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FORWARD

Since September 2007 universities in the East African region have been undertaking a regional project on Quality Assurance. The project focused on developing internal quality assurance structures in the various universities. The initial phases of the project took place under the auspices of the Inter University Council of East Africa (IUCEA) with support from the German Academic Exchange Services (DAAD).

The project, through the support of the national regulatory agencies, has been a success and has resulted in capacity building on the Quality Assurance initiative in the participating universities drawn from the five East African countries of Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda and Burundi. The project has also resulted in the development of a Handbook for Quality Assurance in Higher Education, known as “A Roadmap to Quality”, which consists of four volumes. The first two volumes of the handbook have been published and distributed to the participating universities.

The project entailed the universities carrying out a self-assessment of selected programmes, which were thereafter externally reviewed by experts using the handbook. Reports on the peer review were given to the relevant universities. A mid-term evaluation of the project that was carried out in 2010 provided useful insights about the success of the project. A study was also carried out among the trained quality assurance co-ordinators to establish the effectiveness of the project in the various participating universities. Results from the evaluation of the project indicated that most of the participating universities have embraced the Quality Assurance initiative and are using the handbook to improve on quality. This has seen the establishment of Quality Assurance units and the development of appropriate QA mechanisms and policies in the various universities. The universities expressed a desire to be trained further on various aspects of quality assurance.

As first phase of the project advanced towards the end, it was found necessary to organize this “East African Quality Management and Quality Assurance Coordinators’ Networking” workshop in order to share experiences and lessons learned with a view of re-orienting the project from the quality assurance focus to quality management. The workshop was organized in three parts, namely:

a) The Future of the Quality Assurance Forum: The First High Level Forum on Quality Management in East Africa;

b) A Tool for Quality Development: EDULINK Partnership between East Africa and Europe; and

c) From Quality Assurance to Quality Management: The First Meeting of the East African University Quality Assurance Coordinators’ Network

The workshop brought together the top management and quality assurance co-ordinators of the participating universities and other interested universities in the region.

The workshop culminated in:
a) The IUCEA giving its commitment to spearhead the future Quality Assurance Initiatives in the region with the full support of the National Regulatory Agencies and the various universities of the region;

b) The establishment of the East African University Quality Assurance Coordinators’ Network (QAC-NET) with an interim steering committee to spearhead its activities with the assistance of the IUCEA;

c) The commitment of member states to form National Chapters of the QAC-NET under the direction of the respective National Regulatory Agencies.

It is envisaged that as the various partners commit themselves to enhancing quality and upscaling quality assurance activities, the Quality Assurance initiatives in the region shall be sustained.
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PART A
THE FUTURE OF THE EAST AFRICAN QUALITY ASSURANCE
(The first High Level Forum on Quality Management in East Africa
(Hi-Quam I)

1.1. OPENING SPEECHES – HIGHLIGHTS

1.1.1 Prof. Everett Standa, CEO CHE

a) The delegates were welcomed with a special note that a lot of progress had been made since the inception of the QA project;

b) It was expected that the project will yield fruitful results;

c) The project was considered to have demonstrated that quality assurance is crucial for:
   
   i. Enhancing competitiveness of universities;
   ii. Marketing products of the university; and
   iii. Giving university a mark of recognition.

d) It was noted that the aspiration to be world class has to be within the context of quality, hence, it was envisaged that quality will be enhanced in the participating universities;

e) IUCEA and the East African NRAs were commended for their role in institutionalizing quality assurance in the region;

f) There was need for awareness on the emerging challenges of quality which include
   
   i. Rapid expansion of university education; and
   ii. Limited staffing capacity, hence, lack of adequate academic leadership in programmes

g) As the QA initiative progresses, there was need to:
   
   i. Establish how the graduates were performing in the job market, hence the need for tracers studies;
   ii. Establish a criteria to recognize excellence; and
   iii. Enhance collaboration with stakeholders.

h) Universities were expected to demonstrate support for the QA initiative through providing budgets at the institutional level.
1.1.2 **Prof. James Tuitoek, Representative, IUCEA Executive Committee**

a) IUCEA welcomed the participants who were high profile representatives drawn from the East African Region, German and the Netherlands;

b) It was noted that quality assurance is one of the pillars of IUCEA;

c) The workshop was therefore considered as a follow-up of the QA initiatives since they began in the region;

d) In cognisance of the possible conclusion of the DAAD support to the initiative, there was need to have an East African supported initiative, thus the need for such a meeting;

e) IUCEA was prepared to give the onward lead towards the East African QA Initiative;

f) The various NRAs were therefore required to implement the initiative at the national level with the co-ordination of the whole project being undertaken by IUCEA;

g) To this effect, an exercise of cost sharing with the universities, NRAs and IUCEA was required;

h) IUCEA was committed to cost share with the NRAs in order to see the initiative sustained in the region;

i) DAAD was thanked for its initiative in QA in the region and for organizing such a workshop as a transitional forum.

1.1.3 **Christoph Hansert, DAAD, Regional Office for Africa, Nairobi**

a) DAAD welcomed all the participants to the workshop on behalf of the German ambassador;

b) It was reported that progress had been made since the inception of the project. Progress had been made in the setting up of QA units at universities and training of QA officers among other areas;

c) The project was expected to continue and DAAD was willing to continue cooperating with all stakeholders in the next phase of the programme.

d) During the course of the project some important milestones had been reached including:

i. The publishing and the launch of the handbook on QA;

ii. The formalization of the EA community hence making it another partner in the project; and

iii. Mid-term review of the project and recommendations.

e) The mid-term review, which was conducted by external reviewers, highlighted certain issues that the project needed to take into consideration in the next phase. These included the observed need to:
i. Strengthen and broaden linkages with other projects and initiatives in quality assurance;

ii. Broaden the scope of the project;

iii. Establish fora that will ensure that QA lives beyond the project;

iv. Retrain QA officers in universities due to the frequent movement of staff across universities; and

v. Shift from QA to QM, in essence having QA that leads to quality improvement.

f) The handbook had created interest in other regions of the continent.

1.1.4 Prof. Harry Kaane, Secretary of Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology, representing Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology

a) The participants were welcomed, more so those from outside Kenya;

b) The support of the German government, through DAAD, was appreciated;

c) The Government of Kenya took cognizance of the workshop that comprised three parts to be held in the course of the week;

d) Various challenges in University Education in the region were highlighted;

e) It was noted that, as the country strives to achieve vision 2030, the aim is to provide knowledge that would transform Kenya from an agro-based to an industrial-based economy;

f) There was need for a balance between QA and addressing the needs of the four pillars of education, namely, access and equity, relevance and quality of outcomes, efficiency and sustainability of HE through financing;

g) There was need for the NRAs in the region to come together in order to establish the criteria used in assessing quality in the various countries and aim at harmonizing quality indicators in the region;

h) The Education Secretary declared the meeting officially open.

1.1.5 Discussions

a) It was observed that the ISO quality management system was not sufficient in judging the quality of University Education. While ISO quality management systems focused on processes, those of universities focused on quality assurance and management including the quality of resources; and

b) The expansion of University Education would not render technical and vocational education irrelevant.
1.2. OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

1.2.1 Presentation of the Joint IUCEA-DAAD-HRK QA Initiative 2006-2010 and the mid term review results

By: James Tuitoek

a) The East African QA initiative was conceived through a cooperation agreement framework between IUCEA and NRAs of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania (now with Rwanda & Burundi) on:
   i. Developing a framework for describing and quantifying the content of study programmes;
   ii. Benchmarking, equating and recognizing qualifications;
   iii. Developing and overseeing the use, by institutions, of common, comparable or equivalent admission requirements across the sub-region for courses of study;
   iv. Developing and using common criteria and benchmarks for QA in HE; and
   v. Sharing information on mechanisms and status of QA, accreditation of institutions and programmes including informing each other about the issuance and revocation of relevant licenses, charters as well as approval or cancellation of programmes.

b) It was considered necessary to have a regional QA system so as to promote:
   i. Regional comparability of HE;
   ii. Regional student and staff mobility;
   iii. Internationally credible higher education area;
   iv. Credibility and academic excellence within regional/international socio-economic block set up;
   v. Employability of graduates and labour mobility across borders; and
   vi. Institutional accountability to national stakeholders.

c) The cornerstone of the initiative was the development of the IUCEA Handbook called “Roadmap to Quality” which gives guidelines on how universities can carry out Programme Self and External Assessment;

d) The preparation of the handbook was based on materials and instruments from CHE, NCHE TCU and international best practices;

e) The key players in the development of the handbook were drawn from IUCEA, DAAD, University of Oldenburg, Germany, the East
African NRAs, University managers and Vice Chancellors, academicians and consultants;

f) The Handbook had four volumes, namely,
   i. Volume 1: Guidelines for Self-Assessment at program level;
   ii. Volume 2: Guidelines for external program assessment;
   iii. Volume 3: Guidelines for Self-Assessment at Institutional level; and
   iv. Volume 4: The implementation of a Quality Assurance system

g) Achievements of the QA initiative included:
   i. Capacity building in QA in university education;
   ii. Establishment of a QA unit at IUCEA;
   iii. Establishment of QA units at universities;
   iv. Development of QA policies;
   v. External peer review of several piloted programmes of selected universities; and
   vi. Publishing and launching of Volume 1 and 2 of the handbook

h) Challenges to the QA initiative included:
   i. Resistance among some staff, students and management;
   ii. QA personnel assigned other responsibilities;
   iii. Inadequate funding;
   iv. Heavy teaching and administrative workload;
   v. Quick turnover among students and staff; and
   vi. QA policy and units not established in some universities.

i) A mid-term review was carried out in 2010 with various observations and recommendations.

1.2.2 An analysis of the peer review report of Cohort A and B

By: Ton Vroeijenstijn

a) Between November 2008 and March 2010, external peer review teams evaluated and compiled reports on a total of 46 programmes in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda;

b) The East African-German Co-operation in Enhancing Quality Assurance in Higher Education was evaluated by an external team in 2009 and the report published in March 2010;
c) The analysis of the peer review reports was carried out in two parts, notably:
   i. The analysis of the peer review reports with the aim of seeing if the comments made by the evaluation team are valid or not and how the East African Universities benefited from the comments; and
   ii. The analysis of the recommendations of the peer review teams with the aim of formulating an agenda for quality enhancement of the East African Education sector.

d) Based on the recommendations made in the peer review reports and the evaluation of the reports by the external team, various areas were found important in formulating a clear quality improvement agenda for the universities in the future;

e) The following were considered as possible quality agendas for IUCEA and NRAs:
   i. Drawing up a list of references and leading literature;
   ii. Developing training materials;
   iii. Organising workshops for the QA officers; and
   iv. Addressing the following topics:
      - Formulation of Expected Learning Outcomes;
      - The role and function of a curriculum committee;
      - The role and function of the Examination Committee;
      - The role and function of the External Examiner;
      - How to organise student evaluation;
      - How to use the benchmark instrument;
      - How to conduct tracer studies; and
      - How to implement an IQA system.

