Ministry of Tertiary Education, Science and Research

Report of the

National Committee on **Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation in Higher Education**

2025 HIGHER EDUCATION summit

Committee Members

Professor (Dr) R Mohee, CSK, Chairperson

Dr L Pheiffer (QAA)

Professor (Dr) M I Santally (UoM)

Professor (Dr) B Seetanah (UoM)

Professor (Dr) K K Khedo (UTM)

Professor (Dr) Y Ramma (UDM)

Mr Y K Gaya (OUM)

Dr A Ankiah-Gangadeen (MIE)

Mr Y Matabudul (PML)

Mr A Namah (PML)

Special acknowledgements to the following co-opted members:

Dr N Baguant (HEC), Dr A Moorgawa (HEC), Mrs K Rambhunjun (HEC), Ms A Chellamootoo (HEC), Dr T K Chadeea (OUM), Professor (Dr) H Mariaye (MIE) and Mrs H Laximan (QAA)

Acknowledgements

We begin by expressing our profound gratitude to Dr the Honourable Kaviraj Sharma Sukon, Minister of Tertiary Education, Science and Research for his visionary leadership, encouragement, and steadfast support throughout the development of this *National Strategy on Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation (2025–2035)*. His commitment has been pivotal in advancing this transformative agenda for higher education in Mauritius.

The National Committee on Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation is chaired by Professor (Dr) R. Mohee, CSK, Commissioner, HEC, and comprises members from the Quality Assurance Authority (QAA) and HEIs, supported by a dedicated secretariat from HEC and partner HEIs.

The members of the National Committee on Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation include:

i. Professor (Dr) R. Mohee, CSK, Commissioner, HEC (Chairperson)
ii. Dr Lee Pheiffer, Executive Director, QAA
iii. Professor (Dr) M. I. Santally, University of Mauritius
iv. Professor (Dr) B. Seetanah, University of Mauritius
v. Professor (Dr) K. K. Khedo, University of Technology, Mauritius
vi. Professor (Dr) Y. Ramma, Université des Mascareignes
vii. Mr Y. K. Gaya, Open University of Mauritius
viii. Dr A. Ankiah-Gangadeen, Mauritius Institute of Education
ix. Mr Y. Matabudul, Polytechnics Mauritius Ltd
x. Mr A. Namah, Polytechnics Mauritius Ltd

The following members were co-opted:

i. Dr (Mrs) N. Baguant, HEC
ii. Dr A. Moorgawa, HEC
iii. Mrs K. Rambhunjun, HEC
iv. Ms A. Chellamootoo, HEC

v. Dr T. K. Chadeea, Open University of Mauritius
vi. Professor (Dr) H. Mariaye, Mauritius Institute of Education
vii. Mrs H. Laximan, QAA

We extend our heartfelt thanks to all academic leaders, quality assurance professionals and staff across public and private HEIs in Mauritius who participated actively in the survey. Their feedback was invaluable in identifying key challenges and opportunities. The participating HEIs included:

Public HEIs:

i. University of Mauritius (UoM)
ii. University of Technology, Mauritius (UTM)
iii. Open University of Mauritius (OU)
iv. Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE)
v. Université des Mascareignes (UDM)

Private HEIs:

i. Amity Institute of Higher Education (AIHE)
ii. Charles Telfair Company Ltd trading as Curtin Mauritius and as Charles Telfair Institute (CTI)
iii. Polytechnics Mauritius Ltd (PML)
iv. Middlesex International (Mauritius) Ltd

Our sincere thanks go to the members of the National Committee on Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation, whose expert guidance has shaped this report under the leadership of the Higher Education Commission (HEC).

We extend our sincere gratitude to the moderator and panel members for their invaluable contributions to the panel discussion:

i. Dr. Vinaye Ancharaz, International Economic Consultant (moderator)
ii. Professor Sanjeev K. Sobhee, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Mauritius
iii. Dr. Dinesh Kumar Hurreeram, Director General of the University of Technology, Mauritius

iv. Mr. Ashwan Domah, Deputy Registrar, Open University of Mauritius
v. Prof. (Dr) Vivek Gupta Ramnarain, Vice-Chancellor of Amity Institute of Higher Education
vi. Professor Mari Jansen van Rensburg, Campus Director of Middlesex International (Mauritius) Ltd

We also thank all participants (People's Voice) who shared their thoughtful feedback during the summit, along with the various stakeholders involved.

We express our gratitude to Dr. Aruna Ankiah-Gangadeen and Dr. Wedsha Appadoo-Ramsamy of the MIE for proofreading the report.

Together, this collective effort marks a significant milestone towards elevating academic standards, fostering innovation, and building an equitable and internationally recognised higher education system.

Executive Summary

The *National Strategy on Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation (2025–2035)* establishes a robust framework to elevate academic standards, modernise pedagogical approaches, and ensure equity and consistency across all public and private higher education institutions (HEIs) in Mauritius. This report emerges from a system-wide reflection on the current state of higher education, highlighting both areas of excellence and critical opportunities for improvement.

The report is informed by a comprehensive sector-wide survey involving nine HEIs. A copy of the survey questionnaire is included in Appendix 1. The findings revealed persistent fragmentation and inconsistencies in teaching delivery, assessment practices, programme development, and student support. The resulting transformation agenda aims to provide an inclusive, student-centred, digitally-enhanced, and globally competitive education aligned with national aspirations for socio-economic development and international best practices. The objective is to harmonise teaching and learning practices across HEIs and define minimum operational requirements.

At the Higher Education Summit held on 06 June 2025, Professor (Dr) R. Mohee, CSK, Commissioner of the Higher Education Commission (HEC) and Chairperson of the National Committee on Teaching, Learning, and Quality Transformation, delivered a presentation on the current state of the higher education sector, with particular emphasis on teaching, learning, and quality assurance. The presentation outlined key recommendations from the Committee aimed at enhancing educational quality and promoting transformative practices across higher education institutions. This report also incorporates feedback from participants at the Higher Education Summit (People's Voice),as well as valuable insights from the panel discussions, both of which took place on 06 June 2025.

The key recommendations are as follows:

i. Development of a National Mauritius Quality Code for Higher Education

ii. Strategic Alignment of HEIs with the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)
iii. Conduct a Comprehensive Institutional Student Experience Survey, on a regular basis, by HEIs
iv. Review of the Academic Workload Model, in public HEIs
v. Capacity Building for Quality Assurance and Teaching Excellence Implementation.

By implementing the recommendations outlined in this report, Mauritius' higher education system will be better positioned to:

i. Harmonise academic policies and practices across HEIs;
ii. Enhance curriculum relevance through industry collaboration;
iii. Strengthen quality assurance and accountability mechanisms;
iv. Modernise teaching and learning modalities by embracing digital technologies;
v. Improve graduate employability; and
vi. Promote lifelong learning and professional development for academic staff.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations

CPD	Continuous Professional Development
COL	Commonwealth of Learning
ESG	European Standards and Guidelines
HEC	Higher Education Commission
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
HESF	Higher Education Standards Framework
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
NUHEPs	Non-University Higher Education Providers
OfS	Office for Students
QAA	Quality Assurance Authority
QEF	Quality Enhance Framework
REF	Research Excellence Framework
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
TEF	Teaching Excellence Framework
TEQSA	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency
UG	Undergraduate

List of Appendices

1 Background and Rationale

Mauritius has achieved remarkable progress in expanding access to higher education, with increased enrolments, the introduction of blended and fully online learning modes, and the establishment of quality assurance frameworks aligned with national regulations. However, despite these advancements, the system continues to face significant challenges that impede the overall quality and competitiveness of the higher education sector.

The key challenges include:

i. Fragmentation and uneven application of quality assurance frameworks, resulting in variable teaching and assessment standards;
ii. Inconsistent integration of digital technologies across HEIs, limiting the effectiveness of innovative pedagogies;
iii. Weak supervision structures that affect the quality of student projects and dissertations, especially at the postgraduate level;
iv. Disparate academic workload policies leading to imbalanced staff responsibilities and potential burnout; and
v. Lack of harmonisation in programme delivery and credit recognition, complicating student mobility and lifelong learning pathways.

These issues undermine Mauritius' strategic ambition to establish itself as a regional education hub recognised for academic excellence and graduate employability. Moreover, global higher education trends increasingly emphasise:

i. Student-centred pedagogies that prioritise active learning and competency development;
ii. Competency-based curricula aligned with the demands of evolving economies;
iii. Technology-enhanced learning environments that expand access and improve learning outcomes.

Aligning Mauritius' higher education system with these international trends and standards is imperative to ensure effective teaching and learning and to enhance the quality of higher education in Mauritius.

In this context, and as agreed during the recent management meeting chaired by the Honourable Minister of Tertiary Education, Science and Research, this report presents a strategic approach to strengthening teaching, learning and quality in higher education.

1.1 Review of Standards and Guidelines

In a globally competitive and rapidly evolving academic landscape, quality assurance frameworks play a central role in enhancing teaching excellence, safeguarding academic standards, and supporting institutional accountability.

The HEC uses a structured regulatory framework, including the establishment and registration of HEIs and the accreditation of programmes, to assess the quality of teaching and learning within HEIs. This assessment includes evaluating academic staff qualifications, curriculum relevance, teaching methodologies, overall academic delivery, and the adequacy of infrastructure such as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, and digital learning facilities. HEIs must also show evidence of internal quality assurance, student feedback mechanisms, and ongoing programme review. Through these requirements, the HEC ensures that teaching and learning meet high standards and support continuous improvement in educational quality.

The review critically compares key international quality assurance frameworks: the QAA Mauritius Guidelines, the UK's Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), the UK Quality Code, and Australia's Threshold Standards and examines how they inform and validate the strategic priorities outlined by HEC Mauritius.

1.1.1 HEC Guidelines

Establishment and Registration of HEIs

The establishment and registration of HEIs which are regulated by the HEC, place significant emphasis on the role of infrastructure in supporting quality teaching and learning. As outlined in the HEC guidelines, an institution's physical and digital infrastructure must be adequate and fit for purpose, directly contributing to

the effectiveness of pedagogical delivery and the overall student learning experience. Quality teaching is closely linked to the availability of well-equipped lecture rooms, laboratories, libraries, and access to modern educational technologies, all of which are assessed during the application and site visit process.

Learning is further enhanced by infrastructure that supports independent study, collaborative work, and digital engagement, such as e-learning platforms and internet-enabled study areas. The HEC also evaluates whether institutions have mechanisms for maintaining and upgrading facilities to ensure continuous improvement. By linking infrastructure to academic delivery, learner support, and institutional sustainability, the HEC ensures that only institutions capable of upholding high standards in teaching, learning, and overall educational quality are granted registration.

Accreditation of Programme

The HEC comprehensive Guidelines for the Accreditation of Programmes, include clear guidelines for the teaching and learning environment, learning resources, teaching quality, and student support. These guidelines ensure that HEIs provide an academic setting conducive to effective learning, with appropriate infrastructure and facilities. Programmes are expected to operate within well-maintained physical environments that meet current health and safety standards, and to include sufficient teaching spaces, specialist laboratories, and ancillary amenities.

In terms of learning resources, accredited programmes must have access to adequate and up-to-date physical resources including equipment, ICT tools, and library services that support both teaching and student learning. These requirements aim to maintain alignment with the level and objectives of the programme being offered.

