



# **SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

## **PEER REVIEW POLICY**

**AUGUST 2025**

# **SALT UNIVERSITY**

## **Peer review Policy**

### **1.0 Introduction**

SALT Institute was founded in 2003 but its genesis dates to 1997. During that year's edition of the annual continental prayer conference of the Intercessors of Africa (IFA), held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, God revealed to the intercessors that they faced "challenges in Africa that prayer alone by itself could not solve."

It was further explained that African nations did not have good, proper foundations (the foundations not having been laid on the scriptures); secondly, the nations did not have servant leaders in their governments; thirdly, leaders in the nations did not know how to apply biblical principles to leadership. To tackle these challenges, IFA was directed to train and equip the leaders who will bring about the desired transformation in the land. The vision of the University is to be a preferred world class knowledge and learning center dedicated to the development of transformational leaders for Africa and the global community.

To this end, the university pursues effective teaching and learning as a key thrust area of its Strategic Plan 2019. There is therefore the need for a policy on academic peer review to regulate the academic activities of the university in order to comply with national and global academic standards in higher education.

### **2.0 Purpose of the Policy**

Peer review may be defined as the evaluation of teaching and learning related activities by colleagues or peers. It includes supervision, planning and design of assessment, feedback to students, examinations and the direct observation of teaching in a traditional classroom setting. This Policy provides guidelines for the peer review of academic activities of Salt University College. The Policy is part of the quality assurance systems of the University for research, teaching, learning and examinations. The aim of the policy is to:

- a) Ensure compliance with national and global academic standards in higher education.
- b) Sharpen and enhance the exchange of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values among peers/colleagues.
- c) Improve the quality of research, teaching, learning and examination processes.

Staff and students involved in the peer review processes are to ensure that guidelines contained in this policy are heeded objectively, effectively and efficiently.

### 3.0 Scope of the Policy

The Policy applies to the activities of the Salt University College in the areas of research, teaching, learning and examinations. It also covers course outlines, instructional materials, examination questions, marking schemes, marked examination scripts and students' project works, inventions, and dissertations.

### 4.0 Definition of Terms:

- a) **Academic Peer Review:** The process of evaluating academic staff's teaching, learning and examination outputs by another academic staff within and/or outside the University.
- b) **Audit of Examination Questions, Marking Schemes, Marked Scripts, Project Works and Dissertations:** Review of examination questions, marking schemes, marked scripts, project works and dissertations by internal/external examiners.
- c) **Course Outline:** A document that contains **critical resources that help staff and students understand the course**. It defines the course aims and learning outcomes, course requirements, textbooks, and assessment dates and criteria.
- d) **External Examiner:** An expert or a professional outside the University engaged to review programs and the work of a staff of the University including course outline(s), examination questions, marking schemes, marked script(s), project work(s) and dissertation(s).
- e) **Instructional Material:** Any print or electronic teaching and learning material used by a course lecturer during the teaching and learning process such as: course outlines, lecture notes, handouts, textbooks, videos, audios, etc.
- f) **Instructional Material Reviewer:** Any person appointed within the University to review instructional materials.
- g) **Internal Examiner**
  - i. **First Internal Examiner:** An academic staff within the University who sets examination questions and marks examination scripts of a course or who supervises and marks project works and dissertations.
  - ii. **Second Internal Examiner:** An academic staff within the University (other than the First Internal Examiner) who moderates examination questions and

marking schemes, reviews marked examination scripts, project works and dissertations.

- h) **Marking Scheme:** A guideline prepared based on questions set and used by an examiner in marking students' examination scripts or any examination output.
- i) **Moderation of Examinations Questions and Marking Schemes:** Review of examination questions and marking schemes based on course outline(s) by examiners.
- j) **Observation of Teaching:** The process of observing teaching and learning in classrooms and outside classroom.
- k) **Teaching Observer:** Any person appointed to observe and assess the teaching and learning process.