1.2.3 IUCEA/DAAD QA Project: The pilot and beyond

By: Mike Kuria and Ina Grieb

a) A study was carried out in the universities that participated in the project in order to establish:
   i. The achievements of the QA project;
   ii. The QA state of affairs in the universities; and
   iii. The training needs and priorities.

b) There was a total of 70% response rate, which was considered good;
c) In general, there was high support of QA in universities. However, difficulties were experienced in a few cases;

d) QA mechanisms and policies had been adopted in many universities;

e) Capacity for QA had been strengthened as a result of the project;

f) It was found beneficial by the majority to have cooperation and exchange among QA experts;

g) The peer review reports were found useful by the majority;

h) Many universities were considered to be supportive to the initiative through the provision of finances and personnel;

i) Difficulties were being experienced in some universities in the way of:

   i. Resistance by some administrators to adopt the QA initiative;

   ii. Lack of support from management;

   iii. Limited funds for carrying out QA activities; and

   iv. Heavy workloads for the staff members.

j) The respondents agreed that they needed further training in various areas including tracer studies execution, curriculum review, project management, data management, formulation of learning outcomes and stakeholders’ involvement.

1.2.4 Discussions on the overview of the project

a) Peer review process

   i. Some universities were considered to have been very defensive thus resulting in cases of the peer reviewers asserting their stands and thus being considered as imposing their own views;

   ii. There was a sense of unpreparedness among the peer reviewers. This may have resulted from the limited time given to the peer review training process (especially for the 2nd cohort);

   iii. Many of the peer review reports were considered to be of poor quality. There was need to establish the cause of poor report writing by the external peer reviewers. There was need for an analysis of the factors that contributed to the poor writing of the reports by the peers. Some aspects considered as possibly having influenced the writing of the reports were:

      - The unpreparedness of the peer reviewers for the exercise;

      - The inadequacy of the training duration;

      - Logistical issues; and
• Time constraint during the peer exercise.

iv. There was need for more time to be allocated to the training of peer reviewers at the beginning of a given project so as to allow for simulation of knowledge, skills and attitudes;

v. There was need for the external peer reviewers to take into consideration the quality policies of the institutions they are reviewing as spelt out in the SAR while compiling their reports;

vi. The various universities needed to carefully consider the process of identifying and selecting peer reviewers for the QA initiative so as to ensure that they provide their best. It was observed that the selected peers benefited their mother institutions more than the institutions they reviewed hence the need for careful selection;

vii. The mechanism of peer selection needed to be carefully discussed, approved and operationalized in the entire region; and

viii. In order to enhance the peer review teams, there was need for the selection process to go beyond the CVs and consider other aspects such as commitment, trustworthiness and work ethics, among others.

b) Quality Assurance co-ordinators

i. There was a high percentage of trained QA co-ordinators who were no longer in the project. It was found necessary to establish what happened and how to avoid the same in the future;

ii. There was resistance from some managers who felt that QA co-ordinators should only be senior managers of the institutions; and

iii. There was need to maximize on the peer reviewers and QA co-ordinators already trained hence the need for training of trainer programmes.

c) Curriculum Development

i. There was a tendency of ‘copy and pasting’ in curriculum development. This affected the quality of the programmes produced in the region. More attention needed to be given to the development and review of curriculum in order to ensure that gaps are adequately addressed, competencies are enhanced and relevant knowledge, skills and attitudes are addressed;

ii. Curriculum of any given programme needed to be regularly reviewed;

iii. There was need for a shared understanding of the common competencies of similar programmes; and

iv. Quality was the responsibility of individual universities. Thus individual universities needed to take care of their QA mechanisms with regard to curriculum development.

d) Carrying out Tracer Studies in Universities
In order to ensure tracer studies were carried out in universities, it was suggested that more focus be given to them through ensuring that they are included in strategic plans and performance contracts of various institutions.

e) **Sustainability of the Quality Assurance Initiative of the East African Region**

i. The sustainability strategies of the QA initiative needed to be well thought out in light of the possible pulling out of the main sponsor, DAAD;

ii. Sustainability of the initiative would depend on individual universities;

iii. Institutions needed to consider clustering programmes for peer review purposes so as to reduce the financial strain of having to review too many programmes;

iv. IUCEA was committed to continue the QA initiative on a cost sharing basis, for purposes of seeing the initiative sustained; and

v. There was need for national networks of QA Co-ordinators as regional networks of QA Co-ordinators are developed.

f) **Quality policies**

i. Several universities had developed QA policies which were at different stages;

ii. There was need to rope in professional bodies into the initiative so as to play a complementary role in enhancing quality; and

iii. There was need to disseminate the handbook more widely to stakeholders.

1.3. **CONSEQUENCES FROM THE REPORTS AND WAY FORWARD**

*By: Marc Wilde*

1.3.1 There was an expressed need to bring together the peers who had been trained so as to:

a) Discuss the results of the evaluation reports and what they mean for the different stakeholders;

b) Analyse the experiences from the peer visits and make follow-ups;

c) Exchange experience among QAOs; and

d) Develop a vision for Regional QA in Eastern Africa and adjust the actions within the second phase of the IUCEA-DAAD-HRK Initiative accordingly.

1.3.2 It was considered important to prioritize the recommendations of the peers and determine what kind of action was needed and by who;
1.3.3 The IUCEA together with NRAs needed to define priorities and match their demands with expertise and capacity of European partners;

1.3.4 The following were the key recommendations from the evaluation reports:
   a) Continuation of training;
   b) Multiplication of the QA training among others in the region;
   c) Networking of QA experts within the region; and
   d) Promoting integrative approaches to QA and QM.

1.3.5 The QA initiative needed to be aligned to the processes of NRAs;

1.3.6 The QA initiative needed to develop dialogue with other QA projects and explore relationships and synergies with other organizations and projects, including PAU, Tuning Africa, AfriCAN, INQAAHE, GIQAC and other national donors.

1.3.7 There was need to ensure sustainability of the QA initiative in the region through development of instruments to support the continuing improvement of HE institutions and programmes;

1.3.8 The capacity of IUCEA needed to be strengthened so as to gradually take over the responsibility of QA in the region.

1.4. IMPLEMENTATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL: EXPERIENCE FROM TCU

By: Valeriane Damain

1.4.1 Generally, TCU had played a great role in sensitizing university managers, faculty, students and other potential stakeholders on the need for the structured and functional QA units that coordinate and monitor QA systems at the institution level;

1.4.2 Specifically, TCU had:
   a) Carried out monitoring visits to universities for sharing achievements, challenges and providing guidance where required;
   b) Conducted three national QA workshops;
   c) Reviewed its Universities General QA Regulations that guide development, validation and approval processes of universities’ policy documents and programmes to capture elements of learning outcomes and stakeholders’ involvement;
   d) Adopted and integrated the IUCEA’s checklist on the quality of institution as one of the evaluation tools used during technical evaluation of universities; and
   e) Posted the four volumes of the IUCEA-QA handbook for access by interested stakeholders in the TCU website.
1.4.3 In collaboration with the IUCEA Secretariat, TCU was involved in preparation of project self-assessment report which formed a basis for the external review of the project; and

1.4.4 The outcomes of the project were considered to have been positive in Tanzania as all participating universities were in the process of establishing concrete IQA systems. In addition, institutions that were not part of the project had shown interests to learn and mainstream QA activities.

1.5. EXPECTATIONS OF UNIVERSITIES ON NATIONAL REGULATORY AGENCIES AND RESPONSES

1.5.1 Tanzania

a) The Tanzanian universities expected the regulatory agent to:
   i. Strengthen its capacity regarding QM in the institutions so as to efficiently implement the QA initiatives in the universities;
   ii. Play a role in harmonizing various disciplines with requirements of professional bodies and determine the core competencies, skills and attitudes needed for the disciplines; and
   iii. Come up with a strategy for sustaining the QA processes.

b) According to TCU:
   i. Follow-up of QA processes had been done through the regular institutional audits; and
   ii. A framework was in place for implementing the QA initiatives.

1.5.2 Uganda

a) The Ugandan universities expected the regulatory agent to:
   i. Play a more active role and engage with universities more frequently and proactively on QA issues;
   ii. Co-ordinate training and sensitization of university staff;
   iii. Develop QA materials for the universities; and
   iv. Work with external organs as partners, such as IUCEA, and
   v. Disseminate information to all levels

b) According to NCHE–Uganda, it was:
   i. Already working with the universities on QA;
ii. Strengthening their capacity through recruitment of new officers;

iii. In the process of initiating programme and institutional self evaluation in the universities; and

iv. Already working with external bodies as partners in the QA initiative.

1.5.3 Kenya

a) The Kenyan universities expect the regulatory agent to:
   i. Carry out regular visitations/inspection of all universities;
   ii. Provide guidance on the expected quality of academic staff;
   iii. Create a forum of key QA stakeholders;
   iv. Harmonize quality requirements in curriculum/programme development in both private and public universities;
   v. Accredit all programmes in universities in liaison with the professional bodies where applicable;
   vi. Provide clear policy guidelines for the engagement of professional bodies in the QA process;
   vii. Demand that all universities develop QA policies;
   viii. Link programme self assessment reports to the accreditation of programmes; and
   ix. Coordinate peer reviewers for other programs beyond the project.

b) According to CHE:
   i. There was a University Bill that would be enacted once it is approved by the Kenyan parliament. The new bill would bring both public and private universities under the same regulatory framework;
   ii. It was already taking the peer review approach, whereby Chartered Universities that have established a QA system would be allowed to launch academic programmes and then be subjected to periodic peer reviews;
   iii. Universities were expected to first clear with the relevant professional bodies before their programmes can be approved by CHE;
   iv. It carried out regular inspections of private universities and constituent colleges of public universities; and
   v. It was in the process of restructuring itself so as to be able to handle the demands of the new dispensation.
1.5.4 Rwanda and Burundi

a) According to the Rwanda and Burundi universities, they are still new to the project and desired to grow more in QA with the regulatory agent giving direction;

b) According to the regulatory agent in Burundi:
   i. It was coming up with QA standards for both private and public universities;
   ii. It anticipated the translation of the regional QA handbook to French for their use as a country and other francophone countries; and
   iii. All universities are expected to set up directorates of quality.

c) According to NCHE, Rwanda:
   i. It had already set up a National Qualification Framework for Higher Education and Quality Assurance Policy documents had been published at the national level; and
   ii. The Directorate of Quality in different Institutions of Higher Learning needed to be closely linked to the IUCEA in order to speed up the implementation of the Quality Policy with the support of the NCHE-Rwanda.