The guidelines also emphasise the importance of pedagogical quality, requiring that teaching be well-prepared, student-centred, and varied in approach, thus supporting different learning styles and promoting independent, critical thinking. Programmes should be structured around clear learning outcomes and should incorporate current research, practical applications, and the development of transferable skills.

Furthermore, the HEC highlights the importance of structured student support systems. HEIs must ensure that students receive guidance and assistance in academic, vocational, and personal domains, beginning from the application phase and continuing throughout their studies. This includes induction programmes, access to tutors, support for learning difficulties, and preparation for employment or further study.

These established guidelines provide a solid quality assurance framework that underpins programme delivery across HEIs in Mauritius.

1.1.2 QAA Mauritius Standards and Guidelines

To date, Quality Assurance Authority (QAA) has prepared a manual with 14 standards for Institutional Quality Reviews (IQR) and a manual for the implementation of the standards (QAA 2023). These standards have been internationally benchmarked and used in the context of six institutional reviews. The IQR manual and standards are in the second draft after being updated based on feedback from the sector after the first round of reviews.

Additionally, the QAA Mauritius guidelines (Guidelines for Assessment and Moderation Procedures, Guidelines for the Delivery of Online Programmes, Guidelines for Quality Assurance of Programmes) represent a significant step toward ensuring consistency and quality in higher education across the country.

Although covered in the QAA standards1, certain operational areas such as academic workload, staff performance management, supervision practices, and student support systems are not prescriptively addressed in the IQR Standards. This is because the underlying principle of Quality Assurance is that institutions take responsibility for their own quality and it would be considered prescriptive for the standards to be more detailed in regard to the alleged gaps in the standards. Neither the Higher Education Act, nor the QAA standards, which are aligned to international best practices, require the QAA to monitor academic workload, staff performance management and supervision practices as these fall under the responsibility of HEIs. It is common practice that quality assurance respects the autonomy of HEIs in those areas. However, should it be felt necessary to include more prescriptive benchmarks, these should be presented in a separate 'Norms'–type document and not integrated into the existing standards for QA, in order to maintain their alignment with SADC and international standards.

A Quality Code for Mauritius could serve as an additional layer in the complex structure of quality assurance, without replacing the existing QAA standards.This is necessary so as not to confuse the sector.

1.1.3 UK Quality Code for Higher Education (QAA, UK)

The UK Quality Code for Higher Education serves as the national framework for quality assurance in UK higher education. Developed and maintained by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), the Code sets out expectations, practices, and core principles that all providers must adhere to in order to ensure high-quality academic standards and student outcomes. This literature review analyses the origins, structure, impact, and critiques of the Quality Code, positioning it within the context of UK higher education governance and international quality assurance practices.

[1] All of these areas are addressed in the QAA standards: See Standard 4 on Human Resources for academic workload, and performance management; standard 10 on supervision and student support; and standard 6 on insfrastructure and facilities.

Origins of the Quality Code

The UK Quality Code was first introduced in 2012, replacing the Academic Infrastructure, and has undergone multiple revisions, most notably in 2018, to reflect changes in higher education policy and regulation. The 2018 version offers a more streamlined and principle-based approach, focusing on outcomes rather than prescriptive procedures (QAA, 2018).

The evolution of the Code has been influenced by increased regulatory differentiation across the UK's devolved nations and by broader pressures for greater accountability, transparency, and student engagement in quality processes (Williams, 2016). The Code provides a shared reference point for both universities and alternative providers, underlining the sector's commitment to maintaining academic integrity.

Structure and Components

The current version of the UK Quality Code consists of:

Table 1: Structure of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education

Component	Definition	Applicability
Core Practices	Mandatory requirements that all UK higher education providers must meet to ensure academic quality and standards.	All UK higher education providers
Common Practices	Standards that are expected of providers in addition to the core practices.	Applicable to providers in Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland only (not in England)
Guiding Principles	Statements of good practice provided to support the implementation of core and common practices effectively.	Advisory – applicable to all providers for enhancement and flexibility

The Code is structured around three key themes:

i. Academic Governance
ii. Student Experience
iii. Assessment and Awards

These are underpinned by expectations about setting, maintaining, and assuring academic standards and quality, offering institutions the flexibility to meet these expectations in context-specific ways (QAA, 2018).

Regulatory and Sectoral Role

In England, the Office for Students (OfS) serves as the higher education regulator. It was established by the Higher Education and Research Act 2017 and came into existence in 2018. Since the establishment of the OfS, the QAA, UK no longer acts as the designated quality body. However, the Quality Code continues to influence institutional practice and is used extensively by providers seeking degree-awarding powers, institutional validation, or international recognition (OfS, 2019).

In Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, the QAA retains a more active role, and the Quality Enhancement Framework (QEF) in Scotland incorporates the Code into its enhancement-led review processes (Saunders et al., 2018). This divergence reflects the devolved nature of UK higher education policy, with Scotland placing greater emphasis on enhancement, while England focuses more on regulation and competition.

Institutional Impact and Implementation

A growing body of research highlights how the Quality Code has shaped internal practices in areas such as programme design, assessment policies, external examining, and student engagement (Middlehurst, 2017). Institutions have responded by creating or revising internal frameworks to ensure alignment with the Code, often involving professional services, academic staff, and students in quality assurance processes.

According to Smith and O'Leary (2019), the Code has contributed to a more systematic and transparent approach to quality monitoring, particularly in relation to course validation, academic integrity, and complaints and appeals procedures. Moreover, the shift to principles-based guidance has allowed institutions greater flexibility in tailoring their quality processes to their unique missions and student populations.

1.1.4 UK Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

The TEF was introduced by the UK government in 2016 as a mechanism to assess and promote the quality of teaching in HEIs in England. Positioned alongside the Research Excellence Framework (REF), the TEF aims to enhance teaching standards, ensure accountability, and provide information to students regarding teaching quality (Department for Education, 2016). The TEF rates HE providers based on the quality of their undergraduate teaching, learning, and student outcomes

Rationale and Objectives of the TEF

The TEF was designed to address longstanding concerns about the perceived imbalance between teaching and research in UK universities (Gunn, 2018). While the REF has historically incentivised research outputs, the TEF seeks to reward high-quality teaching practices and improve student outcomes. It reflects a broader shift in policy towards consumer-based models of education, where students are viewed as customers entitled to value for money (Bunce et al., 2017).

According to the Department for Education (DfE), the TEF encourages institutions to “raise teaching standards, provide better outcomes for students, and enhance the reputation of UK higher education” (DfE, 2016). It also serves as a tool for informing student choice and guiding tuition fee adjustments, although the link between TEF outcomes and fees has since been weakened.

Structure and Metrics

The TEF evaluates universities across three main categories: teaching quality, learning environment, and student outcomes and learning gain. These are measured through a combination of quantitative metrics—such as student satisfaction (from the National Student Survey), continuation rates, and employment data (LEO: Longitudinal Education Outcomes)—and qualitative institutional submissions (DfE, 2019).

Institutions receive one of three ratings—Gold, Silver, or Bronze—reflecting the panel's judgment of excellence above a set baseline. The TEF has undergone several iterations, with the latest version in 2023 moving towards a more narrative-based assessment alongside revised criteria and indicators (Office for Students, 2023).

Impact on Higher Education Institutions

Early evidence suggests that the TEF has prompted institutions to invest more strategically in teaching quality and student support (Sharma & McGettigan, 2018). It has also influenced curriculum design, learning technologies, and staff development initiatives. However, the relationship between TEF participation and substantive pedagogical change remains contested (Gourlay & Stevenson, 2017).

Institutions with lower TEF ratings have faced reputational risks, while those with higher ratings have leveraged their outcomes for marketing purposes. However, scholars such as Locke (2017), Gibbs (2012) and Tomlinson (2018) caution against overemphasising TEF scores, arguing that the metrics used are limited proxies for actual teaching quality.

Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) Ratings

The TEF in the UK rates higher education providers based on the quality of their undergraduate teaching, learning, and student outcomes. As of the latest 2023 framework update, institutions can receive the following overall ratings:

Table 2: Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) Ratings

TEF Rating	Meaning	Key Characteristics
TEF Gold	The provider delivers consistently outstanding teaching and learning outcomes for its students. It is of the highest quality found in the UK.	• High levels of student engagement • Excellent academic support • Very positive student outcomes (e.g., progression, employability)
TEF Silver	The provider delivers high-quality teaching and learning outcomes for its students. It consistently exceeds rigorous national quality requirements.	• Strong support for student learning • Generally positive student outcomes • Some areas of excellence
TEF Bronze	The provider delivers teaching and learning outcomes that meet rigorous national quality requirements but is not rated as consistently outstanding or high quality.	• Meets minimum standards • Areas needing development or improvement • Satisfactory outcomes and teaching
No Rating (Participating/ Registered Only)	Some providers participate in TEF but choose not to receive a rating, or their submission is incomplete or pending. Providers must meet a baseline of national quality requirements to participate.	• Participation without rating • Submission incomplete or pending • Baseline quality requirements met

How Ratings Are Determined

TEF ratings are based on two key submissions:

Table 3: Rating Determination Table (TEF)

Details	Purpose
1. **Provider Submission**	
A qualitative narrative written by the institution. Includes internal evidence, innovations, support systems, course design, staff development, etc. Shows how strategies are inclusive and effective across different student backgrounds.	Explains how the provider ensures excellent teaching, learning environment, and outcomes. Provides context beyond metrics and highlights strengths across student groups.
2. **Student Submission**	
An optional qualitative submission by students, often via student unions or associations. Includes feedback on inclusivity, engagement, teaching quality, and outcomes.	Offers the student perspective on teaching, learning support, and the academic experience. Balances institutional claims and ensures student voice is considered.
3. **National Data Metrics**	
Quantitative indicators supplied by national agencies, benchmarked across the sector.	Enables consistent, objective comparison of institutional performance.
Student Satisfaction - Data from the National Student Survey (NSS).	Reflects students' views on teaching quality, assessment, feedback, and support.
Continuation Rates - Measures how many students continue or complete their studies without dropping out.	Indicates effective student engagement and institutional support.
Graduate Outcomes - From the Longitudinal Education Outcomes (LEO) dataset. Considers quality and level of employment or further study.	Shows employment or further study status 15 months after graduation.
Positive Outcomes - Combines successful completion, progression, and acquisition of key skills.	Assesses whether students achieve meaningful outcomes.

Details	Purpose
Panel Assessment - Independent expert panel reviews all evidence—both qualitative and quantitative.	Considers the institution's context, including student mix, size, mission, and subject focus.
Rating Outcome	
Gold: Outstanding Silver: High quality Bronze: Meets baseline Requires Improvement (if applicable)	Final overall judgement based on holistic assessment of evidence.

A panel of experts, including student representatives and academics, assesses this information and determines the rating.

The last Teaching Excellence Framework assessment took place in 2023, with 33 of 128 higher education institutions profiled being awarded a gold rating. Some ratings show as 'Pending' because the university or college is still being assessed by the TEF Panel. These ratings will be updated when the assessments are concluded. Below are extracts of the outcome of the Teaching Excellence Framework 2023 sourced from the official TEF 2023 ratings published by the Office for Students. An extract of TEF 2023 Ratings is given below:

Table 4: Examples of TEF Universities

Category	Institution	Student Experience	Student Outcomes
GOLD	Loughborough University	Gold	Gold
	University of Warwick	Gold	Gold
	University of Oxford	Gold	Gold
	Coventry University	Gold	Silver
	University of Chichester	Gold	Silver
SILVER	University College London	Silver	Gold
	Luminate Education Group	Silver	Bronze
	Activate Learning	Bronze	Silver
BRONZE	AECC University College	Bronze	Silver
	BIMM University Limited	Bronze	Bronze

Category	Institution	Student Experience	Student Outcomes
	BPP University Limited	Requires Improvement	Silver
No Rating	Arden University Limited	Requires Improvement	Requires Improvement

1.1.5 Australia Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021

The Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 is a central quality assurance instrument used to regulate higher education providers in Australia. Enforced by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), the framework establishes minimum requirements (threshold standards) for HEIs to be registered and to maintain accreditation for their courses.

