

# Review of: "Evaluation of the effectiveness of the collegiate system of administration at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana"

Angelina Kirkova-Bogdanova<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Medical University Plovdiv

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic is interesting and important in the context of "expansion and diversification of the systems of teaching and learning, student heterogeneity, incorporation of new technologies, new forms of governance and financing, and redefinition of the competency of graduates". The rationale behind the implementation of a collegiate system at the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) is well explained, and so is the need for assessing its effectiveness, though fifteen years after its initial implementation.

I would advise the authors to give more explanation and clarity on these issues:

How was the target population selected? What is the share of the 151 participants in the study from all Provosts, Deputy Registrars, Deputy Finance Officers, Deputy Librarians, Deans, and Heads of academic departments in the university? If it is correct (from the results) that only 32 responded, this number gives a too-small relative share.

Why students and graduates were not surveyed as well? As the authors cite "The collegiate structure fosters a deep sense of identity by drawing together leading scholars and students from various disciplines and year groups, as well as from various cultures and nations".

I find the methodology section a little bit insufficient. Please explain the choice of statistical methods and statistical software used.

The questionnaire is not evident. Please give the questions asked as well as the scales for gathering the responses.

The questionnaire validation procedure is not explained. How did you manage to validate it with five respondents?

Gender and educational qualification are presented - if these are factor variables, how do they influence opinions and attitudes?

Results on the six points of "Effectiveness of the collegiate system of administration" were not presented, except for Figure 3. There are just a few lines of discussion. This is quite scarce, having in mind that it is the core of the study.

I congratulate the authors for their efforts and I am convinced that their paper will be well received after corrections.