1.5.5 Inter-University Council of East Africa

It was pointed out that the IUCEA was an agency of the East African Commission and operates within the protocols agreed upon by partner states. It depended on the inputs of NRAs to implement its mandate and thus did not have a direct mandate over institutions in partner states.

1.6. QUALITY MANAGEMENT

1.6.1 From Quality Assurance to Quality Management

Presentation of Volume 4 of the East African QA Handbook

By: Ton Vroijenstijn

a) Volume 4 of the handbook “A Roadmap to Quality” was presented;

b) This volume was considered useful for the QA co-ordinators for the development and establishment of an IQA system;

c) The handbook aimed at supporting universities in East Africa in:
   i. Implementing good practices for QA;
ii. Applying the standards and criteria as formulated by competent authorities;
iii. Developing an adequate IQA system that fitted international developments; and
iv. Discovering their own quality by offering self-assessment instruments for IQA, the teaching and learning process and for some institutional aspects.

d) The following were considered to be basic elements of an IQA system:
i. Simplicity as opposed to bureaucracy;
ii. Balance between centralized and decentralized approaches;
iii. Management support;
iv. Provision and utilization of effective instruments; and
v. Harmonization with national and international developments.

e) Introduction of IQA systems was reported to face the following challenges:
i. Lack of quality awareness;
ii. Resistance to innovations;
iii. Lack of knowledge on QA;
iv. Different perceptions of quality and quality indicators;
v. Lack of understanding of the purpose and value of QA; and
vi. Poor communication between the staff and the institutions management on QA.

f) The above challenges can be overcome by:
i. Enhancing understanding on IQA;
ii. Mastering the available QA instruments;
iii. Understanding the requirements of an IQA system;
iv. Clearly designing the IQA system and formulating the implementation strategy; and
v. Tuning the IQA system to external developments.

1.6.2 Case Studies of Good Quality Management

a) University of Duisburg-Essen (UDE), Germany
By: Dr. Anette Köster
i. The main features of the QM system in the UDE were:
   • A close linkage between the QA tools and results;
• Standardized tools which leave room for individual adjustments; and
• Strategic planning and decision making based on data.

ii. The UDE had a QA unit, the Center for Higher Education Development and Quality Assurance, that deals with aspects of career development, development of competencies for teaching and learning and Quality Assurance and Management; and

iii. The main tasks of the unit were programme and institutional evaluation, carrying out surveys, advising on QA matters and monitoring of the QM system.

b) **Mzumbe University – Tanzania**

*By: Dr. Jennifer Sesabo*

i. Mzumbe University under the AfriQ’units project adopted the Total Quality Management approach to create comprehensive self-assessments with the aim of establishing a continuous improvement process;

ii. In implementing the pilot project the University used the assessment tools for services and academic programmes; and

iii. The strategies used to implement the TQM in Mzumbe University were:

• Establishment of top management commitment;
• Establishment of a QA office and guidelines;
• Training of staff on TQM; and
• Application and institutionalization of TQM tools

### 1.6.3 Discussions

a) It was observed that internal audits can be carried out in an institution, as a way of assuring quality, in a situation where external assessment has not been done;

b) The QM system in the UDE relied on the core staff who were not involved in any other activities as opposed to East Africa where QAOs are also involved in teaching. The university also used software to carry out surveys hence exploiting the advances in information technology in QA;

c) To ensure the smooth running of the QM system, the UDE engaged staff in target agreement. This was a process of communication within the university that ensures that faculty and management have the same understanding of the expectations of QA;

d) The challenges experienced when implementing the QMS include:

i. Resistance from faculty;

ii. Team building challenges; and
iii. Budgetary constraints.

e) In addition to student support, the QM system needed to encompass support for staff as envisaged in Volume 4 of the “Roadmap to Quality” handbook; and

f) Student evaluations needed not be restricted to evaluation of staff but needed to include other aspects of curriculum and curriculum delivery systems. Student evaluations needed to be done when students were not under stress in order to ensure objectivity.

1.7. GROUP WORK ON THE QUALITY ASSURANCE INITIATIVE

The participants were distributed into four groups in order to discuss various aspects of the QA initiative.

1.7.1 Developing a QA policy

By: Ina Grieb and James Tuitoek

a) A presentation on the formulation of a QA policy was given with an overview of the QA systems in the University of Oldenburg being presented;

b) According to the presenter:

i. The principles of QA in a university should entail top-down, clearly designed policies, transparency and involvement of all internal players and stakeholders;

ii. The goals of a QA policy are accreditation, evaluation and fulfilment of the internal goals of the QA system; and

iii. The structure in a QA policy should include central and peripheral QA offices, a framework of operations, budgets, development of QA tools and procedures of self-assessment, external assessment and recommendations;

c) A presentation of the formulation of a QA policy in the East African region, a case of Egerton University, was made. According to the presenter:

i. The organizational structure of the University’s QA system mainly consisted of a Directorate and Board of Quality Assurance (BQA);

ii. The Directorate, which reports to the Vice Chancellor, was guided by the BQA and worked closely with the Deputy Vice Chancellors, Deans, Directors and Chairs of Departments;

iii. The membership of the BQA comprised of representatives from faculties and other University units, and was
supported by faculty and departmental quality assurance committees (FQAC and DeQAC);

iv. The membership of the BQA was:
- Director, Directorate of QA as the chair of the Board;
- Deputy Director, Directorate of QA as the secretary to the Board;
- Registrar (Academic Affairs);
- Dean of Students;
- Director, Board of Postgraduate Studies;
- Director, Board of Undergraduate Studies;
- Director, Examinations and Timetable;
- One representative from each Faculty/School/Institute (should be a Senior Lecturer and above);
- Two Senate Representatives;
- Librarian;
- Student representatives, one undergraduate and one postgraduate;
- Co-opted members as may be decided by the Board.

v. The membership of the FQAC was:
- Faculty representative to BQA as the Chair;
- One representative from each department in the faculty; and
- Student representatives, one undergraduate and one postgraduate.

vi. The membership of the DeQAC was:
- At least three senior academic staff members, including the examinations officer;
- Chief Technologist, where applicable; and
- Student representatives, one undergraduate and one postgraduate.

vii. The role of the BQA was to:
- Develop and review policies related to academic quality in the University;
- Develop and review quality standards for the University;
- Design and review methods and techniques for measuring and monitoring quality standards in the University;
- Monitor implementation of QA activities in the University as per the set standards/benchmarks;
- Propose recommendations to maintain and/or enhance academic standards in the University; and
• Advice the University on all issues related to academic quality.

viii. **The role of the FQAC was to:**

- Advice the Dean, BQA and DQA on matters related to quality standards in the Faculty;
- Monitor implementation of QA activities in the Faculty as per the set standards/benchmarks;
- Propose recommendations to maintain and/or enhance academic standards in the Faculty; and
- Handle academic QA issues in the Faculty.

ix. **The role of the DeQAC is to:**

- Advice the Chairman and FBQA on matters pertaining to academic quality in the Department;
- Monitor implementation of QA activities in the Department as per the set standards/benchmarks;
- Propose recommendations to maintain and/or enhance academic standards in the Department.
- Handle academic QA issues in the Department.

1.7.2 **Newcomers – Setting up a QA office and structures**

**By:** Mike Kuria

a) The presenter considered a QA office to have the following responsibilities:

i. Developing and updating a system to continuously evaluate the University’s education system;

ii. Establishing, revising and updating routines for evaluating the university’s learning environment and QA activities;

iii. Running regular training workshops and trainings to ensure teaching staff are equipped with the requisite skills in QA;

iv. Providing a forum for self-evaluation by departments within the university and ensuring a follow up on all evaluations;

v. Regularly carrying out studies to determine the quality of the University’s graduates in the industry; and

vi. Keeping up-to-date documentation of records and data related to QA.

b) Following group discussions, it was pointed out that:

i. A QA unit requires the requisite resources, which should include office(s), furniture, software, stationery, personnel and a running budget;

ii. The institution should determine the placement of the QA office in its organogram;
iii. Various considerations should be made while creating a QA unit including:

- Studying the university’s structure;
- Negotiating with management; and
- Lobbying for QA in all areas of the universities

iv. A QA officer in a new QA unit should ensure that:

- Staff are trained on QA;
- There is teamwork;
- There is proper delegation of responsibilities and duties;
- Adequate time and due considerations are given to the process of setting up the QA office; and
- Individuals significant to the smooth implementation of the QA system in the university are identified and appropriately utilized.

1.7.3 Scaling up reviews – QA as a marketing tool

*By: Laurenti Masui and Angelina Kioko*

a) The presenters gave their experiences in the QA process based on the USIU-Kenya and St. Augustine University-Tanzania perspectives;

b) Both institutions were observed to have similar patterns in embracing QA as an effective intervention in quality improvement;

c) QA initiatives specific to USIU were:

i. Establishment of a centre of excellence in teaching and learning;

ii. Staff training as a key support to buying ownership of the QA initiatives;

iii. Networking with other universities and involvement of external experts in the QA initiatives of the university;

iv. Integrating SAR to faculty appraisals;

v. Drawing of key workplans for Programme Assessment and Review;

vi. Receiving of the support of Institutional Research Officer in the QA Initiatives; and

vii. Expansion of the QA management office from a unit to a component of the Associate DVC’s office;

d) The QA initiatives specific to St. Augustine University of Tanzania were:
1. Training of initial QA officer in German;
2. Dissemination of the QA initiative to other staff members within the University;
3. Enhancing capacity building on the QA initiative; and
4. Carrying out annual QA workshops and training forums.

e) The common approaches in QA institutionalization in the two university perspectives included:
   1. Establishment of a QA Unit, which is upgraded to a directorate level;
   2. Staff training and capacity building on QA;
   3. Ownership of the QA initiative by the managements of the institutions;
   4. Networking and creation of QA linkages;
   5. Development of IQA systems through Deans and Department Heads; and
   6. Marketing QA initiatives to both internal and external stakeholders.