Overview and Structure of the Framework

The 2021 update of the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) builds upon the previous 2015 version, aiming to clarify expectations, reduce ambiguity, and ensure greater alignment with contemporary practices in higher education (TEQSA, 2021). The framework is divided into seven domains:

i. Student Participation and Attainment
ii. Learning Environment
iii. Teaching
iv. Research and Research Training
v. Institutional Quality Assurance
vi. Governance and Accountability
vii. Representation, Information, and Information Management

Each domain includes standards that describe the expected outcomes or processes that institutions must meet, with a focus on protecting student interests and promoting academic integrity.

Purpose and Rationale

The primary function of the HESF is to safeguard the quality and integrity of Australian higher education and to bolster international confidence in its qualifications (Norton & Cherastidtham, 2018). It defines the minimum acceptable standards for course design, delivery, assessment, student support, and governance. By providing a consistent reference point, it supports TEQSA's regulatory role and institutional self-assurance practices.

Scholars such as Harvey (2020), Shah and Jarzabkowski (2019), and Croucher et al. (2013) highlight that the HESF reflects a risk-based regulatory approach, wherein TEQSA tailors its oversight to the performance and risk profile of each institution. This allows for flexibility and scalability, particularly for non-university higher education providers (NUHEPs), which have grown significantly within the Australian sector.

Quality Assurance and Academic Governance

A key emphasis of the HESF 2021 is the strengthening of academic governance, especially in domains 5 and 6. According to Moodie (2021), the framework encourages institutions to develop robust internal quality assurance systems, such as course review cycles, academic integrity mechanisms, and staff credentialing.

Moreover, the framework aligns with international quality assurance practices, such as the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG), emphasising continuous improvement and evidence-based quality monitoring (Blackmore, 2016). This alignment also facilitates the international recognition of Australian degrees,thereby enhancing student mobility.

Student-Centric Focus

The framework explicitly centres on student outcomes, participation, and well-being. In Domain 1, it requires providers to ensure that students are appropriately admitted, supported throughout their studies, and achieve expected learning outcomes. The standards call for accessible information, equitable treatment, and transparent grievance procedures (TEQSA, 2021).

According to Shah and Jarzabkowski (2019), this reflects a shift towards a more student-centric regulatory ethos, moving beyond compliance to a focus on student experience and graduate success. However, they also caution that without adequate resources and cultural buy-in, these standards may become performative.

Impact on Institutional Practice

Research indicates that the HESF has encouraged Australian HEIs to adopt more structured and documented internal processes, particularly in curriculum design, learning outcomes, and staff qualifications (Lemon, 2020). The framework has also prompted investments in academic leadership, continuous professional development, and learning analytics to demonstrate quality improvements.

However, some critiques have emerged regarding compliance burdens, particularly for smaller providers. According to Bennetts and Tait (2021), navigating the standards can be resource-intensive and may distract from innovative pedagogical practices. The challenge lies in finding a balance between regulatory compliance and academic creativity.

1.1.6 Commonwealth of Learning Quality Assurance Rubrics

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) Quality Assurance rubrics present a valuable opportunity for Mauritius to adopt a context-sensitive and learner-focused approach to evaluating online and distance education. Since COL developed these rubrics with the specific needs of small island developing states and low- to middle-income countries in mind, they are particularly well suited to the Mauritian context. The rubrics offer practical criteria for assessing institutional readiness, course design, learner support, and technology integration, among other key elements. Embedding the COL QA rubrics into institutional or national quality assurance processes can strengthen the credibility and sustainability of online education in Mauritius. Furthermore, their adoption can support the HEC in its efforts to promote quality, accessibility, and innovation across all modes of delivery.

QAA Mauritius Guidelines for Online learning

The "Guidelines for the Delivery of Online Programmes" by QAA Mauritius set standards to ensure quality in online, blended, and distance higher education. Institutions must have clear policies and quality frameworks to guide programme design and delivery, promoting continuous improvement. Reliable technology and strong technical support for students and staff are essential for smooth online learning. Regular self-evaluations and external reviews ensure programmes maintain high standards and adapt to changing needs. These measures help create a solid foundation for effective and sustainable online education in Mauritius.

2 Methodology

The development of this report involved a rigorous, multi-layered process combining quantitative and qualitative research methods:

i. **Survey:** Conducted across nine public and private HEIs, evaluating eight core criteria, including curriculum design, delivery, assessment, supervision, student support, workload, infrastructure, and professional development. The nine HEIs which participated in the survey are as follows:
    a. University of Mauritius
    b. University of Technology, Mauritius
    c. Université des Mascareignes
    d. Open University of Mauritius
    e. Mauritius Institute of Education
    f. Polytechnics Mauritius Ltd
    g. Charles Telfair Company Ltd Trading as Curtin Mauritius
    h. Middlesex International (Mauritius) Ltd
    i. Amity Institute of Higher Education

ii. **International benchmarking**: Mauritius' practices were compared with recognised frameworks such as the UK Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF), Quality Assurance Agency (UK) Quality Code, and Australia's Higher Education Threshold Standards to identify areas for alignment and adaptation.

Findings from the aforementioned methods/instruments were synthesised into coherent, actionable recommendations organised under strategic pillars, ensuring alignment with both national priorities and international best practices.

iii. Panel Discussion and People's Voice

Additional key instruments employed during the HE Summit to gather comprehensive input include the panel discussion and the inclusion of people's voices. The panel discussion served as a structured yet dynamic platform for institutional leaders, academics, and policymakers to deliberate on critical issues, share best practices, and propose forward-looking strategies. The panel discussion was moderated by Dr. Vinaye Ancharaz, International Economic Consultant, and featured the following panel members:

a. Professor Sanjeev K. Sobhee, Vice-Chancellor, University of Mauritius
b. Dr. Dinesh Kumar Hurreeram, Director General, University of Technology, Mauritius
c. Mr. Ashwan Domah, Deputy Registrar, Open University of Mauritius
d. Prof. (Dr) Vivek Gupta Ramnarain, Vice-Chancellor, Amity Institute of Higher Education
e. Professor Mari Jansen van Rensburg, Campus Director, Middlesex International Mauritius Ltd.

Complementing the panel discussion, People's Voice captured through interactive sessions, public comments, and stakeholder reflections provided a broader societal perspective on the challenges and opportunities facing the higher education sector. nsights from these contributions have been carefully considered and integrated into the report's recommendations. These contributions reflect the collective expertise and aspirations of the higher education community, reinforcing the need for a student-centred, flexible, and innovative approach to teaching and learning. Recognising and valuing these

perspectives strengthens the foundation for meaningful reforms that will advance the sector.

3 Findings

Findings from the survey and international benchmarking converge to reveal a strong, collective demand for reform in Mauritius' higher education sector.

3.1 Survey Findings and Analysis

This section presents the findings and analysis of the national assessment of teaching, learning, and quality within Mauritius's higher education sector. Drawing on a comprehensive and integrated review of quantitative and qualitative data from the nine HEIs, the assessment highlights commendable efforts to enhance the quality of teaching and learning. Public HEIs, in particular, show strong alignment with good practices in programme development, training needs analysis, credit structuring, and compliance with the national qualifications framework. However, the analysis also reveals significant disparities in consistency and depth across institutions, as well as systemic gaps that impede overall sector progress. These findings emphasise the urgent need for enhanced national coordination and policy coherence to effectively drive quality improvements and ensure the higher education system meets both national development goals and international standards.

3.1.1 Curriculum Development

Academic Programme Development

A significant majority (87.5%) of institutions report having a structured academic programme development process, typically involving multi-level internal validation—from departmental design to academic board approval. However, early-stage involvement remains limited, with only 62.5% engaging stakeholders during the initial design or co-creation phases. In the remaining cases, engagement is largely confined to final validation. One respondent provided vague information, indicating possible gaps in internal clarity or formalisation of processes.

Training Needs Analysis (TNA)

While all institutions conduct TNA prior to launching programmes, only half have a systematic process involving structured steps such as market research, benchmarking, and expert consultation. The other half relies on less formal mechanisms, often reacting to external stakeholder requests without robust evidence. This highlights a variation in institutional approaches to labour market alignment and planning rigour.

Programme Credit and Hour Structuring

Three-quarters of institutions align with the national standard (1 credit = 25 notional hours), and credit loads are generally consistent across undergraduate programmes. However, there is considerable variation in master's programme credits (90 to 270), with no clear equivalency mapping. These inconsistencies suggest a lack of common interpretation of postgraduate credit requirements and raise concerns about articulation and comparability.

Qualification Exit Points

75% of institutions offer formal exit awards (e.g. certificates, diplomas) within longer programmes, using accumulated credits as milestones. This reflects a modular approach that accommodates various learner needs. However, 25% do not clearly define exit points or apply them unevenly, which may limit flexibility and progression for students who do not complete full qualifications.

3.1.2 Programme Delivery

Delivery Modes

All respondents employ multiple delivery modes - face-to-face, blended, and online. Blended learning is predominant (87.5%), especially in undergraduate programmes (40–60% online). Postgraduate and doctoral programmes often include up to 75% online content. This flexibility reflects responsiveness to technology and student needs but also reveals variation in institutional capacity, affecting the consistency of delivery.

Learning Management Systems and Communication

All respondents use LMS platforms like Moodle, Blackboard, and Microsoft Teams, complemented by tools such as WhatsApp and email. Although these systems are widely adopted, their usage varies from fully interactive learning environments to basic content distribution, indicating uneven digital integration across institutions.

Academic Calendar and Schedules

Most respondents (87.5%) from the surveyed HEIs report following a two-semester calendar; whereas a minority use trimesters. Semester lengths range from 12–15 weeks, with some modules extending to 18 weeks. Notional hours per module fall between 100 and 150, covering a broad spectrum of teaching and learning activities. These figures indicate a general alignment with standard academic structures while also reflecting institutional diversity in pacing and depth.

Contact Hours

What is surprising is that contact hours vary considerably. Most institutions (62.5%) offer 36–45 hours per module, while others (25%) provide 20–30 hours, and a small fraction (12.5%) report as low as 10 hours, especially in online courses. This variation suggests differences in pedagogical models and resource allocation, raising questions about consistency in credit-hour equivalence.

Staffing and Student–Staff Ratios

Student–staff ratios vary substantially, ranging from 14:1 to 400:1. Lower ratios are associated with personalised teaching environments, while high ratios are typical in distance-learning contexts. These differences reflect institutional missions but also have clear implications for the quality of teaching, learner support, and workload management.

Monitoring Student Engagement

Attendance monitoring is consistent for face-to-face classes (100%) but only half of the institutions actively track engagement in online classes. While 75% use formal attendance registers and QA mechanisms, the absence of standardised digital tracking hampers comprehensive oversight, especially in blended and online formats.

