination is fair in relation to the tasks involved. | | | | | |
| 5. | The examination questions appropriately cover the course outline. | | | | | |
| 6. | The levels of difficulty of the questions are appropriate for the class. | | | | | |
| 7. | The marks allocated to the questions are fair. | | | | | |
| 8. | Considering the course outline, the examination questions relate to the candidates' knowledge, skills and attitudes gained during the course. | | | | | |
| | Marking Scheme | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 9. | The answers provided in the marking scheme are correct. | | | | | |
| 10. | The marking scheme is comprehensible. | | | | | |
| 11. | The marks allocated to the correct answers are fair to the students. | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 12. | The marks allocated to correct answers of each question sum up accurately to the marks allocated to the questions. | | | | | |
| 13. | The marks allocated to the questions sum up accurately to the marks allocated to the whole examination. | | | | | |
| Marking of Scripts | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 14. | All questions answered in every examination script sampled were marked. | | | | | |
| 15. | Marks awarded the candidates were in line with the marking scheme. | | | | | |
| 16. | There was consistency in awarding marks according to the marking scheme. | | | | | |
| 17. | The marks awarded to correct answers of each question sum up accurately to the marks awarded to the question. | | | | | |
| 18. | The marks awarded to the correct answers sum up accurately to the marks awarded to the whole examination. | | | | | |
| 19. | Marks awarded to candidates were properly recorded on the marked scripts. | | | | | |
| Recording of Marks | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 20. | Marks recorded on the marked scripts were correctly transferred to the examination score sheet. | | | | | |
| 21. | Marks on the examination score sheet were orderly and correctly presented. | | | | | |

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Excellent; 4=Very Good; 3=Good; 2=Fair; 1=Poor]

| S/N | Overall Assessments | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. | Overall, how would you rate the course outline? | | | | | |
| 23. | Overall, how would you rate the examination questions? | | | | | |
| 24. | Overall, how would you rate the marking scheme? | | | | | |
| 25. | Overall, how would you rate the marking of scripts? | | | | | |
| 26. | Overall, how would you rate the recording of marks? | | | | | |

27. Indicate strengths identified in the following:

a) Course Outline

b) Examination Questions

c) Marking Scheme

d) Marking of Scripts

e) Recording of Marks

28. Indicate weaknesses identified in the following:

a) Course Outline

b) Examination Questions

c) Marking Scheme

d) Marking of Scripts

e) Recording of Marks

29. Any Other Remarks/Comments

30. Recommendations

External Examiner's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX G1
HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
 Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form
 (For Surveys, Experiments, Observations, etc)

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____

Project Work/Dissertation Topic: _____

Name(s) of Candidate(s): _____ Index No(s). of Candidate(s): _____

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree; NA=Not Applicable]

| S/N | Areas of Assessment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. | The research topic is well stated. | | | | | | |
| 2. | The research problem(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 3. | The research objective(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 4. | The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | |
| 5. | The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature. | | | | | | |
| 6. | The candidate(s) properly justified the sample size and sampling method(s) used. | | | | | | |
| 7. | The candidate(s) thoroughly described the sampling method(s) used. | | | | | | |
| 8. | The candidate(s) properly justified the data collection method(s) used. | | | | | | |
| 9. | The candidate(s) thoroughly described the data collection method(s) | | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | used. | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | The candidate(s) properly justified the data analysis technique(s) used. | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | The candidate(s) thoroughly described data analysis technique(s) used. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | The results relate to data analysis technique(s) stated. | | | | | | | | |
| 13. | The findings and discussions of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge. | | | | | | | | |
| 14. | The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | | | |
| 15. | The project work/dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed rubrics of the University. | | | | | | | | |
| 16. | Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and grammatically correct. | | | | | | | | |

17. What are the strengths identified in the project work/dissertation?

18. What are the weaknesses identified in the project work/dissertation?

19. Comment on the grading of the project work/dissertation by the First Internal Examiner.

20. Any other Remarks/Comments

21. Recommendations

External Examiner's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX G2
HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY
 Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form
 (For Design and Construction/Production)

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____

Project Work/Dissertation Topic: _____

Name(s) of Candidate(s):

Index No(s). of Candidate(s):