1.7.4 Organizing Programme Benchmarking

By: Barbara Michalk

a) The presenter pointed out that:
   1. Benchmarking is a managerial tool that aims at innovation and is used to compare products or services – or study programmes and HEI;
   2. Benchmarking could be done within organisations or between organisations;
   3. Benchmarking aimed at finding out best practice solutions that can be an inspiration for your own organisation;
   4. Benchmarking could take place within a department/faculty, within the HEI or within a “Benchmarking Club” of HEI;
   5. Benchmarking aimed at identifying best practice that can be adapted to the needs of the benchmarking partner/s. Each partner draws their own conclusions from the outcome. The conclusions can differ and each partner implements the changes they feel to be decisive for them;
   6. Benchmarking was not connected to accountability. The use of the data gained is for the benchmarking partners alone;

b) The following diagram was used to depict the diverse impact factors on study programmes:
c) According to the presenter benchmarking involves the following process:
   i. A decision on the issue / the programme to be benchmarked;
   ii. Definition of the target of the analysis; and
   iii. Analysis of the necessary data.

d) The presenter proposed the following ways to cooperate with partners:
   i. Partners should be identified on similarities vs. differences basis, similar challenges or as members of a benchmarking club;
   ii. Based on the evidence, the challenges, the performance indicators, the strategies, processes and procedures are discussed. There may be site visits, focus groups or surveys connected to this part of the process; and
   iii. A model of best practices is then identified.

e) It was pointed out that in order to draw conclusions and implement the new practices, the responsible persons should:
   i. Make a decision as to whether to implement the best practice model either completely or partially;
   ii. Draw up a plan for the changes and communicate the implementation; and
   iii. Keep track in a follow-up process.

f) A Code of Good Practice for Benchmarking was presented as:
   i. Honesty and confidentiality;
   ii. Unanimity and mutuality;
   iii. Voluntary participation and follow-up procedures; and
   iv. No free-riders!
g) In conclusion, it was emphasized that this was not just benchmarking, but benchlearning.

1.8. FUTURE DIRECTION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EASTERN AFRICAN REGION

By: Michael Mawa, Florence Lenga, Barbara Michalk and Ton Vroeijenstijn

The possible future direction of QA in the East African region was explored through panel discussions in the specific areas of creation of incentives, upscaling of the QA activities and sustainability of the QA initiative.

1.8.1 Creation of Incentives

It was observed that there was need for creation of incentives for the QA initiative at the institutional level through:

a) Basing programme and institutional accreditation to the SARs; and
b) Availing funds to departments and faculties based on the SARs.

1.8.2 Upscaling of the QA initiatives

It was observed that upscaling of the quality assurance initiative could be done at the regional, national and institutional levels through:

a) At the university level:
   i. Having funding for QA initiatives increased;
   ii. Providing training on QA to others in the university;
   iii. Self assessing more programmes of the university;
   iv. Availing adequate resources for QA activities;
   v. Putting procedures and policies in place for QA;
   vi. Ensuring continuing management commitment to QA;
   vii. Prioritizing activities on QA at the budgetary and policy levels; and
   viii. Preparing and availing materials on quality.

b) At the national level, through the NRAs:
   i. Increasing the number of universities participating in the QA initiative;
   ii. Nurturing a network of QA forums and providing guidance and advice to the forums nationally;
iii. Persuading respective governments to increase the budgetary allocations to universities for the purpose of enhancing QA activities in HE;

iv. Assuming the role of improvement agents rather than inspectors of the universities; and

v. Building the QA co-ordinators capacity through having continuous training of trainers initiatives.

c) At the regional level, IUCEA should:

i. Continue distributing the “Roadmap to Quality Handbook”

ii. Translate the handbook to French for the consumption of those in the French-speaking countries; and

iii. Have a quality seal for programmes and institutions that have embraced quality.

1.8.3 Sustainability

In order to ensure sustainability of the QA initiatives:

a) There was a consensus in the East African Community that IUCEA would take ownership and give the forward direction to the initiative in the region. Funds would therefore be availed at the regional level for the same;

b) There was need for the various institutions to adopt the Volume 4 of the “Roadmap to Quality Handbook”;

c) There was need for regular quality audits of the QA system to be carried out;

d) There was need for the available resources to be shared across the region;

e) There was need for regular exchange of regional QA experts;

f) Individual universities should market the QA initiative to others within and outside the region; and

g) IQA systems should be put in place in every individual university.

1.8.4 Discussions

a) It was pointed out that the quality seal would relate to quality standards of given programmes of an institution and would not necessarily determine admission into other institutions out of the region; and

b) The quality seal has the potential of selling out the quality of the programmes in the region and beyond.
1.9. WRAP UP OF FIRST SECTION OF THE WORKSHOP

By: James Tuitoek

1.9.1 The participants were appreciated and encouraged to continue embracing the QA initiatives in their institutions;

1.9.2 The support of DAAD to the QA initiative was greatly appreciated;

1.9.3 It was pointed out that QA is very crucial for the development of individuals and institutions. However, much was required in terms of availing resources for the same;

1.9.4 It was observed that QA in the region needed to be embraced because it had the potential of producing highly qualified graduates who could even be exported to other countries within and out of the region;

1.9.5 The following agreements had been made between IUCEA and DAAD as the way forward with regard to the QA initiative:

a) There will be an annual QA forum in the region;

b) There will be one dialogue meeting with vice chancellors and NRAs every two years;

c) There will be a series of trainings on QA, which will address the areas of tracer studies, curriculum review, project management, data management, formulation of learning outcomes and stakeholders’ involvement in the next three years. More specifically, there will be a training addressing the area of benchmarking in November 2011; and

d) There will be cost sharing between IUCEA, NRAs and universities involved in the QA initiative.
PART B
A TOOL FOR QUALITY DEVELOPMENT
(Edulink Partnership between East Africa and Europe)

2.1. PRESENTATION ON DAAD SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMMES

By: Anja Bengelstorff

2.1.1. A brief presentation on the various DAAD scholarship programmes was made by detailing the eligibility criteria, duration, level of funding and where they are offered;

2.1.2. Clarifications were sought and responses provided as follows:

a) The areas funded by DAAD are determined by specifications given by the ministries providing the funds to DAAD to manage;

b) In Kenya DAAD has partnered with the National Council for Science and Technology (NCST) so that the funds specific for research in various DAAD funded projects are channelled through NCST. The same arrangement also existed with TCU;

c) DAAD alumni scholarships are not automatic. One has to go through screening by a panel;

d) DAAD has gender considerations in the award of its project funds but it is rarely applied since there has always been a gender balance in the application; and

e) Faculty in East African universities were encouraged to apply for DAAD scholarship since the quota for the region was yet to be met in the Bonn office.

2.2. GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE EDULINK AND ERASMUS MUNDUS PROGRAM

By: Nina Salden

2.2.1. An overview of the EDULINK programmes for EU-Africa Higher Education co-operation and the ERASMUS MUNDUS program was given, detailing the objectives, duration, areas of funding, thematic priorities and eligibility criteria;

2.2.2. Participants sought clarifications on the programmes and responses provided as follows:

a) East African universities should explore the possibility of partnering with German partners to increase the chances of getting funding; and

b) Universities with foreign liaison offices should fashion them in such a way that they become units for resource mobilization.
2.3. HIGHLIGHTS OF EDULINK AND ERASMUS MUNDUS SPONSORED PROJECTS

2.3.1 Highlights of two EDULINK and one ERASMUS MUNDUS sponsored projects were presented, notably:

a) Sustainable Quality Culture in East African Institutions through Centralised Units;

b) Catalysing Change in African Universities: Strengthening Leadership, Management and Cross-cutting Professional Skills of East and South African Universities; and

c) Europe-Africa Quality Connect: Building Institutional Capacity through Partnership.

2.3.2 Sustainable Quality Culture in East African Institutions through Centralised Unit Project (AfriQUûnts)

By: Anne Nangulu

a) The project was sponsored through the EDULINK programme;

b) The project partners were:

   i. University of Alicante (Spain) (Coordinator);
   ii. Moi University (Kenya);
   iii. Mzumbe University (Tanzania);
   iv. University of Makerere (Uganda);
   v. Inter-University Council of East Africa (IUCEA);
   vi. African Association of Universities (Ghana); and
   v.ii. German Accreditation Council (Germany).

c) The project entailed different initiatives aimed at inculcating a culture of quality at different levels

   i. At the University/National level, internal mechanisms of QA, notably self assessment of service units and education programmes, were put in place;

   ii. At the Regional level, the project brought together the three Universities in East Africa, namely, Makerere, Moi and Mzumbe, to self assess and benchmark service units and academic programmes as part of strategic planning to implement QA in HE in East Africa and beyond;

   iii. At the Continental level, the Association of African Universities (AAU) representative shared experiences of QA with universities and partners in the project; and
iv. At the International level, the project was linked with the European Union (Project Sponsors); German Accreditation Agent for Higher Education and DAAD, through its linkages with the EDULINK/AfriQUûnts and the University of Alicante.

d) A case of the initiatives at Moi University was presented;

e) As a way forward, the project recommended the dissemination of findings, continuous improvement and sharing of best practices through training and advocacy targeting other HE institutions;

f) The main lessons learned in the project were:

   i. There were some small universities that had very good student support and were able to account for every student accommodation; and

   ii. Challenges experienced in embracing a quality culture were similar across the various universities.

2.3.3 Catalysing Change in Africa Universities: Strengthening Leadership, Management and Cross-Cutting Professional Skills of East and South African Universities

By: Agnes Akwang Obua-Ogwaa, RUFORUM, Uganda

a) The project was funded through the EDULINK programme under the auspices of the Regional Universities Forum for Capacity Building in Agriculture;

b) The participating universities were drawn from Eastern, Central and Southern Africa;

c) The aim of the project was to pool efforts by member universities to:

   i. Strengthen graduate training within the region;

   ii. Strengthen university engagement in Agricultural Research for Development; and,

   iii. Advocate for university engagement in national and regional agenda.

d) The project was reported to have had the following impacts:

   i. Rejuvenated graduate training programmes in partner universities;

   ii. Enhanced collaborative and interdisciplinary research among faculty;

   iii. Enhanced staff retention;

   iv. Increased visibility of participating faculties; and
v. Strengthened human capacity both for university and community service.

2.3.4 Europe – Africa Quality Connect: Building Institutional Capacity Through Partnership

By: Banda A. Salim, Sokkine University of Agriculture, Tanzania

a) The project was funded by the European Commission and the Erasmus Mundus programme;

b) Other partners included:
   i. European University Association (EUA, coordinator);
   ii. Association of African Universities (AAU);
   iii. Irish Universities Quality Board (IUQB);
   iv. University of Aveiro, Portugal (UA); and
   v. The Africa Chapter of the Erasmus Mundus Alumni Association as Associate Partners.

c) The project aimed at sharing experiences of EUA’s Institutional Evaluation Programme’s methodology in an African context as a pilot project;

d) The project resulted in a report adopted by EUA and AAU with key recommendations on:
   i. The need to enhance the contribution of HE to development and to take cognizance of the role of universities in Africa;
   ii. The need for enhanced Africa-Europe university cooperation;
   iii. The need to strengthen intra-African cooperation in HE and the Africa-EU Strategic Partnership; and
   iv. Having an agenda for future action by actors responsible in both Africa and Europe.

e) The Quality Connect was designed to support the implementation of the recommendations made by the project; and

f) It was pointed out that there was need for the dissemination of the results to as many stakeholders as possible.