## 5.0 Academic Peer Review Procedures

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

### 5.1 Review of Instructional Materials

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

- a) The Head of Department shall recommend instructional material reviewers for consideration and appointment by the Registrar.
- b) Each lecturer shall prepare and submit to the Head of Department course outlines and other instructional materials two (2) weeks before the start of each semester.
- c) The departmental reviewers shall review the instructional materials using the course outline and submit reports to the Head of Department.
- d) The Head of Department shall give copies of the reviewers' report to the respective lecturers for corrections, if necessary, before the start of each semester.
- e) The academic staff shall submit the corrected versions of the instructional materials to the Head of Department before the start of each semester.
- f) The Head of Department shall submit approved instructional materials to the Quality Assurance and Planning Directorate through the Registrar.

## **5.2 Observation of Teaching**

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

- a) Heads of Department in collaboration with the Quality Assurance and Planning Directorate shall ensure the observation of teaching in the various departments each semester.
- b) Heads of Department shall propose academic staff whose teaching and practical lessons shall be observed to the Registrar for consideration and approval each semester.
- c) Heads of Department shall recommend observers for consideration and appointment to the Registrar each semester.
- d) The observation of teaching and practical lessons shall be done using a prescribed criteria and reports submitted to the Heads of Department.
- e) Heads of Department shall discuss the reports with the observed lecturers.
- f) Heads of Department shall submit a report to the Registrar.

## **5.3 Moderation of Examinations Questions and Marking Schemes**

End of semester examinations questions set and marking schemes prepared by First Internal Examiners shall be moderated internally under strict confidentiality each semester by the Heads of Department and Second Internal Examiners. The External Examiners shall moderate examinations questions and marking schemes where required by an external body.

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

### **5.3.1 Internal Moderation**

- a) The Heads of Department in consultation with the Registrar shall appoint one Second Internal Examiner for each level of a programme.
- b) Moderators shall not moderate their own examinations questions and marking schemes.
- c) The First Internal Examiners shall set examinations questions and prepare marking schemes according to the prescribed criteria and submit them together with copies of the approved course outlines to the Heads of Department at least eight (8) weeks in the case of the requirements for external moderation or three (3) weeks in the case of the requirements for internal moderation before the commencement of the end-of-semester examinations.
- d) Within two (2) days, the Heads of Department and Second Internal Examiners shall moderate the examinations questions and marking schemes alongside the course outlines using the

prescribed criteria at a moderation conference and write reports and give copies of the reports to the respective First Internal Examiners for necessary corrections.

- e) The First Internal Examiners shall make necessary corrections and submit corrected examinations questions and marking schemes together with the course outlines to the Heads of Department within three (3) days upon receipt of the reports for printing and administration.

### **5.3.2 External Moderation**

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

### **5.4 Vetting of Marked Scripts**

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

The following procedures shall be followed in vetting marked examinations scripts:

#### **5.4.1 Internal Vetting of Marked Scripts**

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

#### **5.4.2 External Vetting of Marked Scripts**

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

### **5.5 Vetting of Marked Project Works and Dissertations**

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

- a) The Heads of Department shall recommend Second Internal Examiners for review of project works and dissertations to the Registrar for consideration and appointment.
- b) The Second Internal Examiners shall vet at least one (1) marked project work or dissertation supervised by each First Internal Examiner using the prescribed criteria and submit reports within two (2) weeks with project works and dissertations received to the Heads of Department.
- c) The Heads of Department shall give copies of the reports to the respective First Internal Examiners,
- d) The First Internal Examiners shall take note and apply any recommendations contained in the reports.

## **5.6 Audit of Examinations Questions, Marking Schemes, Marked Scripts, Project**

### **Works and Dissertations**

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

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

## **5.7 Academic Peer Review Reporting**

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

- a) The Heads of Department shall submit the AAPRR covering all aspects of academic peer review undertaken during the academic year to the Registrar for consideration,

- b) The Heads of Department shall subsequently submit the AAPRR to the Registrar of for the consideration of the Heads of Department and Faculty,
- c) The Heads of Department and Faculty shall submit the report to the Registrar through the Quality Assurance and Planning Directorate,
- d) The President shall study the reports and forward same to the Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee for consideration and necessary actions.

## **6.0 Roles and Responsibilities**

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

- (a) The Academic Board
- (b) The President
- (c) Registrar
- (d) The Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee
- (e) The Quality Assurance and Academic Planning Directorate
- (h) The Heads of Department
- (i) Academic Staff

### **6.1 The Academic Board**

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

### **6.2 The President**

The President shall receive AAPRRs from the Departments through the Heads of Departments of Faculty and the Quality Assurance and Planning Directorate.