3.1.3 Assessment Methods and Practices

Assessment Methods

All institutions employ diverse assessment methods, including exams, tests, projects, presentations, and portfolios. Over half (57%) also use innovative, discipline-specific tools like case studies, software demonstrations, and online quizzes. This diversity reflects an effort to align assessments with practical skills and programme learning outcomes, though the extent of innovation varies by institution.

Continuous Assessment

Most institutions (71%) use continuous assessment for some modules, but percentages differ widely from as little as 5% to as high as 60%. Some faculties (e.g., Tourism and Management) show greater uptake than others. This disparity reflects divergent institutional strategies and reveals a lack of sector-wide norms. Enhanced standardisation could promote equity and ensure fair recognition of continuous assessment practices.

Online Assessment

A large majority (86%) have implemented online assessments, although usage varies – some are limited to the pandemic, while others continue the practice. Only a few HEIs use secure systems (e.g., SEB, MS Teams with analytics). The lack of consistent frameworks highlights the need for shared protocols, investment in digital infrastructure, and policy support to effectively scale online assessment sustainably.

Feedback on Continuous Assessment

All respondents provide feedback, but only a few (around 43%) apply clear timelines or use structured platforms like Blackboard. Feedback methods vary from formal tools to informal discussions. This signals a shared understanding of the importance of feedback, but inconsistent practices limit its effectiveness. Clear institutional policies on the timeliness and quality of feedback could improve student outcomes.

Timeliness of Results

Time frames for publishing exam results range from 3 to 4 weeks (57%) to as long as 3 months. Variability is linked to academic calendars, holidays, and administrative efficiency. Institutions with faster turnaround times better support student progression. Standardised deadlines and automated result-processing systems would enhance consistency across the sector.

3.1.4 Project and Dissertation Supervision

Guidelines for Supervision

All respondents (100%) have formal guidelines outlining roles, timelines, feedback, and assessment for supervising final-year projects and dissertations. About 25% provide orientation sessions for students, and 12.5% use academic or industry panels to help frame project topics. This shows strong institutional commitment, though wider adoption of orientations and panels could improve support.

Supervision Load (Normal and Extra)

75% reported normal supervision loads of 5 to 7 students per supervisor annually, with one using a time-based workload. Extra supervision is allowed by 62.5%, is disallowed by 12.5%, and is unclear for 12.5%, reflecting varied institutional policies and a need for clearer guidance.

Remuneration for Extra Supervision

Half (50%) of respondents provide financial compensation for extra supervision (Rs 3,000–8,000), 25% offer reduced teaching or admin duties, and 25% provide no compensation. This variation suggests a need for standard policies to ensure fairness and encourage quality supervision.

PhD Supervision Maximum Allocation & Remuneration

62.5% have limits on PhD students per faculty, varying by rank (e.g., professors up to 8 students). 37.5% have no set limits. Only 37.5% offer financial compensation (around Rs 30,000 per student annually), while most consider it part of normal workload. Limits help balance workload; a lack of incentives may impact supervision quality.

Monitoring Student Progress

All respondents (100%) monitor student progress through biannual reports, logbooks, scheduled reviews, and digital platforms. PhD students regularly participate in formal progress panels. Although monitoring is systematic, the use of varied tools could cause inconsistencies.

3.1.5 Student Placement, Industrial Training, and Internships

Inclusion of Industrial Training/Internship Component

All respondents (100%) recognise that industrial training or internships are crucial, showing strong sector-wide recognition of the importance of practical experience as essential for employability and the connection between academic learning and workforce needs.

Dedicated Office or Department for Managing Internships

About 75% have a dedicated office or coordinator for placements; the rest rely on academic departments. Dedicated offices generally improve coordination and student support, while others may face challenges related to efficiency.

Duration of Industrial Training/Internship

Internship durations vary from 4 weeks to 6 months or more, with about half offering placements lasting a semester or longer. This flexibility suits different disciplines but may result in inconsistent practical exposure, indicating a need for minimum standards.

Credit Allocation for Internships

Credits awarded vary widely, ranging from 2-4 to over 50, with 60% using different systems depending on placement length and programme. This inconsistency may affect motivation and perceived value, highlighting a need for harmonised credit policies.

Assessment Methods for Industrial Training/Internship

Assessments include employer reports, academic evaluations, logbooks, journals, and presentations, often combining academic and industry feedback. Standardising key assessment elements could improve quality and comparability.

Supervision of Industrial Training/Internship

About 70% received formal dual supervision from academic and industry supervisors with regular monitoring; others have less formal oversight. Clear supervision protocols would ensure consistent student support and learning outcomes.

Maximum Number of Supervisions per Academic Year

Half of the respondents have no supervision limits; others cap students per supervisor at 2–3 or count it as part of the workload. Without clear limits, faculty risk overload, which may reduce supervision quality.

Remuneration or Workload Recognition for Supervision

Around 70% do not offer formal remuneration for supervision; some recognise it in workload, and a few provide financial compensation. Lack of incentives may lower faculty motivation, so clear policies would help acknowledge and encourage supervision efforts.

3.1.6 Academic Workload Practices in HEIs

Formal Academic Workload Models

Out of eight respondents, seven (87.5%) have formal academic workload models outlining teaching, research, admin, and service duties. While most have official documents, implementation varies—some face delays due to pending approvals or legal disputes.

Operational Status of Workload Models

Four HEIs report fully operational models guiding teaching and admin. Two have partial models, usually limited to teaching. One awaits model approval, and one faces legal barriers. This suggests gradual implementation and challenges in covering all academic functions.

Monitoring and Oversight Mechanisms

Monitoring practices vary. Some HEIs require departmental submissions (e.g., timetables, and module sheets) to be reviewed by senior staff. Others rely on planning sheets or lack formal oversight. Well-structured systems support better planning and quality assurance.

Total Academic Workload Hours Per Year

Reported workloads range widely from 270 to 1,800 hours/year and 180 hours(for LCCS programmes), depending on whether only teaching or all academic functions are counted. Some HEIs use holistic models, while others focus narrowly on teaching.

Allocation of Time Across Core Academic Functions

Teaching loads across HEIs range from 270 to 710 hours per year, with some using percentage splits, for example, 60% for teaching, 20% each for research and administration. Research hours are inconsistently defined, with only two HEIs specifying figures (315 and 50 hours), while others leave it vague. Administrative duties range from 90 to 800 hours annually or are expressed as role-based percentages; service tasks are often defined vagely. Extra teaching allowances vary from 100 to 270 hours, with some HEIs setting higher limits for specific programmes or linking eligibility to research performance. One HEI has no limit,

relying on internal approval. Remuneration also differs: Rs 800–1,200/hour depending on the level of teaching, while some apply flat or time-based rates. Not all HEIs offer payment for extra teaching, which may affect motivation and fairness.

3.1.7 Infrastructure, Resources, and Campus Readiness

Availability and Capacity of Classrooms and Lecture Rooms

All respondents reported having classrooms and lecture rooms available, indicating basic institutional readiness for academic delivery. However, only about one-third of respondents indicated having more than 30 such rooms, suggesting that the majority may face scheduling constraints or difficulties in accommodating large student cohorts. This could limit their flexibility in offering diverse or concurrent courses, particularly during peak academic periods.

Seating Capacity

The majority of respondents (75%) reported seating capacities below 1,500 students in their classrooms and lecture halls. While this is generally sufficient for moderate student populations, it may restrict the ability to conduct large lectures or exams in a single session. The remaining 25% of respondents, with capacities above 1,500, are better equipped to host large groups more efficiently.

Laboratories and Group Sizes

70% of respondents reported having ten or more laboratories, demonstrating strong support for practical and experiential learning, particularly in STEM fields. Most respondents indicated managing laboratory group sizes of 15 to 30 students, a range that promotes safety and meaningful engagement. Respondents with fewer labs or larger group sizes may experience challenges in maintaining quality lab experiences.

Library Facilities

All respondents confirmed having physical libraries, although only about 20% reported having large physical book collections. This suggests a shift among respondents toward digital resources, which offer greater accessibility but may

not fully meet the needs of students who prefer or rely on physical materials. A balanced collection is therefore essential.

Academic Databases

All respondents reported access to at least one academic database, reflecting a shared emphasis on academic quality and research support. About 60% of respondents indicated subscriptions to multiple databases, providing broader academic coverage and supporting advanced research needs. Respondents with fewer subscriptions may benefit from expanding access to meet growing academic demands.

Sports Facilities

Approximately 90% of respondents reported having sports facilities, highlighting institutional efforts to support student wellbeing and holistic development. The 10% without such facilities may face challenges in promoting physical health and extracurricular engagement among students.

Canteen Services

Canteen services are widely available, with 95% of respondents indicating the presence of on-campus food outlets. These services support student wellbeing and convenience. The 5% of respondents without canteen facilities may need to consider alternative food options to better support their student communities.

Accessibility for Students with Disabilities

75% of respondents reported having adequate facilities for students with disabilities, while 25% acknowledged gaps in accessibility. This reveals a need for improvement among a significant portion of respondents to ensure inclusive and equitable access to education for all students.

3.1.8 Professional Development

Professional Development Programmes

About 75% of respondents reported having professional development programmes for academic and non-academic staff, including workshops and training in areas like leadership and IT. However, 25% lack formal programmes

or are still developing policies, indicating a need for structured staff development across all institutions.

Support for Staff Qualification Upgrades

Around 62% of respondents offer support schemes for staff to upgrade their qualifications through tuition waivers, study leave, or sponsorships. The remaining 38% do not provide such support, revealing a gap in promoting staff's academic development.

Orientation and Induction for New Staff

Approximately 81% of respondents conduct orientation and induction programmes for new staff, helping them understand institutional roles and culture. The 19% without such programmes may face challenges in staff integration and retention.

Conference and Workshop Attendance Schemes

Nearly 70% of respondents have schemes to support staff participation in conferences and workshops, often with knowledge-sharing requirements. However, 30% lack such policies, limiting staff exposure to external learning and collaboration opportunities.

3.2 Analysis of Findings with QAA Mauritius Standards and Guidelines

The Quality Assurance Authority (QAA) Mauritius has issued a set of guidelines to promote quality and consistency across HEIs. These standards and guidelines are designed to support quality assurance processes, particularly quality audits, while safeguarding both public and student interests. They provide clear expectations for HEIs and stakeholders regarding output standards. Developed by the QAA, these guidelines are subject to finalisation following consultation with all HEIs in Mauritius.

The three principal documents are:

i. Guidelines for Quality Assurance of Programmes
ii. Guidelines for the Delivery of Online Programmes
iii. Guidelines for Assessment and Moderation Procedures

These guidelines provide a national quality framework to support the delivery of robust, relevant, and flexible higher education programmes, both on campus and online.