2.4. INFORMATION SEMINAR ON EDILINK FOR DVCS, DAAD ALUMINI AND SPECIAL INVITEES

By: Nina Salden

2.4.1 The participants, who were notably DVCS of various universities in the region, DAAD Alumni and Special Invitees, were provided with information on the important steps to follow while planning for an
EDULINK project and the EDULINK documents that they needed to access for the same;

2.4.2 The guidelines for planning for an EDULINK project were considered to be of key importance to the planning process;

2.4.3 It was noted that it will be difficult for inexperienced EDULINK project institutions to succeed in receiving support to proposed projects. The participants were encouraged to identify and partner with individuals who have previously carried out EDULINK projects and those who have expertise in project writing and development to assist them in the developing their EDULINK project proposals;

2.4.4 The EDULINK project proposals had deadlines that were strictly adhered to;

2.4.5 The funding of successful projects is done in Euros and this does not take into consideration differences based in inflation and differences in exchange rates;

2.4.6 Funding of the successful projects is released in stages by which pre-financing is first given followed by future financing based on success in the first phase of the project. Thus, regular reports on the project are required for the continual financing of the project;

2.4.7 More information on the EDULINK programme could be obtained from the website.
PART C
FROM QUALITY ASSURANCE TO QUALITY MANAGEMENT
(The first meeting of the East African University Quality Assurance Co-ordinators’ Network)

3.1. COUNTRY EXAMPLES ON QA ON THE GROUND: CHALLENGES, RECOMMENDATIONS AND EVALUATIONS

3.1.1 Experiences from universities that were average in the implementation of the QA initiative were shared. The main areas of focus were on the challenges faced, evaluations and recommendations made. The universities were:

a) African Nazarene University from Kenya;
b) St. John’s University from Tanzania;
c) University of Burundi from Burundi;
d) Kyambogo University from Uganda; and
e) The National University of Rwanda from Rwanda

3.1.2 African Nazarene University, Kenya

By: Raphael Kiugu

a) The challenges experienced by the university were as follows:
   i. QA had not yet been internalized by all the stakeholders;
   ii. The university sometimes pulled from different directions, thus a challenge to a common direction in quality assurance;
   iii. There was a general perception that the QA officer was underutilized, hence giving him/her additional responsibilities;
   iv. QA was at times a one person affair, thus an individual acting as a messenger, clerk and secretary;
   v. There were financial constraints; and
   vi. There were difficulties adapting to change.

b) The University evaluated the QA initiative and observed that:
   i. Through the QA initiative, there is more awareness on QA in the university;
   ii. The unit had achieved several milestones in QA within a very short period;
iii. There was still much more to be done and accomplished in the QA initiative, including increasing QA personnel and facilitation of the QA initiative from all arms of the university; and

iv. Through the QA unit the university had significantly improved its internal monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

c) The following recommendations were made:

i. There was need for proper training of peer reviewers;

ii. There was need for continuous training of QA Coordinators;

iii. There was need for the establishment of the Kenyan Network of QA Officers. This network would organize regular forums for QAOs to share experiences and best practices;

iv. CHE needed to continue encouraging Universities on QA aspects

v. The trained QAOs needed to be utilized in training new entrants;

vi. The process of quality assessment, using volume 3 of the QA handbooks needed to be enhanced;

vii. The NRAs needed to develop a sample of the job description/responsibilities of the QAO and have it adopted by all universities; and

viii. There was need to set a criteria for evaluating the performance of the unit to avoid subjectivity.

d) The following discussion points were generated from the presentation:

i. The students were fully involved in the QA initiative of the university through their membership in the QA committee and regular programme evaluations; and

ii. The QA officer reports to both the DVC and the Director of Academic programmes. However, no conflict had been experienced with regard to the roles and reporting system of the officer.

3.1.3 St. John’s University, Tanzania

By: Reuben Kaali

a) The challenges experienced by the university included:

i. The demand for qualified manpower in the university far exceeding supply;

ii. Some members of staff had the misguided view that QA was the responsibility of the directorate of QA; and

iii. Students and some academic staff had not yet shown adequate interest in QA activities.
b) The Institution recommended more work to be done to create awareness of the link between QA and the stakeholder’s daily activities;

c) The following discussion points were generated from the presentation of the university:

i. The university’s initial focus for QA was in the faculty of Commerce within which academic programmes were being piloted. However, the Institution had already initiated steps to include all other university programmes into the QA programmes. Training was already going on with a view of starting self assessment in all the programmes;

ii. The Institution had an approved QA policy that it had exposed staff and students to. The Institution had however faced challenges in that students do not seem to understand it well. The policy was under review to simplify it to a more user-friendly document; and

iii. The Institution had established QA committees that deal with QA matters at the faculty level.

3.1.4 University of Burundi, Burundi

By: Paul Banderembako

a) The university experienced the following challenges:

i. The QA staff were very busy with other activities and responsibilities; and

ii. The QA activities were not budgeted for thus could not be executed.

b) The university evaluated the QA initiatives and observed that:

i. All the QA evaluation tools were being used by the university; and

ii. The faculties and institutes were mobilized to improve teaching and evaluation of programmes.

c) The university recommended that:

i. There was need for continuous sensitization of all the University staff on the importance of the QA in the institution.

ii. There was need for the Deans and Heads of Departments and student representatives to be trained on QA aspects;

iii. The QA self assessment committee needed to be re-activated; and

iv. There was need for government budgetary allocation towards QA initiatives.
d) It was observed that the University had not experienced any challenges in applying the East African quality handbook even though it was a French speaking country. The country had recently integrated into an English speaking one.

3.1.5 Kyambogo University, Uganda

By: Kaahwa Gorretti

a) The challenges faced by the university were:
   i. The QA Directorate had not yet been approved by the University Council;
   ii. The QA administrative Unit had not yet been allocated office space and equipment;
   iii. There was little awareness of the QA concept in the University; and
   iv. There was lack of commitment from the University stakeholders.

b) According to the University, there was need for:
   i. The QA Directorate to be approved by the Council;
   ii. More awareness and training on QA in the entire university community;
   iii. An up-to-date data base for alumni for future tracer studies;
   iv. More collaboration and nurturing of QA in the University from NRAs, DAAD, IUCEA, HRK, DIES, UUQAF;
   v. More copies of the QA handbook to be availed to all faculties; and
   vi. QA to be treated in totality both academic and support staff.

c) The following discussion points were generated from the presentation:
   i. The University had established a QA unit with an independent budget. However, the budget was not adequate and would be more effective if it was distributed to the faculties;
   ii. The QA unit had management support but it had not been able to make progress because the budget had to be approved by the University Council; and
   iii. The University, being a public institution, still suffered from bureaucratic inefficiencies to the extent that NCHE, which is situated inside the University, had to step in to have the QA structures set up.
3.1.6 The National University of Rwanda, Rwanda

By: Emmanuel Havugimana

a) The following challenges were experienced by the University:
   i. Limited budgetary allocations;
   ii. Resistance to change by staff;
   iii. Language limitations;
   iv. Limited infrastructure vis-a-vis increasing number of students; and
   v. Poor procurement procedures.

b) The following discussion points were generated from the presentation:
   i. The University had been using policy manuals that had been based on the Scottish system but is now reviewing them to be inline with the East African systems;
   ii. The QA unit had faced challenges similar to those faced by other universities but there was no evidence that these challenges were related to where the unit is placed within the university structure;
   iii. The QA unit did not handle QA matters related to support services hence the need to make the QA process more inclusive;
   iv. The QA unit had been advised to consult with the directorate of internal audit to avoid functional overlaps; and
   v. The QA officer was a member of Senate and the Executive Council and this had helped mainstreaming of QA in the university system.

3.2. DATA MANAGEMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF QA PROCESSES

3.2.1 Two views of Data Management and Documentation of the QA processes were presented from the perspectives of University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany and Mzumbe University, Tanzania.

3.2.2 The Germany perspective

By: Anette Koster

a) The presentation outlined aspects of data management, documentation of processes, linkages between data management and documentation and the QA elements;
b) The objectives of data management in a university were considered to be to:
   i. Track developments;
   ii. Give account for achievements and possible marketing strategies; and
   iii. Make comparisons possible.

c) The importance of documentation of processes in data management was emphasized. The following were considered to be the objectives for documenting processes:
   i. Agreement concerning standards;
   ii. Transparency; and
   iii. Self responsible participation.

d) The relationship between data management and documentation of processes in QA was illustrated;

e) Quality conferences were considered to be an important future QA tool;

f) Based on the presentations made, the following clarifications were made:
   i. The quality conferences were considered to be a way of communicating the quality directions of the university;
   ii. The duration of the quality conferences varied from conference to conference depending on the areas of quality being addressed; and
   iii. Every university needed to have a data management system.

3.2.3 The Tanzanian perspective

By: Jennifer Sesabo

a) Data management was considered as the development and execution of principles, architectures, policies, practices and procedures that ensures availability, confidentiality, and integrity of institutional information asset;

b) The strategies of effective data management were considered to comprise of:
   i. Proper assignment of responsibilities, accountability and enhancement of awareness;
   ii. Development of policies and procedures;
   iii. Formulation of systems and policies;
   iv. Ensuring data security; and
   v. Enhancement of staff development.
c) The following were considered to be consequences of poor data management:
   i. Misleading external and internal impressions of institutional performance in teaching, research and community outreach activities;
   ii. Inappropriate decision-making across the institution;
   iii. Reputational damage in areas such as student recruitment and access and student records; and
   iv. Diminishing funding.

d) The following were considered to be key challenges in universities with regard to data management:
   i. Lack of clear data management roles and accountability;
   ii. Lack of clear policies and procedures regarding data management;
   iii. Lack of appropriate systems and processes in data management; and
   iv. Lack of capacity regarding data management.

3.3. MANAGING TRANSITION IN QA DIRECTORATES/UNITS/OFFICES

*By: Barbara Michalk, HRK*

3.3.1 According to the presenter, change management is governed by the following principles:
   a) Change management is a structured approach to shifting and transition in teams and organizations;
   b) Change management monitors the change from the current state to future state; and
   c) Change management is an organizational process aimed at empowering employees to accept and embrace change in the working environment.

3.3.2 Change was considered to have the following phases;
   a) Status quo;
   b) Experiencing something new;
   c) Uncertainty and chaos;
   d) Integration of change; and
   e) New status quo.

