

**CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR SELF-ACCREDITING INSTITUTION
AREA 2: ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT**

STANDARDS FOR AREA 2

2.1 Formulation of Learning Outcomes

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>2.1.1 The HEP must conduct needs analysis which considers market and societal demand through engagement with stakeholders.</p> <p>2.1.2 The HEP must align the learning outcomes of its programmes and courses with the Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any reports that document the findings of the market survey/needs analysis; • Sample of a programme from various faculty/schools to show the alignment of the respective PLOs against MQF. • Programme benchmarking analysis. <p><i>(Engagement with a wider range of stakeholders in addition to Market survey; Talent Corp; Job Street; Ilmia; Meeting of JKIKU & LPU)</i></p> <p><i>Sample of “Kertas Cadangan Program Baharu” presented and approved at JKIKU/ SENAT/ LPU.</i></p> <p><i>Standard evaluation procedure for checking compliance of PEO & PLO to MQF.2.0. and Other selected set of Future Skillsets, e.g. WEF – UHEK</i></p> <p><i>Is CQI on PEO and PLO analysed to show achievements of PEO?</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The learning outcomes are not aligned with the MQF and a needs analysis was not conducted through engagement with stakeholders.
2	The learning outcomes of the programmes are aligned with the MQF but the needs analysis was not conducted, and vice versa.
3	The learning outcomes are aligned with the MQF and a needs analysis was conducted through engagement with stakeholders.
4	Feedback are gathered from a wider range of stakeholders and used as an input in ensuring the currency and relevancy of the learning outcomes.
5	The formulated learning outcomes ensure the achievement of the programme educational objectives.

2.2 Curriculum Design, Delivery and Assessment

a. Curriculum structure and content

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>2.2.1 The HEP must have policy on curriculum design and delivery which must be regularly reviewed and improved.</p> <p>2.2.2 The curriculum structure and content must address topics of national and international importance, taking into account the institutional goals, MQF qualification descriptors, appropriate programme standards, professional and industry requirements as well as good practices in the field.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on curriculum design and delivery; • Minutes of meetings and the composition of the committee involved in the review process; • A sample of programme from the various faculty/school outlining its curriculum structure and content; • Course file; • Teaching portfolio. <p><i>(Governance & Policies on Acad. Prog. Development – Garispanduan Pembangunan Kurikulum – any revision?)</i></p> <p><i>Select samples of syllabus (from Year 2&3 for Diploma; from year 3&4 for Degree) that practices various delivery methods including those using disruptive technologies with contents addressing SDG & 4IR.</i></p> <p><i>Evidence on Future Skillsets- see comment in Std 2.1.2.</i></p> <p><i>Can UiTM introduce a policy that all documents must be updated and reviewed every 3 years?</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policy on curriculum design and delivery which is not reviewed and improved.
2	The HEP reviews the policy on curriculum design and delivery but does not address the new practices.
3	The HEP has policy on curriculum design and delivery which is regularly reviewed and improved. The curriculum structure and content address topics of national and international importance, taking into account the institutional goals, MQF qualification descriptors, appropriate programme standards, professional and industry requirements as well as good practices in the field.
4	The curriculum design and delivery promote a variety of delivery mode that incorporates the latest pedagogical advancement and teaching and learning technologies.
5	The HEP regularly monitors and reviews its policy on curriculum design and delivery that incorporates the development of current and future skill sets.

b. Instructional Method

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>2.2.3 The HEP must use appropriate instructional methods in a conducive learning environment to improve student learning experience.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A document highlighting the various instructional methods adopted for one sample of programme from the various faculty/school. • Course file; • Teaching portfolio. <p><i>Highlight smart classrooms and Big Data Lab for AL4.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight Week Without Wall for non-face to face guided learning – ubiquitous learning environment.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight Wisdom Wednesday on enhancing skillsets and promoting a more flexible and liberal curriculum.</i></p> <p><i>Can we have digital collaboration on assignment (for Programmes conducted in 3-4 campuses) involving students from different campus?</i></p> <p><i>Check with HEA and Secretariat Kenaikan Pangkat OR Kesepakatan Gugusan – those promoted based on T&L track has provided evidence of innovative teaching. Showcase some of these and emphasize that UiTM not only encourage innovation but reward staff through promotion (AL5).</i></p> <p><i>Have we conducted survey on student learning experience? Can we design a new instrument to capture student learning experience?</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not use appropriate instructional methods.
2	The HEP uses limited instructional methods in a conducive learning environment to improve student learning experience.
3	The HEP uses appropriate instructional methods in a conducive learning environment to improve student learning experience.
4	The HEP uses innovative instructional methods in a conducive learning environment to improve student learning experience in attaining the learning outcomes.
5	The HEP effectively uses state-of-the-art instructional methods in a conducive learning environment to improve student learning experience in attaining the learning outcomes.