A comparison of the QAA guidelines against the key findings and recommendations of the National Committee reveals the following:

Table 5: Comparison of QAA Mauritius Guidelines to National Committee Findings

Covered by QAA Mauritius	Gaps Identified	Recommended Actions
1.Governance and Management		
The *Quality Assurance of Programmes* guideline ensures NQF alignment and promotes evidence-based programme monitoring, indirectly supporting credit harmonisation	• Absence of a clearly defined academic workload model • Lack of formal systems for performance appraisal • Missing supervision limits or established guidelines for academic staff	– Develop standard workload models and appraisal policies – Introduce national guidelines on project/internship supervision, including supervision caps, recognition mechanisms, and postgraduate tracking tools
2. Teaching, Learning and Assessment		
• ***Assessment and Moderation* guidelines address standardised moderation, fair assessment, security, and online delivery integrity.** • ***Online Delivery* guidelines mandate**	• National minimum standards for the frequency of continuous assessment and feedback timelines are currently undefined • Inconsistencies in the number of teaching weeks remain unaddressed	– Set national minimum benchmarks for continuous assessment and feedback timelines – Define standard semester durations or permissible ranges – Establish a national framework for micro-credentials aligned with

institutional frameworks for virtual learning, including self-review mechanisms, learning platforms, and support structures.	• National benchmarks for the quality and scope of online learning provision have yet to be established • Guidance on the development, recognition, and stackability of micro-credentials is currently lacking	NQF and RPL pathways – Enhance online delivery guidelines to include learner support for low connectivity and digital literacy
3. Student Support		
– The *Online Delivery* guideline encourages accessibility and learner support, though not comprehensively for all modes of delivery.	• Student satisfaction surveys and evaluations of the learning experience are not currently part of standard institutional practice. • Campus readiness—including suitable classrooms, inclusive infrastructure, sports facilities, and student support services—has not yet been systematically addressed. • Institutions currently lack a consistent, standardised mechanism for monitoring the delivery of scheduled lectures and practical sessions.	– Mandate regular (annual or biennial) student satisfaction and experience surveys – Define campus readiness standards, including inclusive infrastructure, quality learning environments, and student query resolution mechanisms – Establish institution-wide monitoring systems supported by Quality Assurance units

The QAA Mauritius guidelines offer a solid foundation for quality enhancement, but additional standards and mechanisms such as formal academic workload models, national assessment and supervision standards, improved student support, and micro-credentials are needed to fully implement the National Strategy, address recommendations, and align with national and international quality goals.

3.3 International Benchmarking

Comparative analysis with established international frameworks such as the UK's TEF, Quality Assurance Agency (UK), and Australia's Threshold Standards reveals:

i. The need to strengthen student-centred learning approaches;
ii. Importance of competency-based curricula for graduate employability;
iii. Necessity for secure, continuous assessment practices including online assessment integrity;
iv. The value of formal policies regulating supervision and academic workloads;
v. The imperative to invest in digital infrastructure and staff training to keep pace with global educational innovations.

Mauritius' strategy draws heavily on these insights to craft policies that are ambitious yet contextually relevant.

3.3.1 Analysis of Findings with the UK Quality Code (2024)

Analysis of the findings in relation to the 2024 UK Quality Code allows Mauritius to benchmark its higher education standards against internationally recognised best practices, reinforcing the credibility and comparability of its qualifications. This analysis supports the HEC's efforts to enhance quality assurance, promote student-centred learning, and facilitate global recognition of Mauritian qualifications, particularly within Commonwealth and international academic networks. An analysis of the findings with the UK Quality Code (2024) is detailed below:

Table 6: Analysis of Findings with the UK Quality Code (2024)

A. Governance / Management

Key Finding	UK Quality Code for Higher Education 2024 - Sector-Agreed Principles	Rationale
1. **Academic workload systems lack consistent application, with significant variation in teaching loads.**	**Principle 1 – Strategic Management of Quality and Standards:** Institutions take responsibility for academic standards through clear governance, policies, and leadership.	Inconsistent workload allocation affects the quality of delivery and alignment with institutional goals.
2. **Formal staff development and performance appraisal systems are absent in some institutions.**	**Principle 3 – Resourcing delivery of high-quality learning experience:** Providers plan, secure and maintain resources, including staffing, to enable the delivery and enhancement of an accessible, innovative, and high-quality learning experience. **Principle 10** - Supporting students to achieve their potential. Providers facilitate a framework of support for students that enables them to have a high-quality learning experience and achieve their potential as they progress in their studies. The support structure scaffolds the academic, personal, and professional learning journey, enabling	Staff development is part of a strategic and reflective quality enhancement cycle.

	students to recognise and articulate their progress and achievements.	
3. **Limited data on overall student experience**	**Principle 4 - Using data to inform and evaluate quality:** Providers collect, analyse, and utilise qualitative and quantitative data at provider, departmental, programme, and module levels. These analyses inform decision-making with the aim of enhancing practices and processes related to teaching, learning and the wider student experience.	Lack of data undermines evidence-based improvements to teaching and student experience.
4. **HEIs differ in how they allocate credits and define contact hours**	**Principle 7 - Designing, developing, approving and modifying programmes:** Providers design, develop, approve and modify programmes and modules to ensure the quality of provision and the academic standards of awards are consistent with the relevant Qualifications Framework. Providers ensure their provision and level of qualifications are comparable to those offered across the UK and, where applicable, to The Framework of Qualifications for The European Higher Education Area.	Ensuring consistency in credit and contact hour definition is central to comparability and standards.

B. Teaching, Learning & Assessment

Key Finding	UK Quality Code for Higher Education 2024 - Sector-Agreed Principles	Rationale
1. **Credit Allocation vary across institutions**	**Principle 7 - Designing, developing, approving and modifying programmes:** Providers design, develop, approve and modify programmes and modules to ensure the quality of provision and the academic standards of awards are consistent with the relevant Qualifications Framework. Providers ensure their provision and level of qualifications are comparable to those offered across the UK and, where applicable, the Framework of Qualifications for the European Higher Education Area.	Relates directly to academic standardisation and qualification frameworks.
2. **Approaches to continuous assessment vary widely across HEIs**	**Principle 11 - Teaching, learning and assessment:** Providers facilitate a collaborative and inclusive approach that enables students to have a high-quality learning experience and to progress through their studies. All students are supported to develop and demonstrate academic and professional skills and competencies. Assessment employs a variety of methods, embodying the	Highlights inconsistencies in pedagogical practices and assessment integrity.

	values of academic integrity, producing outcomes that are comparable across the UK and recognised globally.	
3. **Teaching weeks vary between 10 and 18, with common semester lengths of 12, 15, or 16 weeks.**	**Principle 11 - Teaching, learning and assessment:** Providers facilitate a collaborative and inclusive approach that enables students to have a high-quality learning experience and to progress through their studies. All students are supported in developing and demonstrating academic and professional skills and competencies. Assessment employs a variety of methods, embodying the values of academic integrity, producing outcomes that are comparable across the UK and recognised globally.	Teaching duration impacts curriculum coverage and assessment scheduling.
4. **Full Time to Part Time student-staff ratios vary widely**	**Principle 3 - Resourcing delivery of a high-quality learning experience:** Providers plan, secure and maintain resources related to learning, technology, facilities, and staffing to enable the delivery and enhancement of an accessible, innovative and high-quality learning experience for students that aligns with the provider's strategy and the composition of the student body.	Impacts teaching quality and individual learning support.

C. Student Support

Key Finding	UK Quality Code for Higher Education 2024 - Sector-Agreed Principles	Rationale	Application of Principle to Overcome Challenge
1. Inadequate campus readiness and support services in some institutions	**Principle 3 - Resourcing delivery of a high-quality learning experience** Providers plan, secure, and maintain resources relating to learning, technology, facilities, and staffing to enable the delivery and enhancement of an accessible, innovative, and high-quality learning experience for students that aligns with the provider's strategy and the composition of the student body **Principle 12 - Operating concerns, complaints and appeals processes** Providers operate processes for complaints, and appeals that are robust, fair, transparent, and accessible, and clearly articulated to staff and students. Policies and processes for concerns, complaints and appeals are regularly reviewed and the outcomes are used to support the enhancement of provision and the student experience.	Affects equity, inclusiveness, and overall academic journey.	Prioritise investments in inclusive facilities, campus infrastructure, and holistic student support services aligned with strategic priorities.

2. Not all HEIs provide access to digital libraries	**Principle 3 - Resourcing delivery of a high-quality learning experience:** Providers plan, secure, and maintain resources relating to learning, technology, facilities, and staffing to enable the delivery and enhancement of an accessible, innovative, and high-quality learning experience for students that aligns with the provider's strategy and the composition of the student body.	Access to knowledge resources is key to delivering quality education.	Secure licensing agreements and budget allocations to provide all students with equitable access to digital libraries and learning resources.
3. No standardised system to evaluate teaching quality and academic support, and the overall learning experience across HEIs	**Principle 5 - Monitoring, evaluating and enhancing provision:** Providers regularly monitor and review their provision to secure academic standards and enhance quality. Deliberate steps are taken to engage and involve students, staff and external expertise in monitoring and evaluation activities. The outcomes and impact of these activities are considered at the provider level to drive reflection and enhancement across the provider. **Principle 4 - Using data to inform and evaluate quality:**	Lack of a sector-wide framework hampers ongoing enhancement and benchmarking.	Develop a sector-wide quality evaluation framework that standardises indicators and incorporates student, staff, and peer feedback mechanisms.

	Providers collect, analyse, and utilise qualitative and quantitative data at the provider, departmental, programme and module levels. These analyses inform decision-making with the aim of enhancing practices and processes relating to teaching, learning and the wider student experience.		
4. Monitoring mechanisms for conduct of lectures and practicals vary	**Principle 5 - Monitoring, evaluating and enhancing provision:** Providers regularly monitor and review their provision to secure academic standards and enhance quality. Deliberate steps are taken to engage and involve students, staff, and external expertise in monitoring and evaluation activities. The outcomes and impact of these activities are considered at the provider level to drive reflection and enhancement across the provider.	Consistent quality assurance of delivery is essential for maintaining standards.	Implement consistent monitoring protocols with involvement of stakeholders, ensuring feedback loops lead to actionable improvements.

3.4 Categorisation of Key Findings

The findings are grouped under three categories as shown below:

Table 7: Categorisation of Key Findings

SN	Category	Key Findings
1	Governance/ Management	Academic workload systems lack consistent application, with significant variation in teaching loads.
2		Formal staff development and performance appraisal systems are absent in some institutions.
3		Limited data on overall student experience.
4		HEIs differ in how they allocate credits and define contact hours.
5	Teaching, Learning and Assessment	Credit Allocation vary across institutions.
6		Approaches to continuous assessment vary widely across HEIs.
7		Teaching weeks vary between 10 and 18, with common semester lengths of 12, 15, or 16 weeks.
8		Full Time to Part Time student-staff ratios vary widely.
9	Student Support	Inadequate campus readiness and support services in some institutions.
10		Not all HEIs provide access to digital libraries.
11		No standardised system to evaluate teaching quality and academic support, and the overall learning experience across HEIs.
12		Monitoring mechanisms for conduct of lectures and practicals vary.

4 Recommendations

The recommendations for the Strategic Advancement of Higher Education Quality Assurance in Mauritius are grouped as per the categories as follows:

Table 8: Recommendations for the Strategic Advancement of Higher Education Quality Assurance in Mauritius

Category	Recommendations
Governance/ Management	**Strategic Alignment with the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)** Facilitate a structured engagement of public universities in aligning their institutional teaching and learning practices with the core principles of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). This alignment should operate at both the micro (institutional) and macro (national policy) levels to ensure coherence and systemic improvement. The process should be supported by clear guidance on performance metrics and benchmarks, contextualised to the local higher education environment while ensuring alignment with internationally recognised standards. **Comprehensive Review of the Academic Workload Model -** Undertake a thorough review of existing academic workload models across Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), introducing clear differentiation based on academic ranks, namely Lecturer/Senior Lecturer (L/SL), Associate Professor (AP), and Professor (P). The model should ensure equitable distribution of responsibilities across the three pillars of academic activity: teaching, research, and community engagement. In applying the model,

	consideration must be given to the specific mandates and functional roles of individual institutions, particularly where responsibilities such as curriculum development constitute a core institutional function. **Development of a National Mauritius Quality Code** Formulate a comprehensive Mauritius Quality Code aligned with globally recognised quality assurance frameworks such as the UK Quality Code. This code should provide guidance on institutional governance, curriculum design, teaching and learning processes, student assessment, and academic and welfare support. It will serve as the national reference document for quality assurance and enhancement in HEIs. **Stakeholder Validation through Structured National Dialogue** Conduct a national-level structured consultation process to validate the proposed Mauritius Quality Code. This dialogue must include representatives from public universities, student unions, academic staff associations, senior institutional administrators, and key industry stakeholders. The aim is to ensure that the Quality Code is contextually relevant, aligned with local academic realities, and supported by the higher education community.