3.3.3 Change was observed to be managed either proactively or reactively;
3.3.4 The necessary steps within the framework of change management were considered to include:

a) Formulating the vision and objectives;
b) Discussing decisions made;
c) Developing solutions with those involved;
d) Defining roles and expectations;
e) Agreeing on roles and expectations with others;
f) Reflecting on what has been achieved and learned; and
g) Finding a way of managing the emotions the change process is bound to provoke.

3.3.5 In general, it was pointed out that there was need for individuals to ‘keep calm and carry on’ while implementing change;

3.3.6 Based on the presentation made, the following clarifications were made with regard to change management:

a) The leadership of the organization should be very clear on the direction they want to go;
b) The duration of time spent in the chaotic stage all depends on how fast the organization embraces the change; and
c) Since students are stakeholders within the university, they should be involved during the transition of the institution.

3.4. NEW TOOLS FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE: INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL BENCHMARKING

By: Mike Kuria and Patrick Okae

3.4.1 Two examples of benchmarking in East Africa were presented, notably Internal Benchmarking, an example of Daystar University in Kenya and External Benchmarking though the CATS initiative;

3.4.2 Internal Benchmarking

a) It was noted that internal benchmarking entailed the comparison of performances of similar programmes in different components of a HE institution;
b) The main focus of internal benchmarking was considered to be in the areas of:
   i. Self Evaluation Reports;
   ii. Improvement plans;
   iii. Advisory and mentoring systems;
iv. Research including grants, dissemination and use in teaching;
v. Publications including publications in peer reviewed journals, chapters in quality publications and conference paper presentations; and
vi. Teaching innovations, including strategies to identify plagiarism, examination and grading and learning from each other’s experiences.

c) The process of internal benchmarking was observed to entail:
i. Developing indicators of quality/good practice;
ii. Developing standards against the indicators;
iii. Documenting achievements of individuals, departments and faculties;
iv. Carrying out periodic evaluations; and
v. Disseminating the information and rewarding high achievers.

d) Internal benchmarking has been found to have the advantages of:
i. Increasing accessibility and accuracy of data;
ii. Providing uniformity of variables;
iii. High potential for change;
iv. Being financially less demanding than external benchmarking;
v. Being able to appreciate goals as realistic;
vi. Providing an opportunity to reward outstanding performance of employees;
vii. Greatly supporting continuous improvement; and
viii. Accessing confidential data.

3.4.3 External Benchmarking

a) The Credit Accumulation and Transfer System (CATS) project was presented as an external benchmarking initiative;
b) The East African region CATS project aimed at:
i. Obtaining detailed descriptions of courses of study and agreeing on the content of programmes at a regional level;
ii. Promoting mobility of students among institutions and programmes within the region;
iii. Guaranteeing value for money in the region’s HE sector;
iv. Providing a model that links diplomas to degrees;
v. Considering recognition of prior learning;
vi. Facilitating integration and harmonization of HE; and
vii. Linking the East Africa HE system to the global HE systems.

c) The regional project, that was co-ordinated by the NRAs of the region, resulted in identification and publication of minimum standards in the undergraduate programmes of Medicine, Engineering, Basic Sciences and Agriculture; and

d) The publications had been availed to the various universities of the region that offer the four programmes of study.

3.5. DISCUSSION OF VARIOUS QUALITY ASSURANCE ASPECTS

3.5.1 Three aspects of QA were presented and discussed in groups;

3.5.2 Tools for stakeholder involvement: Tracer Studies/ Interactive Curriculum Workshop

By: Chris Shisanya and Ina Grieb

a) External stakeholder involvement was considered relevant in the universities;
b) The external stakeholders included industry, professional bodies, trade unions, non-governmental organizations, partners in the higher education sector and public service departments;
c) Students and staff of the university needed to be considered as internal stakeholders and thus their views needed to be obtained;
d) Stakeholder involvement was considered necessary for:
i. University profiling;
ii. Determining employability of graduates;
iii. Determining the needs of the labour market;
iv. Curriculum development;
v. Soliciting for donor funding for specific projects; and
vi. Formulating research initiatives.
e) Challenges of stakeholder involvement included:
i. Determining the value they added to the institution;
ii. Time limitation;
iii. Balance between the academic interests of the university and labour market needs;
iv. Ensuring autonomy of institutions; and
v. Ability to create interest in the stakeholders.
f) A case of the Kenyatta University in Kenya tracer study project was presented;

g) The key issues of concern were:

i. The stakeholder tracing could not be easily differentiated from the alumni data follow-up;

ii. Members from public universities found it very hard to trace their alumni due to the great numbers involved, lack of contact addresses after so many years and lack of staff for the same;

iii. Tracer studies were considered to be of importance in the evaluation of the curriculum, accreditation of programmes, provision of general feedback on the professional significance of programmes and ensuring QA of the programmes;

iv. The success of tracer studies was largely dependent on an accuracy and establishment of a well manned database; and

v. Tracer studies were an expensive endeavour and thus needed to be undertaken in phases.

3.5.3 Networking between QA and other University units

By: Anette Koster

a) The case of networking at the University of Duisburg Essen, Germany was presented;

b) According to the presenter:

i. QA needed to be linked to the management board. The finding of QA research needed to be the basis of decision-making;

ii. The Dean of faculty needed to be responsible for ensuring quality in the faculty.

iii. QA was necessary in planning in order to ensure the sustainability of programmes; and

iv. QA training needed to be made a component of staff development.

c) The key issues of concern were:

i. The position of the QA within the organogram needed to be such that it showed the relationship between QA and other units;

ii. The relationship with senior managers and other units needed to be well defined for the QAO to know where to disseminate which information;

iii. Some QA units were overloaded with many types of duties, thus interfering with their core duties of the QAOS; and
iv. Most of the QA units were operating more like information, research and advisory units between the senior managers and the faculty boards.

3.5.4 Budgeting for QA – Managing a QA Office

By: Michael Mawa and Prisca Tuitoek

a) An Egerton University perspective of budgeting and managing a QA office was provided;

b) According to the presenter, the budgeting of the QA office needed to include:
   i. A costed list of QA activities in the annual workplans of the university;
   ii. Preparing a draft budget for the University Committee to consider; and
   iii. Soliciting of a university vote for QA activities through the University Budget Committee.

c) The budgetary lines for the QA office were considered to include:
   i. Stationery for the office;
   ii. Surveys;
   iii. Teaching Effectiveness;
   iv. Board meetings;
   v. Workshops and seminars;
   vi. Trainings;
   vii. Travel and subsistence;
   viii. Self-assessments and peer reviews; and
   ix. Improvement plans.

d) The key issues with regard to budgeting were:
   i. The need to establish the structure or the position of the QA within the organogram;
   ii. The need to establish who should pay the QA staff and whether there was a need for a separate strategic plan and budgets; and
   iii. The National Procurement policies and the institutional policies that often interfered with the QA budgets.
3.6.  ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EAST AFRICAN QA FORUM

By:  Cosam Joseph and Michael Mawa

3.6.1  Two presentations were made on the establishment of an East African QA forum;

3.6.2  There was a need for the establishment of a network of institutional QA coordinators in order to facilitate:
   a)  Training on pertinent current issues on QA such as curriculum innovation and benchmarking;
   b)  Sharing of experiences and continuous networking; and
   c)  Establishment of national QA forums.

3.6.3  The decision to establish the network was approved by the IUCEA Executive Committee on 29th March and in an Annual Meeting on 31st April 2011 in Bujumbura;

3.6.4  Two versions of the network were proposed, notably the:
   a)  Biannual/Annual Activity Based Forums, which had been approved by the IUCEA Executive Committee, and would entail training/dissemination of information; and
   b)  Web-Based networking that would comprise newsgroups, discussion forums, web conferencing, social-networking and blogs.

3.6.5  A case of the established Ugandan Universities Quality Assurance Forum (UUQAF), which was founded on the 22nd April 2010, was presented.

3.7.  ESTABLISHMENT OF EAST AFRICAN QAC-NET BOARD

3.7.1  It was observed that QA fora have been formed and are operational in other regions of the world. It was considered high time for the East African region to have one;

3.7.2  Uganda was commended for taking the initiative to start a national QA forum;

3.7.3  The organizers of the Ugandan forum reported that they intent to register their QA forum with INQAAHE once the forum is formally registered in Uganda;

3.7.4  The idea to set up a regional QAC Network for East Africa was received positively and endorsed unanimously;

3.7.5  An Interim Steering Committee, with representation from institutions in the five East African countries, was elected to spearhead the establishment of the network;

3.7.6  The membership of the committee comprised of:
   a)  Mike Kuria  -  Kenya;
b) Emmanuel Havugimana - Rwanda;
c) Jennifer Sesabo - Tanzania;
d) Paul Mbanderembako - Burundi; and
e) Michael Mawa - Uganda.

3.7.7 The committee elected Michael Mawa as its interim chair;
3.7.8 The terms of reference of the committee were set as to:
   a) Develop a constitution/statutes for the forum;
   b) Develop a network platform;
   c) Establish a secretariat; and
   d) Develop a work plan.
3.7.9 The Interim Steering Committee was advised to clearly stipulate, in the constitution, the membership criteria, the relationship between the regional network and the national chapters, the relationship between the different levels of the network and the NRAs, sources of funding among other necessary prerequisites;
3.7.10 The IUCEA undertook to support the initiative and will, in the initial stages, act as the secretariat for coordination purpose and will convene the first meeting of the committee; and
3.7.11 The NRAs agreed to coordinate the establishment of National Chapters of the QA network.

3.8. VIRTUAL WORK SPACE ON THE WEB-BASED ALUMNI PORTAL DEUTSCHLAND
   By: Georg Verweyen

3.8.1. A presentation was made on how to use the virtual work space on the Web-based Alumni Portal Deutschland; and
3.8.2. A demonstration was made, Using Kenyatta University as a case, on how to navigate through the web-based alumni portal.