### **6.3 The Academic Planning and Quality Assurance Committee (APQAC)**

The APQAC acting on behalf of the Academic Board shall:

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

## **6.4 The Quality Assurance and Planning Directorate**

The Quality Assurance and Planning Directorate shall:

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

## **6.5 Heads of Department/Faculty**

The Heads of Department/Faculty shall:

- a) Consider External Examiners recommended by the Heads of Departmental and make recommendations to the Academic Board.
- b) Consider the AAPRRs of the Departments
- c) The Head of Department shall receive the AAPRRs from the Departments and submit same to the President through the Quality Assurance and Planning Directorate.
- (d) Recommend External Examiners through the Faculty/Department Heads for consideration and appointment by the Academic Board.
- (e) Ensure that academic peer review activities take place in the Departments.
- (f) Recommend Academic Peer Reviewers for the consideration and approval of the Departmental Heads and the Academic Board as the case may be.
- (g) Supervise the academic peer review processes.
- (h) Perform academic peer review liaison and reporting functions required.
- (i) Submit the AAPRRs covering all aspects of academic peer reviews undertaken in the academic year to the President.

## **6.6 Academic Staff**

Every academic staff shall:

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

## **7.0 Regulatory Framework**

The regulatory framework for this Policy includes:

- a) The National Board for Professional and Technician Examinations Act, 1994 (Act 492).
- b) The National Accreditation Board Act, 2007 (Act 744).
- c) The Statutes of Salt University College
- d) Salt University College Ethics Policy.
- e) Salt University College Examinations Policy.

## **8.0 Monitoring and Review**

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

**APPENDICES**

**Appendix A: Instructional Materials Review Report Form**

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Instructional Materials Review Report Form

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Staff \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Level: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructional Materials Reviewed:

Course Outline       Textbook(s)       Lecture Notes       Handout(s)

Audio-Visual Material(s) Others (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_

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

---

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

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

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

- 11 -

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

students.

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

Excellent     Very Good     Good     Fair     Poor

13. What are the strengths of the instructional materials?

---

---

---

14. What are the weaknesses of the instructional materials?

---

---

---

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

Instl. Mat. Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Teaching Observation Report Form

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Teacher Observed: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_

Level: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Lesson Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Mode of Delivery: \_\_\_\_\_ Lesson Venue: \_\_\_\_\_

Lesson Period: \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Observation Period: \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

---

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

Excellent     
 Very Good     
 Good     
 Fair     
 Poor

19. What were the strengths of the teaching observed?

---



---

20. What were the weaknesses of the teaching observed?

---



---

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

---

---

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

---

---

Teacher Observed

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Teaching Observer

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Appendix C: Examinations Questions &amp; Marking Schemes Internal Moderation Report Form

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

## Academic Peer Review

## Examinations Questions &amp; Marking Schemes Internal Moderation Report Form

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

First Internal  
Examiner's  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Code: \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Questions Set: \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Questions to be Answered: \_\_\_\_\_

Duration of Paper: \_\_\_\_\_

Nature of Examination:

Written Exam

Practical Exam

Oral Exam

Materials Reviewed:

Course Outline

Examinations Questions

Marking Scheme

Others (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

18

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

19

13.	The marks allocated to the questions sum up accurately to the marks allocated to the whole examinations.					
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--

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

Excellent     
 Very Good     
 Good     
 Fair     
 Poor

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

---



---



---

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

---



---



---

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

---



---



---

2<sup>nd</sup> Internal Examiner's

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Head of Department's

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Marked Scripts Vetting Report Form

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

First Internal Examiner's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Code: \_\_\_\_\_

No. of Questions Set: \_\_\_\_\_ No. of Questions to be answered: \_\_\_\_\_

Duration of Paper: \_\_\_\_\_

Nature of Examination:

Written Exam

Practical Exam

Oral Exam

Materials Reviewed:

Examinations Questions

Marking Scheme

Marked Scripts

Result Sheets

External Examiner's Moderation Report

---

*Respond to the following statements as fairly as possible. Your frank and constructive comments*

would assist to improve course quality.

