

**CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR SELF-ACCREDITING INSTITUTION
AREA 4: CONTINUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY**

STANDARDS FOR AREA 4

4.1 Mechanisms for Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

a. Policy on Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>4.1.1 The HEP must have policy on monitoring, reviewing and evaluation of its programmes, covering the need and/or benchmarking analysis, teaching-learning activities, student assessment, administration and related educational and support services, which must be regularly reviewed and updated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies, criteria, guidelines and standards on Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation; • Systems and procedures for Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation; • Minutes meeting (campuses and senate approval). <p><i>Provide information related to Std 4.1.1 and relevant data above for AL3.</i></p> <p><i>A comprehensive CQI on the programme – Outcomes and Curriculum; Student Assessments; Talent and Educational Resources; Support Services, Program Management & Program Review.</i></p> <p><i>CQI at Program Level results in interventions that leads to improvement of academic programmes Taking on board Future Skillsets and Elements of SDG and 4IR.</i></p> <p><i>Describe benchmarking exercise conducted based on themes – Curriculum, Promotion Criteria, Teaching Facilities etc.</i></p> <p><i>CQI results in recommendation and action taken to meet current and future challenges- APEL, MOOCS, Micro-Credential</i></p> <p><i>Can we claim that Education 5.0 @UiTM resulted from program reviews? Or was it more of our reaction to external factors</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policy on monitoring, reviewing and evaluation of its programmes.
2	The HEP has policy on monitoring, reviewing and evaluation of its programmes, but does not address new requirements.
3	The HEP has policy on monitoring, reviewing and evaluation of its programmes, covering the need and/or benchmarking analysis, teaching-learning activities, student assessment, administration and related educational and support services, which is regularly reviewed and updated.
4	The policy on programme monitoring, reviewing and evaluation has resulted in programme improvement.
5	The policy on programme monitoring, reviewing and evaluation enables the institution to overcome current and future challenges.

b. Processes and Outcomes of Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>4.1.2 The programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises must be headed by designated coordinators and must involve all parties managing the programme, including collaborative partners, if applicable.</p> <p>4.1.3 The review and evaluation processes for programmes must include student progression and performance analysis, covering the passing, attrition and employability rates, and review by the programme external advisors to ascertain attainment of the learning outcomes and must be performed with sufficient impartiality.</p> <p>4.1.4 The results of the programme review and evaluation as well as the recommendations and areas of improvement must be brought to the attention of the highest relevant authorities in the HEP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment letters and terms of reference for coordinators for programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises; • Surveys or studies on need analysis; • Programme benchmarking reports; • Programme performance/ review reports; • Programme assessment/ evaluation reports; • Programme self-review portfolios; • List of programme assessors; • Committee for overseeing programme evaluation exercises; • Minutes of HEP's senate and/or management regarding programme assessment/evaluation. <p><i>Provide information related to Std 4.1.2-4.14 and relevant data above for AL3.</i></p> <p><i>Are recommendations resulting from CQI at programme levels analyzed to identify common issues that need intervention at UiTM level? Were these issues then discussed at JKIKU/Senate and finally brought to LPU if they involve policy changes or addition resources?</i></p> <p><i>How effective is the MKSP mechanism in utilizing the PDCA cycle to improve institutional performance in terms of attainment of Educational Goals?</i></p> <p><i>Has reviews on student progression and performance analysis, covering the passing, attrition and employability rates, and review by the programme external advisors been brought to the attention of the Senate/LPU which resulted in changes of policy or SOP?</i></p> <p><i>Were intervention measures monitored over a period of time? Does the monitoring shows improvement in the attainment of UiTM Educational Goals?</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not appoint any party to coordinate programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises. The programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises are not performed at any level in the HEP.
2	The programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises are headed by designated coordinators but the coordination does not include collaborative partners, if applicable. The programme review and evaluation processes are incomplete or not performed with sufficient independence/impartiality and the results are not managed effectively.
3	The programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises are headed by designated coordinators and involves all parties managing the programme, including collaborative partners, if applicable. The review and evaluation processes for programmes include student progression and performance analysis, covering the passing, attrition and employability rates, and review by the programme external advisors to ascertain attainment of the learning outcomes and are performed with sufficient impartiality. The results of the programme review and evaluation as well as the recommendations and areas of improvement are brought to the attention of the highest relevant authorities.
4	The results of the programme review and evaluation as well as the recommendations and areas of improvement are brought to the highest relevant authorities in the HEP to ensure further appropriate measures being taken to effectively address the gaps.
5	The programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises have resulted in significant improvement and enhancement of students learning experience and the accomplishment of the educational goals.

4.2 Involvement of Stakeholders

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>4.2.1 The programme review and evaluation exercises must involve relevant stakeholders, including alumni, employers and external experts and the feedback must be systematically documented, analysed and considered in the curriculum and the changes be disseminated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Systems, procedures and guidelines for engaging stakeholders, including alumni and employers; • List of programme external advisors; • Alumni and employer surveys; • Minutes of meeting with programme external advisors. • Minutes of meeting of programme review committee related to stakeholders' feedback. • External advisor report. <p><i>Provide information related to Std 4.2.1 and relevant data above for AL3.</i></p> <p><i>Does the Programme Review process involve representation a wider stakeholder (including students)</i></p> <p><i>Are there evidences that over 2-3 cohorts there are significant improvements in the attainment of UiTM Educational Goals?</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The programme review and evaluation exercises do not involve any external stakeholders.
2	The programme review and evaluation exercises do not involve alumni, employers and external experts and the feedback is not systematically documented.
3	The programme review and evaluation exercises involve relevant stakeholders, including alumni, employers and external experts and the feedback is systematically documented, analysed and considered in the curriculum and the changes are disseminated.
4	Students are represented in the programme review and evaluation exercises.
5	The involvement of a wide range of stakeholders in programme review and evaluation exercises has resulted in significant improvement and enhancement of the programmes and the accomplishment of the educational goals.