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree; NA=Not Applicable]

| S/N | Areas of Assessment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. | The research topic is well stated. | | | | | | |
| 2. | The research problem(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 3. | The research objective(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 4. | The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | |
| 5. | The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature. | | | | | | |
| 6. | The candidate(s) properly justified the design criteria and constraints. | | | | | | |
| 7. | The candidate(s) thoroughly evaluated alternative designs. | | | | | | |
| 8. | The candidate(s) developed the design into working drawings/sketches/technical specifications. | | | | | | |
| 9. | The candidate(s) properly built (constructed) prototype of best design. | | | | | | |
| 10. | The candidate(s) followed the required safety procedures. | | | | | | |
| 11. | The candidate(s) thoroughly tested and evaluated the prototype | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | employing the design criteria. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | The candidate(s) properly analysed test results, made design changes and retested the design. | | | | | | | | |
| 13. | The candidate(s) properly made design changes and retested the design when necessary. | | | | | | | | |
| 14. | The candidate(s) thoroughly communicated the design or proved its functionality. | | | | | | | | |
| 15. | The product(s) relate to the design criteria stated. | | | | | | | | |
| 16. | The findings and discussions of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge. | | | | | | | | |
| 17. | The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | | | |
| 18. | The project work/dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed rubrics of the University. | | | | | | | | |
| 19. | Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and grammatically correct. | | | | | | | | |

20. What are the strengths identified in the project work/dissertation?

21. What are the weaknesses identified in the project work/dissertation?

22. Comment on the grading of the project work/dissertation by the First Internal Examiner.

23. Any other Remarks/Comments

24. Recommendations

External Examiner's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

*Design criteria: Aesthetics, Robustness, Cost, Resources, Time, Skill required, Safety

APPENDIX G3

HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form

(For Painting, Sculpture, Graphic Design, Ceramics & Textiles)

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____

Project Work/Dissertation Topic: _____

Name(s) of Candidate(s): _____ Index No(s). of Candidate(s): _____

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree;

NA=Not Applicable]

| S/N | Areas of Assessment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. | The research topic is well stated. | | | | | | |
| 2. | The research problem(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 3. | The research objective(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 4. | The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | |
| 5. | The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature. | | | | | | |
| 6. | The candidate(s) properly justified the originality of the product. | | | | | | |
| 7. | The candidate(s) thoroughly demonstrated the mastery of use of tools and materials. | | | | | | |
| 8. | The candidate(s) properly designed, demonstrated knowledge and skill in use of elements and principles of art (lines, dots and colour | | | | | | |

Academic Peer Review Policy

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | combinations). | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | The candidate(s) thoroughly demonstrated knowledge and skill in draftsmanship/ craftsmanship. | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | The candidate(s) thoroughly proved the product's functionality. | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | The product(s) relate to the stated objective(s). | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | The findings and discussions of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge. | | | | | | | | |
| 13. | The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | | | |
| 14. | The project work/dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed rubrics of the University. | | | | | | | | |
| 15. | Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and grammatically correct. | | | | | | | | |

16. What are the strengths identified in the project work/dissertation?

17. What are the weaknesses identified in the project work/dissertation?

18. Comment on the grading of the project work/dissertation by the First Internal Examiner.

19. Any other Remarks/Comments

20. Recommendations

External Examiner's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX G4

HO TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form

(For Product Development)

Academic Year: _____ Semester: _____

First Internal Examiner's Name: _____

Department: _____

Programme: _____

Project Work/Dissertation Topic: _____

Name(s) of Candidate(s): _____ Index No(s). of Candidate(s): _____

Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments would assist to improve course quality.

Please indicate a tick in the column that most closely reflects your opinion using the Five Point Scale below:

[5=Strongly Agree; 4=Agree; 3=Quite Agree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree; NA=Not Applicable]

| S/N | Areas of Assessment | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | NA |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|----|
| 1. | The research topic is well stated. | | | | | | |
| 2. | The research problem(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 3. | The research objective(s) is/are well formulated. | | | | | | |
| 4. | The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | |
| 5. | The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature. | | | | | | |
| 6. | The candidate(s) properly justified the originality/innovativeness of the product. | | | | | | |
| 7. | The candidate(s) thoroughly demonstrated the knowledge and skill in packaging (using appropriate packaging material(s), incorporating hygiene and safety). | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 8. | The candidate(s) properly demonstrated knowledge and skill in the design of the label (E.g. brand name, nutritional content, expiry date, manufacturing date, ingredients, legibility etc.) | | | | | | | | |
| 9. | The candidate(s) thoroughly demonstrated knowledge and skill in sensory analysis. | | | | | | | | |
| 10. | The candidate(s) properly demonstrated knowledge and skill in product testing. | | | | | | | | |
| 11. | The candidate(s) thoroughly proved the product's functionality. | | | | | | | | |
| 12. | The product (s) relate to the stated objective(s). | | | | | | | | |
| 13. | The findings and discussions of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge. | | | | | | | | |
| 14. | The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana. | | | | | | | | |
| 15. | The project work/dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed rubrics of the University. | | | | | | | | |
| 16. | Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and grammatically correct. | | | | | | | | |

17. What are the strengths identified in the project work/dissertation?

18. What are the weaknesses identified in the project work/dissertation?

19. Comment on the grading of the project work/dissertation by the First Internal Examiner.

20. Any other Remarks/Comments

21. Recommendations

External Examiner's Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____