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

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

S/N	Correction of Examinations Questions and Marking Scheme in line with the External Examiner's Moderation	5	4	3	2	1
1.	The corrections recommended by the External Examiner were effected in the examinations questions.					
2.	The corrections recommended by the External Examiner were effected in the marking scheme.					
	<b>Marking of</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
3.	The First Internal Examiner marked all the questions answered in <b>Scripts</b>					

every examinations scripts sampled.

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

sheets.

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

Excellent   
 Very Good   
 Good   
 Fair   
 Poor

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

---



---



---

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

---



---



---

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

---

---

---

2<sup>nd</sup> Internal Examiner's \_\_\_\_\_Signature

Date:

Name:

:\_\_\_\_\_

Appendix E: Marked Project Work and Dissertation Vetting Report Form

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Marked Project Work and Dissertation Vetting Report Form

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

First Internal Examiner's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

Project work/Dissertation Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Name(s) of Candidate(s):

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

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

8.	The candidate(s) properly justified the data collection method(s) used.					
9.	The candidate(s) thoroughly described the data collection method(s) used.					
10.	The candidate(s) properly justified the data analysis technique(s) used.					
11.	The candidate(s) thoroughly described data analysis technique(s) used.					
12.	The results of the study relate to the data analysis technique(s) stated.					
13.	The findings of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge.					
14.	The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana.					
15.	The project work or dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed format and the standard of the University.					
16.	Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and					
<b>S/N</b>	<b>Areas of Assessment</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
1.	The research topic is well stated.					
2.	The research problem(s) is/are well formulated.					
3.	The research objective(s) is/are well formulated.					
4.	The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana.					
5.	The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature.					
6.	The candidate(s) properly justified the sample size and sampling method(s) used.					
7.	The candidate(s) thoroughly described the sampling method(s) used.					

grammatically correct.

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

Excellent       Very Good       Good       Fair       Poor

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

---

---

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

---

---

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

---

---

2<sup>nd</sup> Internal Examiner's \_\_\_\_\_ Signature:                      Date:  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix F: Examinations Questions, Marking Schemes & Marked Scripts Audit Report Form

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Examinations Questions, Marking Schemes & Marked Scripts Audit  
Report Form

Academic Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Semester:  \_\_\_\_\_

First Internal  
Examiner's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_ Level: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Course Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Nature of Examination:

Written Exam

Practical Exam

Oral Exam

Materials Audited:

Course Outline  Examinations Questions  Marking Scheme  Marked Scripts

Examinations Score Sheet

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

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

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

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

30

12.	The marks allocated to the correct answers of each question sum up					
13.	aThe marks allocated to the questions sum up accurately to the accurately to marks allocated to the whole examination.					
	<b>Marking of</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
14.	All questions answered in every examinations script sampled were					
15.	Marks awarded the candidates were in line with the marking scheme.					
16.	There was consistency in awarding marks according to the marking					
17.	The marks awarded to the correct answers of each question sum up accurately to the marks awarded to the question.					

30

18.	The marks awarded to the correct answers sum up accurately to the marks awarded to the whole examination.					
19.	Marks awarded to candidates were properly recorded on the marked					
	<b>Recording of</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
20.	Marks recorded on the marked scripts were correctly transferred to the examinations score sheet.					
21.	Marks on the examinations score sheet were orderly and correctly					

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

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

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

27. Indicate strengths identified in the following:

a) Course Outline

---



---

b) Examinations Questions

---

---

c) Marking Scheme

---

---

d) Marking of Scripts

---

---

e) Recording of Marks

---

---

28. Indicate weaknesses identified in the following:

a) Course Outline

---

---

b) Examinations Questions

---

---

c) Marking Scheme

---

---

d) Marking of Scripts

---

---

e) Recording of Marks

---

---

29. Any Other Remarks/Comments

---

---

---

30. Recommendations

---

---

---

External Examiner's \_\_\_\_\_ Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: \_\_\_\_\_ :

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form

(For Surveys, Experiments, Observations, etc)

Academic \_\_\_\_\_  
Year: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester: \_\_\_\_\_  
First \_\_\_\_\_  
Internal \_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Programme: \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Work/Dissertation Topic: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

Applicable

I

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

36

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

grammatically correct.