4.3 Quality Improvement and Enhancement

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>4.3.1 The HEP must establish policies and procedures for regular reviewing and updating of its internal quality assurance system and processes to ensure continual quality improvement.</p> <p>4.3.2 The HEP must have an independent department or unit dedicated to, and responsible for, the internal quality assurance system given a prominent status with the direct line of reporting to the head of the institution or the governing board.</p> <p>4.3.3 The HEP must promote quality culture through participatory and cooperative process across all levels in order to assure quality in education, research, service and management of the institution.</p> <p>4.3.4 The HEP must have mechanisms to implement recommendations for quality improvement and quality enhancement plans, which must be linked with the institutional goals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies, guidelines and procedures for reviewing/updating of internal quality assurance (IQA) system and continual quality improvement (CQI); • Terms of reference for the department/unit for the HEP's IQA system; • HEP's organisation chart showing the position of the IQA department/unit; • Appointment criteria and terms of reference for head of the IQA department/unit; • Quality manuals, documentation and procedures for HEP's internal processes; • Quality plans, including action plans and risk treatment plans for quality improvement/enhancement; • Certificates for quality management systems. • Minutes of HEP's senate and/or management regarding quality plans and CQI of IQA processes; • KPI monitoring system. <p><i>Provide information related to Std 4.3.1- 4.3.4 and relevant data above for AL3.</i></p> <p><i>Describe the IQA eco system at UiTM – faculty level and UiTM level; involvement of internal and external panel of assessors.</i></p> <p><i>Describe the training (internal and external) programs that the IQA staff had undergone to ensure high quality standards are maintain consistently between faculties and campuses.</i></p> <p><i>Describe the processes of gathering and analyzing data; identification of strengths, concerns and weaknesses; recommendations for interventions and approval to implement the intervention measures.</i></p> <p><i>Describe how implementation of the intervention measures improve the institutional Educational Goals.</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policies and procedures for regular reviewing and updating of its internal quality assurance activities.
2	The HEP's policies and procedures for regular reviewing and updating of its internal quality assurance activities is inadequate for continual quality improvement within the institution. The HEP has a non-independent department or unit responsible for the internal quality assurance system, and does not report directly to the head of the institution or the governing board.
3	<p>The HEP establishes policies and procedures for regular reviewing and updating of its internal quality assurance activities to ensure continual quality improvement and has an independent department or unit dedicated to, and responsible for, the internal quality assurance system given a prominent status with the direct line of reporting to the head of the institution or the governing board.</p> <p>The HEP promotes quality culture through participatory and cooperative process across all levels in order to assure quality in education, research, service and management of the institution. The HEP has mechanisms to implement recommendations for quality improvement and quality enhancement plans that are linked with the institutional goals.</p>
4	<p>The HEP regularly reviews and updates its internal quality assurance activities through participatory and cooperative process across all levels to ensure continual quality improvement for all its core processes and to take continuous efforts in keeping abreast with the changes and best practices in quality assurance. The HEP's mechanisms to implement recommendations for quality improvement and quality enhancement plans is dynamically linked to the achievement of the institutional goals and to the accomplishment of the strategic plans.</p>
5	The HEP has systematic and integrated mechanisms to embrace the spirit of continual quality improvement based on prospective studies and analyses that leads to the revisions of its current policies and practices, taking into consideration past experiences, present conditions, and future possibilities.

4.4 Institutional Sustainability

Standards	Impactful Evidences
<p>4.4.1 The HEP's strategic and internal processes, including governance, capacity building, quality assurance activities and risk management, must be institutionalised and supported by the highest authority in the HEP to ensure effective implementation and sustainability.</p> <p>4.4.2 Sufficient resources for establishing and maintaining an effective and sustainable quality culture within the institution must be provided.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies, guidelines and procedures related to institutional autonomy, and sustainability. • Documents related to risk management • Resource allocation plan and fund disbursement for all department/units; • Reports on income/wealth generation; • Minutes of meeting of HEP's senate, management and board of governance on matters to institutional sustainability. <p><i>Provide information related to Std 4.4.1- 4.4.3 and relevant data above for AL3.</i></p> <p><i>Show that UiTM Educational Goals is formally institutionalized as UiTM Strategic Plan which is systematically monitored by the top management.</i></p> <p><i>Show that there is a BOD-standing committee on audit and risk that was instrumental in making decision for UiTM to invest in the UiTM Solar Farm in Gambang – to provide Financial sustainability.</i></p> <p><i>Show that appointment at mid management level and top management level comprise younger talent – talent sustainability.</i></p> <p><i>Show that recruitment strategy resulted in age groups of staff that will keep UiTM sustainable in terms of Academic talent.</i></p> <p><i>Show that most of the active research group consist of good combination of young and experienced researcher – sustainability of research.</i></p> <p><i>If the above had been institutionalized, then UiTM can claim AL4</i></p>

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP's strategic and internal processes, including governance, capacity building and quality assurance activities, are not adequately institutionalised.
2	The HEP's strategic and internal processes, including governance, capacity building and quality assurance activities, are institutionalised without sufficient resources.
3	The HEP's strategic and internal processes, including governance, capacity building, quality assurance activities and risk management, are institutionalised and supported by the highest authority in the HEP to ensure effective implementation and sustainability, with sufficient resources to sustain the quality culture.
4	The HEP has institutionalised the strategic and internal processes, which enable it to explore the boundaries of institutional limitation in sustaining quality in education, research, service and management of the institution.
5	The HEP has institutionalised the strategic and internal processes, which enable it to address the latest global development and future challenges in enhancing its global position and recognition.