

CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR SELF-ACCREDITING INSTITUTION
AREA 1: INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE
STANDARDS FOR AREA 1

1.1 Review of Vision, Mission and Educational Goals

Standards	Impactful Evidences
1.1.1 The HEP must review or revisit its vision, mission and educational goals, in line with national and global developments.	Vision and Mission of UiTM is periodically reviewed. What about the Educational Goals, are these being reviewed as well?
1.1.2 The new/existing vision, mission and educational goals must be approved by a governing board or other appropriate body to be relevant and current.	Is there a record of past reviews? To prove that there is a quality culture in UiTM that “constantly” perform reviews to stay current and relevant.
1.1.3 The HEP must disseminate the vision, mission and educational goals to its internal and external stakeholders.	<p>What is the Rationale for the current change? Changes in <u>National</u> (MEB (2015-2025), MQF2.0, COPPA2.0 / <u>Global landscapes</u> (SDG, 4IR). <i>[Reports to MEU/LPU highlighting UiTM responses to these changes]</i></p> <p>Is there an established processes? Initiator (who? & why?); <u>a wider stakeholder engagement</u>; approval process (MEU/LPU). <i>[Process of developing VMG; SOP or ISO Procedure or Policy/guideline and Minutes of MEU/LPU meetings]</i></p> <p>Is there a Communication Plan in place to inform stakeholders of strategic changes at UiTM? <i>[SOP/Guideline on Communication Plan]</i></p> <p>Can samples of material used in the Communication Plans be provided?</p> <p>Is there an <u>evaluation on the effectiveness</u> (internalization) of the Communication Plan? <i>[Analysis/Report]</i></p>

**Documents to be prepared by HEP may include but not limited to the list of examples provided.*

Note: The scoring of the attainment level is based on a cumulative or incremental approach. For example, attainment level 5 will only be considered after fulfilment of attainment level 4. Fulfilment of attainment level 3 indicates conformity to the stated standards.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not review or revisit its vision, mission and educational goals and has no plan in place to review or revisit them.
2	The HEP is reviewing or revisiting its vision, mission and educational goals.
3	The HEP has reviewed or revisited its vision, mission and educational goals, in line with national and global developments, which were approved by a governing board or other appropriate body to be relevant and current and disseminated to its internal and external stakeholders.
4	The approved and disseminated vision, mission and educational goals have been formulated in consultation with <u>a wider range of stakeholders</u> that may include the community, civil society, international peers, alumni, industry, professional bodies, funding agencies, and the government, <u>in line with national and global developments</u> . There is <u>internalisation of vision and mission</u> among the HEP community.
5	The approved and disseminated vision, mission and educational goals have <u>reflected the institutional responsiveness to current change and future development</u> of higher education landscape.