3.9. CONCLUSION
The workshop was a success and provided an opportunity for all the players in the QA initiative to look back and recapitulate on the successes, challenges and lessons learned from the project. The workshop made it possible for stakeholders in the East African region to chart the way forward for QA. Ideas were crystallized on the specific steps to be taken to ensure that the gains of the first phase of the project were not lost even as the project moved to the next phase. The QA initiative would thus continue under the auspices of IUCEA and with possible support from DAAD. It was hoped that the strategies proposed by the workshop as possible avenues for moving from QA to QM would realize more success and move quality in HE, in the region, to a new level.
# LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Angelina Kioko</td>
<td>United States International University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akioko@usi.ac.ke">akioko@usi.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 20 360 6432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr Raphael Kiugu</td>
<td>Africa Nazarene University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rkiugu@anu.ac.ke">rkiugu@anu.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:rkiugu@yahoo.com">rkiugu@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254 723 530770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr. Lily Njanka</td>
<td>Kabarak University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:qualityassurance@kabaraku.ac.ke">qualityassurance@kabaraku.ac.ke</a> and <a href="mailto:lnjanka18@gmail.com">lnjanka18@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>254 722 635 437/051343513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr. Mike Kuria</td>
<td>Daystar University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkuria@daystar.ac.ke">mkuria@daystar.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0735880917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ongwae</td>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eongwae@uonbi.ac.ke">eongwae@uonbi.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>318262, 0722512987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mr. Dominic Ojwang</td>
<td>KCA University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oyombed@yahoo.com">oyombed@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:ojwang@kca.ac.ke">ojwang@kca.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 725 208 358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Ms. Benadette W. Sabuni</td>
<td>Masinde Muliro University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bernadettesabuni@yahoo.com">bernadettesabuni@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254722 272 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Ms. Mercie Gachie</td>
<td>St. Paul's University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mgachie@spu.ac.ke">mgachie@spu.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254722-755826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Paul Muoki Nzioki</td>
<td>Laikipia University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:muokih@yahoo.com">muokih@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0726292115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prisca Tuitoek</td>
<td>Egerton University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ptuitoek@yahoo.com">ptuitoek@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254 711 801 005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof Justus Mbae</td>
<td>CUEA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Academics@cuea.edu">Academics@cuea.edu</a></td>
<td>254 722 677 227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Anne Nangulu</td>
<td>Moi University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anangulu@yahoo.com">anangulu@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:deanarts@mu.ac.ke">deanarts@mu.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 733 870502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. David M. Mulati</td>
<td>JKUAT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmulati@fsc.jkuat.ac.ke">dmulati@fsc.jkuat.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 721 381 086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. F. Imbuga</td>
<td>Kenyatta University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fimbuga@yahoo.com">fimbuga@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254 733 838 017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Fredrick O. Wanyama</td>
<td>Maseno University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fwanjama@hotmail.com">fwanjama@hotmail.com</a>, <a href="mailto:fwanjama@maseno.ac.ke">fwanjama@maseno.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 722 233479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Joel O. Ogot</td>
<td>University of East Africa, Baraton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dqo@ueab.ac.ke">dqo@ueab.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:ueabarg@gmail.com">ueabarg@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>254 727 678546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Nephat Justus Kathuri</td>
<td>Kenya Methodist University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nephat.kathuri@gmail.com">nephat.kathuri@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0723 770605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Dr Safari Bonfils</td>
<td>National University of Rwanda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:director_quality@nur.ac.rw">director_quality@nur.ac.rw</a>, <a href="mailto:bsafari@nur.ac.rw">bsafari@nur.ac.rw</a>.</td>
<td>+250 788508669.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Dr. Baanda A. Salim</td>
<td>Sokoine University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:basalim@suanel.ac.tz">basalim@suanel.ac.tz</a>, <a href="mailto:basalim2000@yahoo.co.uk">basalim2000@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>255 755 753233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Email(s)</td>
<td>Phone(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Dr. Jennifer Sesabo</td>
<td>Mzumbe University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jbsesabo@yahoo.com">jbsesabo@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:jksesabo@mzumbe.ac.tz">jksesabo@mzumbe.ac.tz</a></td>
<td>255 786 342048, 255 655 342 048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Dr. Masoud Muhsin</td>
<td>University of Dar es Salaam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:masoud@udbs.udsm.ac.tz">masoud@udbs.udsm.ac.tz</a>, <a href="mailto:muhsin-masoud@yahoo.com">muhsin-masoud@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>255 784 470 876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Dr. Monica Chiduo</td>
<td>Hubert Kairuki Memorial University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:monicalwg@yahoo.com">monicalwg@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>255 713 618847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Kihwelo</td>
<td>Open university of Tanzania</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paulkib@yahoo.com">paulkib@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:paul.kihwelo@out.ac.tz">paul.kihwelo@out.ac.tz</a></td>
<td>255 754 261 995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Dr. Reuben Kaali</td>
<td>St John's University of Tanzania</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rkaali@sjut.tz">rkaali@sjut.tz</a>, <a href="mailto:kaali.reuben@yahoo.co.uk">kaali.reuben@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>255 784 308899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Enock Mlyuka</td>
<td>Tumaini University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:henomkae@yahoo.com">henomkae@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>255 262720900/255 769 880 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Hamdun Ibrahim Sulayman</td>
<td>Muslim University of Morogoro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:h_sulayman@yahoo.com">h_sulayman@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+255 754695522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Laurenti Masui</td>
<td>St. Augustine University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmasui@yahoo.com">lmasui@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+255 787 443630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Mr Josta Nzilano</td>
<td>Dar es Salaam University College of Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jostanzilano@yahoo.com">jostanzilano@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>255 755 774 481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Msafiri Jackson</td>
<td>Ardhi University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msafiri@aru.ac.tz">msafiri@aru.ac.tz</a></td>
<td>+255 754263995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. Michael Mawa</td>
<td>Nkumba University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mawamike@yahoo.co.uk">mawamike@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>256 772410622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. Anthony Ocaya</td>
<td>Gulu University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antocaya@gmail.com">antocaya@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>256 772 463917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. John K. Amoah</td>
<td>Bugema University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jamoah94@yahoo.com">jamoah94@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0753-102192; 0773-102192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. Mohamed Menya</td>
<td>Islamic University in Uganda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:menya1707@yahoo.co.uk">menya1707@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>+255 782 436 553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>George Henry Tusiime</td>
<td>Makerere University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ghtusiime@makdos.mak.ac.ug">ghtusiime@makdos.mak.ac.ug</a>, <a href="mailto:ghtusiime@gmail.com">ghtusiime@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>+256 782644068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Jane Katusiime</td>
<td>Mbarara University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janek@must.ac.ug">janek@must.ac.ug</a></td>
<td>+256 712150914 or +256 785347197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Jude Namukangula</td>
<td>Ndejje University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:namukangas@yahoo.co.uk">namukangas@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>256 772 512524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mr. Davis Matovu</td>
<td>Busitema University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davismatovu@yahoo.com">davismatovu@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+256 703198514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mr. Mulumba Fawz</td>
<td>Kampala International University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fauzkk@yahoo.com">fauzkk@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>256 712 402 669; 256 702 749 920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mr. Musinguzi Benon</td>
<td>Uganda Christian University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bmusinguzi@ss.ucu.ac.ug">bmusinguzi@ss.ucu.ac.ug</a>, <a href="mailto:quality@ucu.ac.ug">quality@ucu.ac.ug</a></td>
<td>256 772 770 846 or 256 718 352 784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Ouma</td>
<td>Uganda Martyrs University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rouma@umu.ac.ug">rouma@umu.ac.ug</a></td>
<td>+256 772395525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mrs Twegongyere Maureen</td>
<td>Makerere University Business School</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtwegongyere@mubs.ac.ug">mtwegongyere@mubs.ac.ug</a></td>
<td>256 712 178 617 or 256 701 101 269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Ms Amaal Namakula Nsereko</td>
<td>Kampala University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amaal_nk@yahoo.co.uk">amaal_nk@yahoo.co.uk</a>, <a href="mailto:ak0020@ku.ac.ug">ak0020@ku.ac.ug</a></td>
<td>256 772 490 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Prof. Waiswa Sam</td>
<td>Busoga University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:waiswasam@yahoo.com">waiswasam@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>256 702 819 075, 256 712 819 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Rashida Kateregga</td>
<td>Kampala University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ar@ku.ac.ug">ar@ku.ac.ug</a>, <a href="mailto:raluwngi@gmail.com">raluwngi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>256 772352920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Sr. Dr. Maria Gorett Kaahwa (DST)</td>
<td>Kyambogo University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaahwa.goretti@yahoo.com">kaahwa.goretti@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>256 772 342820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Banderembako,</td>
<td>University of Burundi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bandep2001@yahoo.fr">bandep2001@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>25777740937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr. Marangi Mbogho</td>
<td>Mombasa Polytechnic University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbogho-ms@yahoo.co.uk">mbogho-ms@yahoo.co.uk</a>, <a href="mailto:marangimbogho@gmail.com">marangimbogho@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>254 727 215 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr. Peter K. Muriungi</td>
<td>Chuka University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:muriungip@yahoo.com">muriungip@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>256 728 229 548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr. Siloa</td>
<td>Strathmore University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:idasiloa@strathmore.edu">idasiloa@strathmore.edu</a></td>
<td>0733 900 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mary Omingo</td>
<td>Strathmore University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:momingo@strathmore.edu">momingo@strathmore.edu</a></td>
<td>0733 596 537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mr. Ken Mugambi</td>
<td>Kenya Methodist University for DVCAA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kenneth.mugambi@kemu.ac.ke">kenneth.mugambi@kemu.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:kenmujau@yahoo.com">kenmujau@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0753 194908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mrs. Purity Kiambi</td>
<td>Daystar University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pkiambi@daystar.ac.ke">pkiambi@daystar.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0722 988 435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof Joseph B. Ojambo</td>
<td>Kabianga University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ojjamebaj@yahoo.com">ojjamebaj@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254 721 883 683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Noah Midamba(VC)</td>
<td>KCA University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nomidamba@kca.ac.ke">nomidamba@kca.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>+254 722 720 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Samuel Kangethe</td>
<td>Inoorero University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvc-ars@iu.ac.ke">dvc-ars@iu.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 722 363 008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Asenath Sigot</td>
<td>Masinde Muliro University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asenathjero@yahoo.co.uk">asenathjero@yahoo.co.uk</a>, <a href="mailto:dvc-aa@mmust.ac.ke">dvc-aa@mmust.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>+254-056-30771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Rose A. Mwonya</td>
<td>Egerton University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvcaa@egerton.ac.ke">dvcaa@egerton.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:mwonyar@yahoo.com">mwonyar@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0722 106572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. B.M. Khaemba</td>
<td>Ag. Principal Chepkoilel University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:princhep@mu.ac.ke">princhep@mu.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 711 275 459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Charles Kimani Njoroge</td>