c. Assessment

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>2.2.4 The HEP must have clear policies and procedures regarding management and security of assessment related documents from the preparatory stage to the award of qualification results, including appeal process which must be regularly reviewed and improved.</p> <p>2.2.5 The HEP must provide sufficient autonomy to the relevant departments to develop and review assessment criteria and methods, comprising formative and summative components.</p> <p>2.2.6 The methods of student assessment, policy on plagiarism, grading criteria and results must be documented, communicated to students at appropriate schedules.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy on management and security of assessment documents; • Appeal policy for assessment; • Any policy/procedure that would highlight the autonomy granted to the relevant department in developing and reviewing the assessment criteria and methods; • Procedures for the management of student assessment and its records. <p><i>Highlight that Bah. Peperiksaan has ISO Certification.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight that UiTM policy on assessment is generic and not prescriptive. Academic staff has freedom in designing the curriculum/syllabi including the assessment at course levels.</i></p> <p><i>If there are evidences that no. of final exam is reduced, then we can claim that less assessment is based on examination.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight the seriousness in implementing the plagiarism policy with action taken on the perpetrators.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight CQI at course levels showcasing improvements in learning environment, learning experience and learning outcomes.</i></p> <p><i>Is there a regular and structured review mechanism on assessment methods/tools in UiTM.</i></p> <p><i>We should be able to get AL4.</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policies and procedures regarding management and security of assessment related documents.
2	The HEP reviews policies and procedures regarding management and security of assessment related documents but does not address new requirements.
3	The HEP has clear policies and procedures regarding management and security of assessment related documents from the preparatory stage to the award of qualification results, including appeal process which are regularly reviewed and improved. The HEP provides sufficient autonomy to the relevant departments to develop and review assessment criteria and methods, comprising formative and summative components. The methods of student assessment, policy on plagiarism, grading criteria and results are documented, communicated to students at appropriate schedules.
4	The assessment system and methods are systematically documented, analysed and feedback communicated for improvements of student learning and course delivery.
5	The review of the assessment system and methods incorporates current global developments and best practices in the discipline that leads to enhancement of student learning and course delivery.

d. Constructive Alignment

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>2.2.7 The curriculum structure, content, delivery and assessment must be aligned to the learning outcomes and reviewed periodically to ensure effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of meetings to show the periodic review and deliberations of the curriculum structure, content, delivery and assessment; • The Terms of Reference and the composition of the Programme Review Committee; • Analysis of the results of the assessment against the prescribed CLOs of one sample of the course from the various faculty/school. <p>CQI at program level must show that interventions are carried out and monitored regularly leading to better attainment of PLOs.</p> <p>Show that Topics are aligned to LO and respective C-,P- and A-domains in the Lesson Plans that create good learning environment and learning experience.</p> <p>Show that CAP with assessment tools aligned to LO with the correct C-,P- and A-domains.</p> <p>Show that EST/JSU enforced the alignment between topics, CLO and PLO at the appropriate difficulty levels.</p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The curriculum structure, content, delivery and assessment are not aligned to the learning outcomes.
2	The curriculum structure, content, delivery and assessment are aligned to the learning outcomes but not reviewed periodically to ensure effectiveness.
3	The curriculum structure, content, delivery and assessment are aligned to the learning outcomes and reviewed periodically to ensure effectiveness.
4	The constructive alignment managed to create a contextually relevant and responsive teaching and learning environment.
5	The constructive alignment managed to improve student learning experience.

2.3 Admission and Mobility

a. Student Selection and Admission

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>2.3.1 The HEP must have published policy, criteria, and processes of student selection, admission and appeal, including transfer and exchange students as well as those with special needs which are regularly reviewed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission policy; • Appeal policy for student admission; • Credit Transfer Policy; • Student Exchange Policy; • Minutes of meeting and the committee task to oversee the review of these policies. <p><i>Highlight MDAB and KACA program to address students with special needs.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight support system put in place by OIA to assist students under mobility programs.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight MOAs with partner universities on support provided to participants of mobility programs.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight financial support (zakat, welfare etc) for B40 students.</i></p> <p><i>Highlight the low fees or heavy subsidies provided. By UiTM in discharging our social responsibility.</i></p> <p><i>Show that ALL of the above, resulted from carefully formulated policies that are regularly reviewed.</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have clear policy, criteria, and processes of student selection, admission and appeal.
2	The HEP has published policy, criteria, and processes of student selection, admission and appeal including transfer and exchange students as well as those with special needs which are not regularly reviewed.
3	The HEP has published policy, criteria, and processes of student selection, admission and appeal including transfer and exchange students as well as those with special needs which are regularly reviewed.
4	The HEP provides appropriate developmental or remedial support to suit the student learning capabilities based on the review of the policy, criteria, and processes of student selection and admission.
5	The policy, criteria, and processes of student selection and admission provide greater accessibility and equity for successful completion of studies.

b. Mobility, Articulation and Credit Transfer

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>2.3.2 The HEP must regularly review and publish policies, regulations and processes covering student mobility, articulation, credit transfer and programme transfer within or across institutions recognising formal, informal and non-formal learning.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of meetings to show the deliberation of the matters indicated for this item; • Committee tasked to oversee this review and its Terms of Reference. <p><i>Ensure that related policies are available with records on when they were introduced and reviewed.</i></p> <p><i>If numbers are good, we can claim that students progressed from Diploma to Bachelor to Masters to doctoral Degree.</i></p> <p><i>If numbers are good we can claim we provide opportunities for LLL through InED.</i></p> <p><i>We should ensure AL3 on this Std.</i></p> <p><i>There may be some concerns as UiTM does not encourage program transfer or campus transfer within the system.</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policies, regulations and processes covering student mobility, articulation, credit transfer and programme transfer within or across institutions.
2	The HEP has adequate policies, regulations and processes covering student mobility, articulation, credit transfer and programme transfer within or across institutions but not regularly reviewed.
3	The HEP regularly reviews and publishes policies, regulations and processes covering student mobility, articulation, credit transfer and programme transfer within or across institutions recognising formal, informal and non-formal learning.
4	The policies, regulations and processes covering student mobility, articulation, credit transfer and programme transfer promote greater mobility and recognition.
5	The policies, regulations and processes covering student mobility, articulation, credit transfer and programme transfer provide greater flexibility as well as promote lifelong learning.