1.2 Formulation and Deployment of Strategic Plans

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>1.2.1 The vision, mission and institutional goals, including the educational goals, must be translated into the HEP's strategic plans, in consultation with the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>1.2.2 The strategic plans must be disseminated and deployed to designated parties for implementation.</p> <p>1.2.3 The implementation of the strategic plans, including the associated action plans, must be monitored and reviewed in accordance to the institutional goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report or minute of meetings, workshop or forum conducted to review the statements of purpose (vision, mission and institutional/ educational goals), the strategic plan and/or key performance indicators (KPI); • Booklets or brochure for dissemination of the strategic plans and KPIs; • Associated action and implementation plans for deployment of the strategic plans and KPIs; • KPI monitoring system; • Website/Internet portals containing information on the strategic plans. <p>Has UiTM engaged a wider range of stakeholder in reviewing the Vision and Mission? – Industry; Successful Alumni; Experts in Affirmative Action & Shared Prosperity <i>[Through Forums and Discourses]</i></p> <p>How did UiTM translate the Educational Goals into Action Plans into the UiTM 5-year plans?</p> <p>UiTM has developed a system to monitor the implementation of strategic initiatives and KPI – <i>can this be highlighted, showing how issues/problems are identified and resolved?</i></p> <p>Communication Plans – see Standard 1.1 Two component – Job/Responsibility assignments & dissemination of info.</p> <p>Do we have evidence of past reviews that can correlate with UiTM's achievements over the last 20 years- AKPM; AAN; Entrepreneurial University Award; Improvements in Ranking, etc.</p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The vision, mission and institutional goals, including the educational goals, are not translated into strategic plans.
2	The vision, mission and institutional goals, including the educational goals, are translated into the HEP's strategic plans, in consultation with only the internal stakeholders, i.e., the HEP's staff. However, the strategic plans are not widely disseminated and not properly deployed to relevant parties for implementation, not monitored and reviewed.
3	The vision, mission and institutional goals, including the educational goals, are translated into the HEP's strategic plans, in consultation with the relevant stakeholders, which are then disseminated and deployed to designated parties for implementation. The implementation of the strategic plans, including the associated action plans, is monitored and reviewed in accordance to the institutional goals.
4	The vision, mission and institutional goals, including the <u>educational goals, are translated into the HEP's strategic plans,</u> in consultation with <u>a wider range of stakeholders,</u> representing national and international community, which are then <u>effectively implemented, monitored and reviewed</u> by designated parties.
5	The HEP has improved or enhanced its reputation and branding as a result of the implementation of the strategic plans.

1.3 Institutional and Academic Leadership

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>1.3.1 The selection criteria, including job description, qualifications and experience, and mechanisms for selection of institutional leaders and academic leaders at the department and programme levels must be established, documented and disseminated.</p> <p>1.3.2 The selection process for the appointment of institutional and academic leaders must ensure that the right candidate with appropriate qualifications and experience is appointed for a particular position.</p> <p>1.3.3 The HEP must plan and develop leadership training and development programmes to continuously improve and enhance capabilities of current and future/potential institutional and academic leaders.</p> <p>1.3.4 The institutional and academic leaders must be evaluated at defined intervals for their performance as stipulated by the job description and in relation to the achievement of the mission and institutional goals of the HEP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job description and appointment criteria for institutional and academic positions <i>[HR]</i>; • Any advertisement for institutional and academic positions <i>[HR]</i>; • Systems, procedures and guidelines for appointing institutional and academic leaders <i>[HR & ILD]</i>; • Succession plan for institutional and academic leaders <i>[ILD]</i>; • Professional development and leadership training programmes for institutional and academic leaders <i>[ILD]</i>; • Performance appraisal system for institutional and academic leaders <i>[HR & ILD]</i>; • Teaching permit for both full-time and part-time teaching personnel <i>[not applicable to Public HEPs]</i>. <p>InQKA should request ILD and HR to provide the narrative on how UiTM fulfills this standard.</p> <p>This is an area of concern for UiTM – should target for Attainment Level 3.</p> <p>We cannot claim 4 and 5 if 3 is not fully satisfied. It does not reflect systematic approach and quality culture if HEPs has pockets of 3,4 and 5.</p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP has not established selection criteria or mechanisms for selection of institutional and academic leaders.
2	The selection criteria, including job description, qualifications and experience, and mechanisms for selection of institutional leaders and academic leaders at the department and programme levels are partially established and documented. However, the HEP has no or incomplete plan and leadership training and development programmes for its institutional and academic leaders. Performance of the leaders is not evaluated based on their job description or in relation to the achievement of the mission and institutional goals of the HEP.
3	The selection criteria, including job description, qualifications and experience, and mechanisms for selection of institutional leaders and academic leaders at the department and programme levels are established, documented and disseminated. This selection process ensures a right candidate with appropriate qualifications and experience be appointed for a particular position, taking into consideration the candidate's knowledge and skills that is in line with the job description. The HEP has planned and developed leadership training and development programmes to continuously improve and enhance capabilities of current and future/potential institutional and academic leaders. Performance of the leaders is evaluated at defined intervals as stipulated by the job description and in relation to the achievement of the mission and institutional goals of the HEP.
4	The HEP has developed and implemented talent management plan and succession plan for its institutional and academic leaders, as well as specific KPIs for performance evaluation of the leaders in relation to the achievement of the mission and institutional goals of the HEP.
5	The institutional and academic leaders are evaluated based on their impactful contribution in promoting and creating a conducive environment as well as generating culture of innovation within the HEP.