Teaching, Learning and Assessment	**Capacity Building for QA and Teaching Excellence** Conduct a coordinated capacity-building programme for academic and administrative staff of HEIs, focused on the practical implementation of the Teaching Excellence Framework and the Mauritius Quality Code. This initiative should include targeted training workshops, resource development, and technical assistance in quality assurance practices, curriculum redesign, data management, and student-centred pedagogies.
Student Support	**Establishment of a Comprehensive Institutional Student Experience Survey**: Develop and implement a national Institutional Survey on Student Experience to capture structured and comparative data on various dimensions of student life. The survey should encompass academic engagement, teaching quality, support services, campus environment, and career preparation. The findings will provide a robust evidence base for institutional improvement plans and national policy interventions.

5 Panel Discussion

The panel discussion brought together institutional leaders and national stakeholders to address critical challenges and opportunities in Mauritius' higher education sector. Guided by thematic questions from the moderator, Dr Ancharaz, the panellists namely Professor Mohee, Professor Sobhee, Dr Hurreeram, Mr A Domah, Professor Ramnarain and Professor Jansen van Rensburg shared institutional practices, policy innovations, and strategic perspectives. Professor Mohee set the tone by urging a shift from "publish or perish" to "innovate or perish," highlighting the need for systemic transformation. Discussions covered academic workload reform, quality assurance in online learning, industry-linked education, and strategies to support underprepared learners culminating in a dialogue on how to balance expanded access with the maintenance of academic standards. The session offered valuable insights to inform inclusive and forward-looking national strategies. Details of the panel discussion are included in Appendix 2.

Panel Reflections: Relevance and Impact

The panel affirmed the strong relevance of the national recommendations, highlighting their alignment with institutional goals. Seven key themes emerged from the discussion: the need for sector-wide alignment and harmonisation to enhance student mobility and strengthen quality assurance; the development of governance and equitable academic workload models that account for the complexity of teaching responsibilities; elevating the student voice through national feedback mechanisms and graduate destination surveys; prioritising student support and campus readiness to promote success and internationalisation; better integration of research and teaching with balanced academic roles; acknowledgement of infrastructure challenges that require systemic investment; and a call for bold, coordinated reforms alongside a shared national vision to position Mauritius as a competitive player in the global higher education landscape.

New Learning Framework

The panel stated that his/her HEIs has introduced a trimester system with flexible entry, a harmonised first-year curriculum, and electives aligned to market needs. Assessments focus on real-world tasks with ethical AI-supported feedback. Students attend campus three days weekly, with 25% online delivery balancing flexibility and quality. This framework enhances resilience, learner experience, and academic rigour.

Academic Workload Management

The panel mentioned that since 2020, his/her HEI's workload policy sets 1,575 annual hours distributed as 60% teaching, 30% research, and 10% admin, adjusted for disciplines. Integration with performance and remuneration systems, real-time monitoring, and mandatory workload plans improve transparency and morale. Support modules for underprepared students, especially international students, reflect a commitment to fairness and excellence.

Quality and Integrity in Online Learning

The panel stated that his/her HEI uses the Amigo LMS for video lectures, virtual labs, and self-paced learning. Programmes have a structured five-block design with balanced formative and AI-proctored summative assessments. Integrity is ensured via biometric checks and tiered proctoring. Automated feedback and personalised recommendations enhance engagement without compromising quality.

Student Placement and Internships

One HEI requires business students to complete four-week placements, while engineering students must undertake 20-week internships aligned with SDGs. An entrepreneurship module culminates in business pitches, supported by a campus incubator. Extended timelines for lower-qualified entrants maintain quality standards. The HEI will launch a Graduate Attributes Framework to formalise student outcome expectations.

Leadership Vision: Professor Mohee's Call to Innovate

Professor Mohee highlighted the need for systemic transformation from "publish or perish" to "innovate or perish." She underscored national advances such as the micro-credential framework and AI Guidelines. With policy backing expected in 2025, institutions must embed micro-credentials to develop transversal skills and employment pathways, making innovation a collective imperative for Mauritius to lead globally.

Access and Quality Balance

In response to how to maintain quality while expanding access, one panelist emphasised formal support modules, particularly for international students, and another stressed extended timelines while upholding learning outcomes. Both panellists demonstrated a commitment to inclusive excellence at their institution without compromising academic standards.

6 People's Voice

This section presents key themes emerging from the *People's Voice* initiative, which gathered input from participants across the higher education landscape in Mauritius. Their contributions reflect real-world experiences, expectations, and practical ideas for strengthening the sector. Details of the People's Voice initiative are included in Appendix 3.

Flexible National Framework with Institutional Autonomy

Participants stressed the importance of a coherent national framework that ensures quality while allowing HEIs the autonomy to innovate. Institutions should design programmes that are suited to their contexts, aligned with national and global standards, and in collaboration with industry and the HEC.

Pedagogical Quality Across All Modes of Delivery

Teaching quality should be judged by effectiveness, not format. Participants rejected the assumption that face-to-face is superior, noting that well-designed

online learning is equally valid and effective when accredited and structured properly.

Transparency and Quality Enhancement in Assessment

Clear assessment criteria and rubrics should be shared with students to promote fairness. The focus should shift from mere compliance to continuous quality improvement in teaching and learning.

Representation and Inclusive Engagement

HEIs like the Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE) should be involved in national education dialogues, especially those related to curriculum and teacher preparation, to enrich strategic planning.

Student Experience and Responsibility

A national student satisfaction survey was proposed to support a Teaching Excellence Framework. While student rights were upheld, responsibilities such as ethical conduct, emotional growth, and respectful communication were also emphasised.

Academic Staff Roles, Training, and Workload Management

Ongoing professional development in pedagogy, technology, and Artificial Intelligence is vital. Suggestions included creating research-intensive roles with lighter teaching loads and adjusting workloads based on programme level.

Accreditation Processes Aligned with International Standards

Participants advocated for holistic accreditation that focused on systems, staff development, and QA processes. Recognition by global bodies is essential to strengthening Mauritius' international standing.

Innovation and Policy Reform

Outdated or inconsistent accreditation requirements were identified as barriers to innovation. Reforms are needed to align policies with evolving societal and labour market needs.

Sustainable Funding and Sector Unity

Participants supported sustainable funding through nominal fees and targeted scholarships. Greater collaboration between public and private HEIs was encouraged to build a unified and resilient sector.

The *People's Voice* provides grounded insights that directly inform this strategy. These contributions demonstrate the value of inclusive dialogue and reinforce the urgency of developing a more student-centred, flexible, and forward-looking higher education system in Mauritius.

7 Final Recommendations: Strategic Directions

This section outlines final recommendations that provide strategic directions to support effective planning, implementation, and sustainability. The aim is to guide future actions through clear priorities, coordinated efforts, and inclusive stakeholder involvement. The final recommendations are as follows:

A. **Development of a National Mauritius Quality Code for Higher Education**

   Formulate a comprehensive Mauritius Quality Code aligned with globally recognised quality assurance frameworks such as the UK Quality Code. This code should provide guidance on institutional governance, curriculum design, teaching and learning processes, student assessment, and academic and welfare support. It will serve as the national reference document for quality assurance and enhancement in HEIs.

   Conduct a national-level structured consultation process to validate the proposed Mauritius Quality Code. This dialogue must include representatives from public universities, student unions, academic staff associations, senior institutional administrators, and key industry stakeholders. The aim is to ensure the Quality Code is contextually relevant, reflective of local academic realities, and enjoys support from the higher education community.

B. Strategic Alignment of HEIs with the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF)

Facilitate a structured engagement of public universities in aligning their institutional teaching and learning practices with the core principles of the Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF). This alignment should operate at both the micro (institutional) and macro (national policy) levels to ensure coherence and systemic improvement. The process should be supported by clear guidance on performance metrics and benchmarks, contextualised to the local higher education environment while ensuring alignment with internationally recognised standards.

C. Conduct a Comprehensive Institutional Student Experience Survey, on a regular basis, by HEIs

Develop and implement a national Institutional Survey on Student Experience to capture structured and comparable data on various dimensions of student life. The survey should encompass academic engagement, teaching quality, support services, campus environment, and career preparation. The findings will provide a robust evidence base for institutional improvement plans and national policy initiatives.

D. Review of the Academic Workload Model, in public HEIs

Undertake a thorough review of existing academic workload models across Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), introducing clear differentiation based on academic ranks, namely Lecturer/Senior Lecturer (L/SL), Associate Professor (AP), and Professor (P). The model should ensure equitable distribution of responsibilities across the three pillars of academic activity: teaching, research, and community engagement. In applying the model, consideration must be given to the specific mandates and functional roles of individual institutions, particularly where responsibilities such as curriculum development constitute a core institutional function.

E. Capacity Building for Quality Assurance and Teaching Excellence Implementation

Conduct a coordinated capacity-building programme for academic and administrative staff of HEIs, focused on the practical implementation of the Teaching Excellence Framework and the Mauritius Quality Code. This initiative should include targeted training workshops, resource development, and technical assistance in quality assurance practices, curriculum redesign, data management, and student-centred pedagogies.

8 Conclusion

The *National Strategy on Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation (2025–2035)* represents a pivotal step in redefining the future of higher education in Mauritius. It articulates a coherent, forward-looking vision that addresses the pressing need for innovation, equity, and quality across the higher education system. By identifying key systemic and institutional gaps, ranging from outdated pedagogical practices and limited digital integration to inconsistencies in quality assurance mechanisms, the report lays the foundation for meaningful and sustainable reform.

The recommendations put forth are grounded in international best practices while being tailored to the unique context of Mauritius. They promote a holistic approach that places students at the centre of the learning experience, enhances teaching excellence, and strengthens quality assurance frameworks. The emphasis on digital transformation and inclusive education ensures that no learner is left behind, while the drive for international recognition and alignment with global standards positions Mauritius as a credible and competitive player in the regional and global higher education landscape.

Successful implementation will depend on robust governance, continuous capacity-building, adequate resourcing, and strong partnerships among government, HEIs, industry, and civil society. It will also require ongoing monitoring and evaluation to ensure accountability and responsiveness to emerging challenges and opportunities.

Ultimately, this report is not only a roadmap but also a call to action – a shared commitment to building a dynamic, inclusive, and globally relevant higher education system. By embracing this vision and working collectively, Mauritius can unlock the full potential of its human capital, foster innovation and resilience, and empower future generations to thrive in an increasingly complex and interconnected world.

References

Ashwin, P., Boud, D., Coate, K., Hallett, F., Keane, E., Krause, K. L., ... & McArthur, J. (2017). Reflective Teaching in Higher Education. Bloomsbury.

Bennetts, R., & Tait, C. (2021). Navigating quality assurance in non-university higher education: Challenges and innovations. Australian Journal of Education, 65(2), 112–128.