<td>Multimedia University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmjoroj@yahoo.com">dmjoroj@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0722 860 929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. E. N. Njoka</td>
<td>Chuka University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:prof_njoka@yahoo.com">prof_njoka@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0721 672 506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Ester Mombo</td>
<td>St. Paul University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvcacademics@spu.ac.ke">dvcacademics@spu.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:emombo@spu.ac.ke">emombo@spu.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254728 669 000 or 0736 424 440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Fred Amimo</td>
<td>University of Eastern Africa, Baraton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvca@ueab.ac.ke">dvca@ueab.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:amimof@yahoo.com">amimof@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+254 720332486, 256 720 332 486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Geoffrey Muluvi</td>
<td>South Eastern University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gmuluvi@seuco.ac.ke">gmuluvi@seuco.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0722 861 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. George Marc Onyango</td>
<td>Maseno University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:georgemarkonyango@yahoo.com">georgemarkonyango@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:dvcpres@maseno.ac.ke">dvcpres@maseno.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0722 610210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. J. Magambo</td>
<td>Meru University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:magamboj@yahoo.co.ke">magamboj@yahoo.co.ke</a></td>
<td>0733 793 907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Jacob T. Kaimenyi</td>
<td>University of Nairobi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jkaimenyi@uonbi.ac.ke">jkaimenyi@uonbi.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:dvca@uonbi.ac.ke">dvca@uonbi.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0722 223647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. John Okumu</td>
<td>Kenyatta University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:okumu.john@ku.ac.ke">okumu.john@ku.ac.ke</a>, dvc- <a href="mailto:acad@ku.ac.ke">acad@ku.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>+254 720 716 631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Mathew Buyu</td>
<td>United States International University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbuyu@usiu.ac.ke">mbuyu@usiu.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0733 611 039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Mwaniki S. Ngari</td>
<td>Kisii University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msngari@yahoo.com">msngari@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254 722 568 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. P. N. Kioni</td>
<td>Kimathi University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:principal@kut.ac.ke">principal@kut.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0722 773 095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. P.W. Mathenge</td>
<td>Karatina University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmathenge004@yahoo.com">pmathenge004@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+254 721 390 920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Paul M. Shiundu</td>
<td>Kenya Polythenic University College</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pmshiundu@uonbi.ac.ke">pmshiundu@uonbi.ac.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:pmshiundu@kenpoly.ac.ke">pmshiundu@kenpoly.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>254 722 869 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Peter Kibas</td>
<td>Kabarak University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pkibas@yahoo.co.uk">pkibas@yahoo.co.uk</a>, <a href="mailto:dvca@kabarak.ac">dvca@kabarak.ac</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Reuben O. Mosi</td>
<td>Bondo University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:oyoomosi@bono-uni.ac.ke">oyoomosi@bono-uni.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0722 799 531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Romanus Odhiambo Otieno</td>
<td>JKUAT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvc@jkuat.ac.ke">dvc@jkuat.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0733 341 025/ 0714 491 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Rosemary Maina</td>
<td>KCA University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmaina@kca.ac.ke">rmaina@kca.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>+254 727 222 934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. P. Chege Mungai</td>
<td>Mount Kenya University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cheggemungaieter7@gmail.com">cheggemungaieter7@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0729 887 699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. W.M. Ndegw</td>
<td>Gretsa University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wndegwa2005@yahoo.com">wndegwa2005@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254 723 012 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Dr. Emmanuel Havugimana</td>
<td>National University of Rwanda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ehavugimana@nur.ac.rw">ehavugimana@nur.ac.rw</a></td>
<td>+250 788429964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Abdullah Kanduru</td>
<td>State University of Zanzibar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sijaamini@yahoo.com">sijaamini@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0777 423591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Makenya Maboko</td>
<td>University of Dar Es Salaam</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvc-arc@admin.udsm.ac.tz">dvc-arc@admin.udsm.ac.tz</a></td>
<td>+255 22 2410077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Eginald Mihanjo</td>
<td>St. John's University of Tanzania</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eginaldm@yahoo.com">eginaldm@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+255 773077627.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Elifas Bisanda</td>
<td>Open University of Tanzania</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elifas.bisanda@out.ac.tz">elifas.bisanda@out.ac.tz</a>, <a href="mailto:dvc-ac@out.ac.tz">dvc-ac@out.ac.tz</a></td>
<td>+255 784 301631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Ludovic Kinabo</td>
<td>University of Dodoma</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lkinabo2007@yahoo.com">lkinabo2007@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:dvc-arc@udom.ac.tz">dvc-arc@udom.ac.tz</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Magishi Mgasa</td>
<td>Mzumbe University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmagishi@yahoo.com">mmagishi@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+255 786 101016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Mengiseny Kaseva</td>
<td>Ardhi University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kaseva@aru.ac.tz">kaseva@aru.ac.tz</a></td>
<td>+255 784388921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Prof. Paschalis Rugarabamu</td>
<td>Memorial University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvca@hkmu.ac.tz">dvca@hkmu.ac.tz</a></td>
<td>+255 713226242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Rev. Dr. Richard Lubawa</td>
<td>Tumaini university, Iringa University college</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rihubawa@yahoo.co.uk">rihubawa@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
<td>+255 764 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. Herbert Gaalimaka</td>
<td>Ndeje University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hig_10251960@yahoo.com">hig_10251960@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+256 772 853624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. Mpezamihihig Mouhamad</td>
<td>Islamic University in Uganda IUIU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:drmpeza@yahoo.com">drmpeza@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+256 782902954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. Wilson Muyinda Mande</td>
<td>Nkumba University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mandewm@yahoo.com">mandewm@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+256 772361351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Eng. Dr. Nathan Ba. K Muyobo</td>
<td>Busoga University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nmayobo@hotmail.com">nmayobo@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>+256 772413484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Hyuha Mukwanason</td>
<td>International University Kampala</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hyuhama@gmail.com">hyuhama@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>+ 256 752 803000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mr. Elisha Obella</td>
<td>Busitema University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:arbusitema@hotmail.com">arbusitema@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>+256 776810650, 256 712 810 650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Prof. Callistus W. Baliddawa</td>
<td>University of Gulu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cbaliddawa@gmail.com">cbaliddawa@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0774 757830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Prof. Akiiki Byaruhanga</td>
<td>Kampala University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akiikiabt@yahoo.com">akiikiabt@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+256 751803411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Prof. Joseph Kisekka</td>
<td>Uganda Martyrs University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jkisekka@umu.ac.ug">jkisekka@umu.ac.ug</a>, <a href="mailto:dvcaa@umu.ac.ug">dvcaa@umu.ac.ug</a></td>
<td>+256 782765441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Reuben Mugerwa</td>
<td>Bugema University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reubentmugerwa@yahoo.com">reubentmugerwa@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>+256 775891460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Title and Institution</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nele Foerch</td>
<td>IWM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Dr. Evariste Ngayimpenda</td>
<td>QA standing committee member Universite du Lac Tanganyika</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ngayevariste@yahoo.fr">ngayevariste@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>+257 77746405, 257 757 46 405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Dr. Sylvie hatungimana</td>
<td>PES/NCHE Burundi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hatungasy@yahoo.fr">hatungasy@yahoo.fr</a></td>
<td>+257 79308466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Anette Köster</td>
<td>Duisburg-Essen University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anette.koester@uni-due.de">anette.koester@uni-due.de</a></td>
<td>+49 2033791981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Barbara Michalk</td>
<td>Duisburg-Essen University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michalk@hrk.de">michalk@hrk.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Christoph Hansert</td>
<td>Director DAAD Nairobi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hansert@daadafrica.org">hansert@daadafrica.org</a></td>
<td>+254-725-860 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Ina Grieb</td>
<td>Oldenburg University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Marc Wilde</td>
<td>DAAD Bonn</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wilde@daad.de">wilde@daad.de</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Nina Salden</td>
<td>EDULINK</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salden@daad.de">salden@daad.de</a></td>
<td>+49228882520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Patience Njiru</td>
<td>Intern DAAD Nairobi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:intern@daadafrica.org">intern@daadafrica.org</a></td>
<td>+254 724253230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr. Florah K. Karimi</td>
<td>Rapporteur CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fkarimi@che.or.ke">fkarimi@che.or.ke</a></td>
<td>+254 722 420 752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Dr. Rispa Odongo</td>
<td>Senior Assistant Commission Secretary CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:risiachieng@yahoo.com">risiachieng@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:che@wananchi.com">che@wananchi.com</a></td>
<td>254 722720318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mara Kayser</td>
<td>Intern DAAD Nairobi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:intern@daadafrica.org">intern@daadafrica.org</a></td>
<td>+254 724253230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Margaret Kirai</td>
<td>Programme Officer DAAD Nairobi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kirai@daadafrica.org">kirai@daadafrica.org</a></td>
<td>+ 254 20 2722662, +254 721552499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mr. Calvin Oredi</td>
<td>Press coverage CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:coredi@che.or.ke">coredi@che.or.ke</a></td>
<td>0720803668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mr. Dlishon Bwayo</td>
<td>Messengerial duties CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbwayo@che.or.ke">dbwayo@che.or.ke</a></td>
<td>0722407108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mr. Joseph Musyoki</td>
<td>Rapporteur CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmusyoki@che.or.ke">jmusyoki@che.or.ke</a>, <a href="mailto:jm_musyoki@yahoo.ca">jm_musyoki@yahoo.ca</a></td>
<td>+254 715 277 070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mrs. Elizabeth Onyango</td>
<td>Transport logistics CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eonyango@che.or.ke">eonyango@che.or.ke</a></td>
<td>0720451297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Ms. Jane Ongong’a</td>
<td>Secretary CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jongonga@che.or.ke">jongonga@che.or.ke</a></td>
<td>0722344728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Ms. Jayne Mwangi</td>
<td>Secretary CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmwangi@che.or.ke">jmwangi@che.or.ke</a></td>
<td>0722321316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Chris Chisanya</td>
<td>KDSA Board Member Kenyatta University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. Florence Lenga</td>
<td>Deputy Commission Sec. Accreditation &amp; QA CHE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fklenga@yahoo.com">fklenga@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>254 20 2021156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Prof. James Tuitoek</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor Egerton University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vc@egerton.ac.ke">vc@egerton.ac.ke</a></td>
<td>0512 217810, 0722 341566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Stella Maris Muthoka</td>
<td>KDSA Board Member</td>
<td>Egerton University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>Ton Vroevenstijn</td>
<td>Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Ms. Valeriane Damian</td>
<td>Senior Accreditation Officer</td>
<td>TCU Tanzania</td>
<td><a href="mailto:damiankine@tcu.go.tz">damiankine@tcu.go.tz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Odass Bilame</td>
<td>Director Post graduate studies</td>
<td>St. Augustine University</td>
<td><a href="mailto:obilame@yahoo.co.uk">obilame@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Agnes Akwang Obua Ogwal</td>
<td>Programme officer</td>
<td>RUFORUM</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a.akwag@ruforum.org">a.akwag@ruforum.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Dr. Cosam Joseph</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Officer</td>
<td>IUCEA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cosam@iucea.org">cosam@iucea.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mr. Patrick Okae</td>
<td>Higher Education Officer</td>
<td>NCHE Uganda</td>
<td><a href="mailto:okaepato@yahoo.com">okaepato@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Ms. Juru Marie Eglantine</td>
<td>Ass. Quality Assurance Officer</td>
<td>IUCEA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjuru@iucea.org">mjuru@iucea.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>