1.4 Governance Function and Mechanism

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>1.4.1 The HEP must clarify and publish its governance structures and functions with complementary relationships between the governing board and the senate as active policy-making bodies.</p> <p>1.4.2 The governing board and senate must operate based on principles of non-conflict, transparency, accountability and authority with adequate degree of autonomy.</p> <p>1.4.3 Mechanisms to ensure functional integration and comparability of educational quality must be established in HEPs which have geographically separated campuses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Playbook; • Organization Chart; • Governance Chart; • Policy on Limits of Authority; • On-line systems for approval and monitoring; • Integrity Pact for meetings; • Minutes of Board Meeting; • Minutes of Senate Meeting; • Minutes of Coordination Meeting between Campuses; • Minutes of Management Review Meeting. <p>UiTM has developed own Green Playbook on Governance.</p> <p>Has UiTM conducted a survey on understanding of deans, rectors, directors and their respective deputies on governance and organizational structure. Having found shortcomings, has UiTM developed series of training programs to address the gaps.</p> <p>The use of integrity pact is evidence that UiTM complies to Std. 1.4.2</p> <p>Mechanisms and Processes to ensure this – series of meetings such as META etc can be highlighted in addition to effort by InQKA performing periodic audits.</p> <p>If UiTM can show that the processes and mechanism is consistently performed, we can claim AL4.</p> <p>If there are evidences of regular review of mechanisms and processes (not necessarily result in changes) in responding to latest development in HE landscape, we can claim AL5.</p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have a clear governance structure.
2	The HEP has a governance structure which does not adequately address autonomy, transparency, accountability, authority and principles of non-conflict.
3	The HEP has a published governance structure with complementary relationships between the governing board and the senate with regards to functions, including mechanisms to ensure integration and comparability of educational quality at geographically separated campuses. The governing board and senate operate based on transparency, accountability, authority and principles of non-conflict with adequate degree of autonomy.
4	The HEP has effective and well communicated governance structure, functions and mechanisms.
5	The HEP regularly improves its governance structure, functions and mechanisms to ensure effectiveness, transparency and responsiveness to the latest development and challenges.

1.5 Information Management

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>1.5.1 The HEP must have information management policies concerning the accessibility, privacy, confidentiality and security on student and academic staff records pertaining to human resource, finance and academic activities.</p> <p>1.5.2 The HEP must regularly review information management policies to ensure it is up to date.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on Information Management and Data Protection; • Standard Operating Procedures pertaining to access, privacy & confidentiality; and security of Institution information system; • Policy and infrastructure for risk and disaster management for ICT systems; • Minutes of Management Review Meeting. <p>UiTM should be able satisfy Stds 1.5.1 and 1.5.2.</p> <p>UiTM has developed a Risk Register and institute a Risk Committee at Strategic and Executive Levels – we should qualify for AL4</p> <p>Check with ILD whether we have a systematic set of training programs to qualify for AL5, if not we should start working on these programs and evaluate whether they result in a culture of innovation and creativity.</p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have comprehensive information management policies concerning accessibility, privacy, confidentiality and security.
2	The HEP has not adequately reviewed and updated information management policies.
3	The HEP has regularly reviewed and updated information management policies concerning the accessibility, privacy, confidentiality and security on student and academic staff records pertaining to human resource, finance and academic activities.
4	The HEP continuously monitors and regularly reviews its data integrity and security of system.
5	The HEP has established risk and disaster information management system and provides its data recovery facilities.
5	The HEP regularly improves and updates their training and academic staff development programmes to inculcate the culture of innovation and creativity among academic staff to meet latest development and future challenges.