Blackmore, J. (2016). The marketisation of higher education: The student as consumer and the HE standards framework. Critical Studies in Education, 57(1), 99–115.

Bunce, L., Baird, A., & Jones, S. E. (2017). The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. Studies in Higher Education, 42(11), 1958-1978.

Cheng, J. H. S., & Marsh, H. W. (2010). National Student Survey: Are differences between universities and courses reliable and meaningful? Oxford Review of Education, 36(6), 693–712.

Croucher, G., Marginson, S., Norton, A., & Wells, J. (2013). *The Dawkins Revolution: 25 Years On.* Melbourne University Press.

Department for Education (DfE). (2016). Teaching Excellence Framework: Technical Specification for Year Two. London: DfE.

Department for Education (DfE). (2017). Teaching Excellence Framework Specification.

Department for Education (DfE). (2019). Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework: Delivering the Next Phase.

ENQA. (2020). Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).

ENQA. (2020). Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG).
Gibbs, G. (2012). *Implications of 'Dimensions of Quality' in a market environment.* York: Higher Education Academy.

GoStudyIn (n.d.) Teaching Excellence Framework. Available at: https://gostudyin.com/study-in-uk/study-info/teaching-excellence-framework/

Gourlay, L., & Stevenson, J. (2017). Teaching excellence frameworks: Global perspectives. Higher Education Quarterly, 71(4), 345–354.

Gunn, A. (2018). Metrics and the Teaching Excellence Framework. Higher Education Policy, 31(1), 1–14.

Gunn, V. (2018). Evaluating teaching excellence: A critical review of TEF. Teaching in Higher Education, 23(8), 1043–1056.

Harvey, L. (2020). Beyond compliance: Cultural transformation and the HESF. Quality in Higher Education, 26(1), 4–17.

Harvey, L. (2020). Beyond compliance: Cultural transformation and the HESF. Quality in Higher Education, 26(1), 4–17.

Hazelkorn, E. (2018). Learning to live with league tables and rankings: The experience of institutional leaders. Higher Education Policy, 31(1), 1–14.

Higher Education Commission (HEC), Mauritius. Guidelines for Programme Accreditation. [Available on the HEC website: https://www.hec.mu]

Higher Education Commission (HEC), Mauritius. Guidelines for the Submission of Project Proposals. [Available on the HEC website: https://www.hec.mu]

Higher Education Commission (HEC), Mauritius. Guidelines for the Registration of Postsecondary Education Institutions (2021). [Available on the HEC website: https://www.hec.mu]

Hodson, P., & Thomas, L. (2021). Quality assurance in English higher education: A critical policy analysis. Journal of Education Policy, 36(2), 224–243.

Jones, D., & Gannaway, D. (2020). Student partnership in UK quality assurance: Rhetoric or reality? Studies in Higher Education, 45(6), 1134–1148.

Knight, J. (2019). Transnational education and the UK Quality Code: Ensuring integrity and reputation. International Journal of Educational Development, 66, 23–30.

Lemon, B. (2020). From compliance to commitment: Embedding quality in academic practice. Higher Education Research & Development, 39(5), 968–981.

Lemon, B. (2020). From compliance to commitment: Embedding quality in academic practice. Higher Education Research & Development, 39(5), 968–981.

Locke, W. (2017). The intensification of rankings logic in an age of metrics. International Higher Education, (88), 2–4.

Middlehurst, R. (2017). Leadership, quality and institutional culture in higher education. Higher Education Quarterly, 71(1), 14–28.

Moodie, G. (2021). Regulation and innovation in Australian higher education. Policy Futures in Education, 19(4), 447–460.

Moodie, G. (2021). Regulation and innovation in Australian higher education. Policy Futures in Education, 19(4), 447–460.

Newton, J. (2020). The gap between quality assurance and quality enhancement: Institutional responses to the UK Quality Code. Quality in Higher Education, 26(3), 311–328.

Newton, J. (2020). The gap between quality assurance and quality enhancement: Institutional responses to the UK Quality Code. Quality in Higher Education, 26(3), 311–328.

Norton, A. (2019). Risk-based regulation and fairness in higher education. The Conversation. https://theconversation.com

Norton, A., & Cherastidtham, I. (2018). The University Sector: Demand, Supply and Regulation. Grattan Institute.

Office for Students (OfS). (2023). TEF 2023: Framework and Guidance. Bristol: OfS.

Office for Students (OfS). Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) Guidance for Providers 2023. [Available at: https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk]

OfS. (2019). Regulatory Framework for Higher Education in England.

Pearce, S. (2019). Independent Review of the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework. Department for Education.

QAA. (2018). UK Quality Code for Higher Education. Available at: https://www.qaa.ac.uk

QAA. (2018). UK Quality Code for Higher Education. https://www.qaa.ac.uk

Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), UK. UK Quality Code for Higher Education. [Available at: https://www.qaa.ac.uk]

Saunders, M., Brosnan, K., & Walker, M. (2018). The Scottish Quality Enhancement Framework: A case study in higher education policy divergence. Journal of Education Policy, 33(6), 773–788.

Shah, M., & Jarzabkowski, L. (2019). Changing directions in quality assurance in Australian higher education. Quality in Higher Education, 25(1), 51–68.

Shah, M., Chenicheri, S., & Nair, C. S. (2021). Measuring and Enhancing the Student Experience in Higher Education. Chandos Publishing.

Sharma, M., & McGettigan, A. (2018). Metrics and teaching excellence: From philosophy to practice. Higher Education Policy, 31(1), 21–36.

Smith, R., & O'Leary, M. (2019). Implementing the UK Quality Code: A case study of institutional adaptation. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44(1), 47–60.

Smith, R., & O'Leary, M. (2019). Implementing the UK Quality Code: A case study of institutional adaptation. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 44(1), 47–60.

TEQSA. (2021). Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 Edition. https://www.teqsa.gov.au

TEQSA. (2021). Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 Edition. https://www.teqsa.gov.au

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), Australia. Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021. [Available at: https://www.teqsa.gov.au]

Tomlinson, M. (2018). *Conceptions of the value of higher education in a measured market.* Higher Education, 75(4), 711–727. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0165-6

UNESCO. (2023). Global Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education.

Universities UK. (2023). Future of Quality and Standards in UK Higher Education.
Watermeyer, R., & Olssen, M. (2016). ‘Excellence’ and exclusion: The individual costs of institutional competitiveness. Learning and Teaching, 9(1), 30–47.

Williams, J. (2016). Quality assurance and the student experience: UK policy perspectives. Quality in Higher Education, 22(3), 240–253.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Survey on Teaching and Learning in HEIs

The National Committee on Teaching, Learning and Quality Transformation has been established to lead a system-wide transformation of pedagogical practices, assessment models, learning environments, and institutional support structure across Mauritius' tertiary education landscape.

The objective of this survey is to capture the existing practices and provisions for curriculum development, assessment, programme delivery, academic support, digital readiness, infrastructure, and professional development in tertiary education institutions. These data will be analysed so as to spearhead a system-wide reform that elevates academic standards, modernises pedagogical approaches, and ensures equity and consistency across tertiary education institutions in Mauritius.

Curriculum Development

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**
What is the Academic Programme Development Process in your institution?		
Does your institution carry out Training Needs Analysis before mounting programmes?		
Specify the number of credits/hours per programme.		
Specify the NQF level of each of the following qualifications at your institution.		
What are the exit points provided in the different qualifications offered?		

Programme Delivery

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**
What are the different modes of delivery?		
If blended mode is offered, specify the percentage of online and face-to-face teaching?		
What is the number of teaching weeks/sessions for a typical module?		
Number of semesters in an academic year		

Number of contact hours per standard module		
Number of notional hours per standard module		
Ratio of Full-Time Academic Staff and Part-Time Academic Staff		
Ratio of student to full-time academic		
Specify the modes of transmission of learning materials.		
Do you record student attendance for lectures and practicals?		
Is there a mechanism in place to monitor whether lectures/practicals are being held as per time-table?		

Assessment Methods and Practices

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**
What are the different modes of assessment in your institution?		
Percentage of modules assessed fully by continuous assessment per programme (no final exam)		
Do you conduct Online Assessment?		
If Online Assessment is carried out, what are the technologies/mechanisms used?		
Do students receive feedback on their assignments/continuous assessments before examinations? If yes, describe the mechanisms in place to monitor the provision of such feedback.		
As per calendar of activities after examination what is the time frame for publishing of results?		

Project/Dissertation Supervision

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**
Do you have guidelines for		

project/dissertation supervision?		
Normal supervision load per academic year for an academic staff		
Number of extra supervision allowed above the normal load		
What is the remuneration for extra project/dissertation supervision?		
What is the maximum number of PhD supervision allowed?		
Is PhD supervision remunerated? If yes, what is the quantum?		
What is the monitoring mechanism in place to monitor student progress		

Student Placement / Industrial Training/ Internship

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**
Do programmes of your University have an Industrial Training/Internship component?		
Is there an office/department dedicated for management of Industrial Training/Internship?		
What is the duration of the Industrial Training/Internship?		
What is the number of credits allocated for the Industrial Training/Internship?		
How is the Industrial Training/Internship assessed?		
How is Industrial Training/Internship supervision carried out?		
Is there a maximum number of Industrial Training/Internship supervision per academic year? if yes, how many?		
Is there a remuneration or workload associated with internship supervision? if yes, please specify.		

Academic Workload Policy

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**

Do you have a formal academic workload model?		
Is the academic workload model fully operational?		
What mechanism is in place to monitor the academic workload?		
What is the overall normal academic workload hours per academic year?		
What is the normal load (hours) per academic year for each of the following components?		
What is the maximum number of hours of extra teaching allowed (above normal teaching hours) per academic year?		
What are the rates for payment of extra teaching?		
What is the normal number of programme coordination per academic year?		
What is the number of extra programme coordination allowed per academic year?		
What are the rates for payment of extra programme coordination?		
Is there any policy to buy-in teaching hours?		
Is there a formal performance appraisal system for academic staff?		

Infrastructure & Resources & Support (Campus Readiness)

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**
What is the number of classrooms/lecture rooms available?		
What is the overall seating capacity of the classrooms/lecture rooms available?		
What is the number of laboratories available?		
What is the overall seating capacity of the laboratories available?		
Do you provide a physical library facility? if yes specify indicative surface area and number of books.		

Do you provide an e-library facility?		
List the databases that the University is subscribed to?		
What sports facilities do the University provide?		
Do the University provide canteen facilities on your campuses?		
Does your campus provide accessibility for students with disabilities?		
Do you have a Student Information System?		
Do you have a Learning Management System?		
What mechanism do you have to capture and attend to student queries?		

Professional Development

	Existing Provisions	**Remarks**
Is there a professional development programme for both academic and non-academic staff? If yes, provide details.		
Do you have a scheme to support staff of the University for upgrading of qualification? If yes, provide details.		
Does the University provide a professional Orientation/ Induction for new recruits (academic and non-academic staff)? If yes, provide details.		
Does your institution have a Conference/Workshop Attendance Scheme? If yes, provide details.		