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

---



---

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

---



---

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

---



---

20. Any other Remarks/Comments

---



---



---

21. Recommendations

---

---

---

---

External Examiner's Name: Signature: Date:

---

---

---

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form

Academic \_\_\_\_\_  
Year: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester: \_\_\_\_\_  
First \_\_\_\_\_  
Internal \_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Programme: \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Work/Dissertation Topic: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

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

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

Applicable

	employing the design criteria.						
12.	The candidate(s) properly analyzed test results, made design changes and retested the design.						
13.	The candidate(s) properly made design changes and retested the design when necessary.						
14.	The candidate(s) thoroughly communicated the design or proved its functionality.						
15.	The product(s) relate to the design criteria stated.						
16.	The findings and discussions of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge.						
17.	The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana.						
18.	The project work/dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed rubrics of the University.						
19.	Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and						
<b>S/N</b>	<b>Areas of Assessment</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>NA</b>
1.	The research topic is well stated.						
2.	The research problem(s) is/are well formulated.						
3.	The research objective(s) is/are well formulated.						
4.	The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana.						
5.	The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature.						
6.	The candidate(s) properly justified the design criteria and constraints.						
7.	The candidate(s) thoroughly evaluated alternative designs.						
8.	The candidate(s) developed the design into working drawings/sketches/technical specifications.						
9.	The candidate(s) properly built (constructed) prototype of best design.						
10.	The candidate(s) followed the required safety procedures.						
11.	The candidate(s) thoroughly tested and evaluated the prototype						

40

grammatically correct.

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

---



---

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

---

---

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

---

---

23. Any other Remarks/Comments

---

---

24. Recommendations

---

---

External Examiner's Name:

---

Signature:

---

Date:

---

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form

Academic \_\_\_\_\_  
Year: \_\_\_\_\_  
Semester: \_\_\_\_\_  
First \_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner's Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
Department: \_\_\_\_\_  
Programme: \_\_\_\_\_  
Project Work/Dissertation Topic: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

---

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

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

	combinations).						
9.	The candidate(s) thoroughly demonstrated knowledge and skill in draftsmanship/ craftsmanship.						
10.	The candidate(s) thoroughly proved the product's functionality.						
11.	The product(s) relate to the stated objective(s).						
12.	The findings and discussions of the candidate(s) are significant contributions to knowledge.						
13.	The recommendations of the candidate(s) are appropriate and relevant to the development of Ghana.						
14.	The project work/dissertation has been presented according to the prescribed rubrics of the University.						
15.	Generally, the expressions of the candidate(s) are comprehensible and						
<b>S/N</b>	<b>Areas of Assessment</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>NA</b>
1.	The research topic is well stated.						
2.	The research problem(s) is/are well formulated.						
3.	The research objective(s) is/are well formulated.						
4.	The candidate(s) demonstrated the relevance of the topic and its significance to the development of Ghana.						
5.	The candidate(s) demonstrated adequate knowledge of relevant literature.						
6.	The candidate(s) properly justified the originality of the product.						
7.	The candidate(s) thoroughly demonstrated the mastery of use of tools and materials.						
8.	The candidate(s) properly designed, demonstrated knowledge and skill in use of elements and principles of art (lines, dots and color						

Grammatically correct.

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

---



---

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

---

---

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

---

---

---

19. Any other Remarks/Comments

---

---

---

20. Recommendations

---

---

---

---

External Examiner's Name: Signature:

Date:

---

---

**SALT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE**

Academic Peer Review

Project Works & Dissertations Audit Report Form

Academic \_\_\_\_\_  
Year: \_\_\_\_\_ Semester: \_\_\_\_\_

First \_\_\_\_\_  
Internal \_\_\_\_\_

Examiner's Name:

Department:

Programme: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Work/Dissertation Topic:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Name(s) of Candidate(s):

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

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

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

\_\_\_\_\_

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

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

NA=Not

Applicable

1

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

hygiene and safety).

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

grammatically correct.

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

---



---

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

---



---

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

---



---

20. Any other Remarks/Comments

---



---

21. Recommendations

---



---

External Examiner's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---