Appendix 2: Panel Discussion

1. Panel Reflections: Relevance and Impact of National Recommendations

The panel discussion opened with a broad question to all panel members*: "How relevant are these recommendations from the perspective of your institution, and which of those recommendations do you think are going to be most impactful?"*

All members of the panel affirmed the high relevance of the national recommendations, recognising their strong alignment with institutional priorities and practices. Seven core themes emerged from the collective responses:

i) Alignment and Harmonisation: Institutions acknowledged that while many practices are already in place, there is an urgent need to harmonise standards across the sector. This would enhance staff and student mobility, improve consistency in programme delivery, and strengthen national quality assurance mechanisms.

ii) Governance and Academic Workload Models: Institutions advocated for teaching unit-based models that consider class size, module level, and teaching responsibilities. These more equitable systems would better support academics in balancing teaching, research, and service.

iii) Elevating the Student Voice: Institutions emphasised the importance of integrating student feedback systematically. A coordinated national approach to student and graduate destination surveys was proposed to reduce survey fatigue and yield actionable data on satisfaction, employability, and qualifications. Timely feedback on assessments was also identified as a critical need.

iv) Student Support and Campus Readiness: Robust support systems, including facilities and wellbeing services, were considered essential for internationalisation and student success. Institutions called for comprehensive campus readiness to enhance the learning experience and attract international learners.

v) Integration of Research and Teaching: There was strong consensus on embedding research more effectively in teaching. However, current workloads limit research productivity. Institutions requested support to

rebalance academic roles so that teaching, research, and administrative service can be more meaningfully integrated.

vi) Infrastructure and Sector-Wide Challenges: Institutions acknowledged infrastructure shortfalls that impact student experience and academic delivery. While internal measures can address some issues, national-level coordination is needed to resolve systemic funding and policy constraints.

vii) A Call for Bold and Coordinated Reform: The Summit was seen as a unique opportunity for collective action. Panellists called for bold decisions and a shared strategic vision to advance innovation and internationalisation in Mauritius' higher education sector.

2. Institutional Practice – Enhancing Academic Quality and Learner Experience through a New Learning Framework

- Dr. Ancharaz's second question was addressed to Middlesex International (Mauritius) Ltd as follows: *"With your experience in a transnational university, could you share how Middlesex's new learning framework enhances academic quality and learner experience across campuses? What key innovations have you introduced, particularly in programme delivery and assessment?"*

- Middlesex International (Mauritius) Ltd shared its implementation of a learner-centric New Learning Framework, developed in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the rise of Artificial Intelligence, and evolving student expectations. Key innovations include:

i) Trimester System with Multiple Entry Points: Transition from a two-semester to a three-trimester model (September, January, April), enabling continuous campus activity and flexible learner entry. Faculty now teach in two trimesters and use the third for research and innovation.

ii) Curriculum Harmonisation and Industry-Aligned Pathways: A common first-year curriculum fosters interdisciplinarity and informed choices. Electives in later years are aligned with industry needs to enhance employability and sustainable class sizes.

iii) Restructured Modules and Authentic Assessment: Modules are delivered as two 30-credit units per trimester. About 90% of assessments are real-world

and authentic, supported by formative feedback and policies for ethical AI usage.

iv) Timetable Optimisation and Co-Curricular Balance: Students attend on-campus classes three days per week, allowing time for part-time work and independent learning. Around 25% of the curriculum is delivered online through self-directed resources.

This inclusive framework prioritises student flexibility, academic integrity, and institutional resilience.

3. Institutional Practice – Academic Workload

- The moderator continued the exploration of institutional strategies, with focus on University of Mauritius (UoM), which has taken bold steps to reform academic workload policies. The question was framed as follows: *"What steps has the University of Mauritius (UoM) taken to strengthen its academic workload policy, and how has this impacted teaching quality and staff motivation?"*

- Since 2020, UoM has implemented a comprehensive academic workload policy through extensive consultation with staff and unions. Key features include:

i) Standardised Annual Workload: Each academic completes 1,575 hours annually – 60% teaching, 30% research, 10% administrative duties. Leadership roles receive adjusted workloads.

ii) Disciplinary Flexibility: Workload expectations vary across faculties, recognising differences in teaching intensity. Where teaching demands are lower, research expectations increase to balance the workload.

iii) Integrated Remuneration and Monitoring: The policy is linked to promotion and compensation systems. Real-time monitoring enables streamlined excess teaching hour claims.

iv) Academic Planning and Morale: Annual workload plans enhance transparency and enable better planning. Staff feel more supported in fulfilling teaching and research obligations, improving morale and motivation.

v) Foundation and Support Modules: To support underprepared or international students, UoM introduced support modules such as Mathematics for Economics. Eight credit-bearing modules are being institutionalised.

4. Institutional Practice – Quality and Integrity in Online Learning

In response to Professor Mohee's point that "online is completely chaotic," Amity Institute of Higher Education was prompted to answer the following question: "*could you share what institutional frameworks and support systems Amity Mauritius has implemented to ensure the quality, accessibility, and engagement of online teaching and learning? Specifically, how do you assure quality and uphold academic integrity in online proctored examinations?"*

It was explained that Amity Institute of Higher Education has implemented a robust framework for fully online learning, recently accredited by the Education Commission. Drawing on the parent institution in India, the local framework includes:

i) Amigo Learning Management System (LMS): Central platform hosting video lectures, virtual labs, curated e-content, forums, and self-paced modules. Used notably for the Master of Computer Applications programmes.

ii) Structured Programme Design: Online Master of Business Administration and Master of Computer Applications programmes follow five core learning blocks per module, each with specific outcomes and continuous assessments.

iii) AI-Enabled Online Proctoring: Facial and eye-movement detection, ID verification, and automated alerts uphold academic integrity. Escalation to human proctors occurs after repeated movement alerts.

iv) Balanced Assessment Model: Each module includes formative assessments and a final proctored summative exam.

v) AI-Driven Learner Engagement: Automated feedback, learner progress tracking, and personalised content recommendations support retention and success.

Initial enrolment figures following a dedicated online programme marketing campaign are promising.

5. Institutional Practice – Student Placement and Internship Practices

The following question was addressed to Dr Hurreeram: *"What has been your experience with student placement and internships at UTM? In your view, how can placement practices be more effectively standardised across institutions while still retaining each institution's unique strengths?"*

It was explained that University of Technology, Mauritius promotes a strong industry-linked education model:

i) Student Placements: Business students complete four-week placements; engineering students complete 20-week placements. Projects must align with a UN Sustainable Development Goal and are formally assessed. Supervisors receive workload credit.

ii) Entrepreneurship and Innovation: All students undertake a module requiring them to pitch business ideas. The campus incubator supports viable ventures.

iii) Quality with Flexibility: Students with lower academic entry levels are given extended time to complete their degrees. However, academic rigour and graduate outcomes remain intact.

iv) Graduate Attributes: UTM is launching a Graduate Attributes Framework during its Silver Jubilee celebrations.

6. Leadership Vision – Professor Mohee's Imperative to Innovate

Professor Mohee framed the Summit as a national diagnostic moment: "a gap analysis." It was mentioned that innovation is now imperative, urging a move from "publish or perish" to "innovate or perish."

National achievements, including Mauritius' micro-credential framework and AI Guidelines were highlighted. With micro credentials anchored in the 2025 Finance Bill, she called on institutions to embed micro-credentials, reinforce transversal skills, and enhance pathways to employment.

7. Moderator's Closing Challenge – Access vs. Quality

The moderator posed a final, critical question to UoM and UTM: *“As we open access to students with lower grades, how do we ensure programme quality remains intact?”*

This elicited thoughtful responses from the institutional leaders. UoM and UTM responded by reinforcing the role of foundation and support modules. UoM has formalised eight support modules, initially targeting international students. UTM emphasised that while flexible timelines are offered, quality standards, learning outcomes, and graduate attributes are non-negotiable.

From the above, it can be noted that at its core, the HE Summit aimed to catalyse dialogue, identify systemic gaps, and co-develop solutions that would elevate the quality and relevance of higher education in Mauritius. The collective insights shared by institutional leaders and national stakeholders reveal a clear trajectory: Mauritius is poised for a bold transformation in higher education.

A coordinated national approach—anchored in quality standards, balanced workloads, flexible delivery models, and micro-credential integration—will be vital in positioning Mauritius as a credible and competitive global education hub.

The momentum is here. Turning vision into impact now depends on the collective will to lead, collaborate, and deliver on this shared promise for the future

Appendix 3: People's Voice

1. Flexible National Framework with Institutional Autonomy

While a national framework is essential for coherence and quality assurance, it must allow flexibility for HEIs to innovate and adapt their teaching and learning practices, provided they comply with global standards. Programme design should involve collaboration among industries, HEIs, and the Higher Education Commission (HEC), aligned with national research priorities, while implementation remains the responsibility of each institution.

2. Pedagogical Quality Across All Modes of Delivery

Teaching quality should be assessed independently of the delivery mode. Effective pedagogy is not guaranteed by format alone; for example, reading numerous slides in a classroom is not necessarily better than online teaching. Online learning, when properly accredited and delivered, is a valid and effective modality with demonstrated success and international recognition. Stigmatising online learning as chaotic is misleading and undermines valuable practices.

3. Transparency and Quality Enhancement in Assessment

Transparency in assessment is crucial. Sharing clear marking schemes and assessment criteria with students enhances understanding and aligns with sound pedagogical principles. The sector should shift from a compliance-focused 'quality control' approach to a proactive 'quality enhancement' mindset that encourages continuous improvement.

4. Representation and Inclusive Stakeholder Engagement

Key educational stakeholders, such as the Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE), should be included in policy dialogues to ensure comprehensive perspectives, especially regarding teacher training and pedagogy.

5. Student Experience & Responsibility

A national student satisfaction survey conducted regularly across all institutions would provide valuable comparative data to support a national Teaching Excellence Framework and ongoing quality enhancement.

Student responsibility must be emphasised alongside rights, encompassing ethical behaviour, active engagement, community outreach, and emotional development. Communication and interactions between staff and students should be empathetic and considerate to foster a positive learning environment.

6. Academic Staff Roles, Training, and Workload Management

Lecturers require continuous training in teaching methodologies and educational technologies, including learning management systems and AI tools, to deliver effective, modern instruction.

Academic staff should balance teaching with scholarly activities, and empirical research is needed to understand the relationship between teaching load and research output. Exploring research-focused streams with reduced teaching duties may enhance academic contributions and innovation.

Contact hours and workload should be appropriately categorised and calibrated by programme level (diploma through doctoral studies) to reflect varied instructional demands.

7. Accreditation Processes Aligned with International Standards

Accreditation should focus on evaluating institutional processes in programme development, delivery, and staff capacity-building, rather than only assessing individual programmes. Utilising recognised international and domain-specific accreditation bodies (e.g., engineering boards, Association for Computing Machinery for computer science) will support quality assurance, international recognition, and the sector's strategic vision for internationalisation.

8. Innovation and Policy Reform

Innovation is critical to the sector's survival and growth. However, outdated accreditation policies that contradict current laws hinder programme innovation. Policy reforms are necessary to align accreditation requirements with contemporary legal frameworks and sector needs.

9. Sustainable Funding and Sector Unity

To ensure sustainability and value, higher education should be nominally paid for. The sector must move beyond historic public versus private divides and foster a culture of collaboration, sharing best practices, and harmonising efforts to build an inclusive, competitive higher education environment in Mauritius.

Insights gathered from the public have been carefully considered and integrated into the recommendations throughout this report. These contributions reflect the collective expertise and aspirations of the higher education community, reinforcing the need for a student-centred, flexible, and innovative approach to teaching and learning. Recognising and valuing these perspectives strengthens the foundation for meaningful reforms that will drive the sector forward.