



Agensi Kelayakan Malaysia
Malaysian Qualifications Agency

Guide on Compliance Evaluation for Self- Accreditation Universities

2020

Guide on Compliance Evaluation for Self-Accreditation Universities

© 2020 Agensi Kelayakan Malaysia (Malaysian Qualifications Agency, MQA)

Mercu MQA

No. 3539, Jalan Teknokrat 7

Cyber 5

63000, Cyberjaya

Selangor Darul Ehsan

Malaysia

Tel.: +603 8688 1900

Fax: +603 8688 1911

Portal: www.mqa.gov.my

Contents

Foreword	i
Glossary	ii
Abbreviations	ix
Section 1: Introduction	1
Section 2: Guide on Compliance Evaluation for Self-Accreditation Universities	3
Area 1: Institutional Leadership and Governance	3
1.1 Review of Vision, Mission and Educational Goals	3
1.2 Formulation and Deployment of Strategic Plans	3
1.3 Institutional and Academic Leadership	3
1.4 Governance Function and Mechanism	4
1.5 Information Management	4
Area 2: Academic Development and Management	5
2.1 Formulation of Learning Outcomes	5
2.2 Curriculum Design, Delivery and Assessment	5
2.3 Admission and Mobility	6
Area 3: Talent and Resources	7
3.1 Academic Staff	7
3.2 Non-academic Staff	8
3.3 Physical and Technological Resources	8
3.4 Student Support Services	8
3.5 Financial Resources	9
Area 4: Continual Quality Improvement and Sustainability	9
4.1 Mechanisms for Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation	9
4.2 Involvement of Stakeholders	10
4.3 Quality Improvement and Enhancement	10
4.4 Institutional Sustainability	10
Section 3: Submission for Compliance Evaluation of Self-Accreditation Universities	12
The Required Documentation	12
Part A: General Information on the Higher Education Provider	13
Part B: Information on Quality Assurance Activities	18
Part C: Criteria and Standards Compliance Evaluation for Self-Accrediting Institution	20
Appendix 1 : Committee Representation	50

FOREWORD

The responsibility of ensuring quality of academic programmes in Malaysia is collectively shouldered by the Higher Education Providers (HEPs) and the legislatively mandated regulator, the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA). The HEP ensures quality by establishing an entity within the institution as part of the External Quality Assurance process.

The provision of awarding self-accrediting status to HEP is stated in MQA Act (2007). In 2010, upon a comprehensive institutional audit exercise, eight HEPs, namely, Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM), Universiti Malaya (UM), Universiti Putra Malaysia (UPM), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM), Swinburne University of Technology Sarawak Campus, Curtin University Malaysia, Monash University Malaysia and University of Nottingham Malaysia (UNM) were granted the self-accrediting status. Later in 2013, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) joined the rank. In addition to the nine HEPs, another extensive institutional audit exercise resulted in ten HEPs being granted the self-accrediting status in 2017, i.e., Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM), Universiti Utara Malaysia (UUM), Universiti Islam Antarabangsa Malaysia (UIAM), Universiti Multimedia (MMU), Universiti Teknologi Petronas (UTP), International Medical University (IMU), Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman (UTAR), Universiti Tenaga Nasional (UNITEN), Universiti Kuala Lumpur – Kampus Kota (UniKL – Kampus Kota) and Universiti Kuala Lumpur – Malaysia France Institute (UniKI – MFI).

The award of this status, is an acknowledgement that the HEPs have strong internal quality assurance departments which constantly review their processes and practices leading to continual quality improvements, at both programme and institutional levels. In the spirit of empowering HEPs to continuously strive for excellence, an instrument to evaluate the achievement and performance of self-accrediting HEPs was developed.

The standards developed in this guideline were designed to empower HEP to continually improve through a quality culture that enhances academic excellence and organisational excellence. Furthermore, the standards and their attainment levels were developed with the intention of transforming these HEPs into exemplary institutions that serve as benchmark for other local and foreign institutions. The use of this Guide on Compliance Evaluation for Self-Accreditation Universities during maintenance audits of self-accrediting HEPs will ensure the realization of the vision of making Malaysia a hub of education excellence.

On behalf of the MQA, I wish to extend our sincere appreciation and gratitude to all those who have contributed towards the preparation of this Guidelines. It is our hope that this Guidelines will serve the purpose of our common endeavour to achieve higher education of the highest quality.

Thank you.

PROF. DATO' DR. HUSAINI BIN OMAR
Chief Executive Officer
Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA)
September 2020

GLOSSARY

NO.	TERMS	DESCRIPTION
1.	Academic activities	Activities involving academic affairs including teaching and learning activities, student supervision and advisory, assessments and examinations, research activities and community service.
2.	Academic leaders	Staff responsible for academic programmes and management of an academic department. Academic staff holding management positions at Faculty or Institutional levels, e.g., Deans, Deputy Vice Chancellors etc.
3.	Academic staff	Personnel engaged by Higher Education Providers who are involved in teaching, training and supervision.
4.	Action plan	A specific implementation program consisting of strategic activities associated with KPIs and datelines that are linked to the institutional strategic plan, which is regularly monitored and reviewed.
5.	Administrative and management staff	Non-academic personnel engaged by Higher Education Providers including technical staff, registrar and bursar.
6.	Articulation	A process whereby a student or a group of students progresses from one qualification to the study of a higher level qualification. Usually, this process involves credit transfer from the initial study to the new, higher level qualification.
7.	Autonomy	The ability and authority to make decisions that are in line with the institutional goals at the decision maker's level, e.g., Deans at the faculty level and Deputy Vice Chancellors at the institutional level.
8.	Benchmarking	A tool to identify good practices and opportunities for improvement through comparison of performance and practices with those of purposefully selected HEPs.
9.	Constructive alignment	An approach to curriculum design in which the teaching and learning activities are designed to maximise learning by requiring students to engage and activate the verbs specified in the learning outcomes and for them to activate the same verb in the assessment tasks. The term construct refers to students constructing and structuring their own understanding and personally make meaning to what is to be learned. Alignment refers to a learning environment setup by the teacher that allow students to meaningfully engage with the action verb of the learning outcomes and engaging the same action verb again in the assessment task in order to solicit how well the outcomes are learned.
10.	Continual quality improvement (CQI)	A cyclical and continual process to bring about the enhancement of quality.

NO.	TERMS	DESCRIPTION
11.	Course file	A document that has information about the course specification and course content to help teachers understand the given course details. The course file may comprise lesson plan, appointments, timetable, course learning outcomes, relation of course learning outcomes to programme learning outcomes and the MQF domains of learning outcomes, instructional methods and materials, assessment methods, assignments, marking schemes, assessment rubrics and attendances.
12.	Course learning outcomes (CLO)	Intended or desired learning gains in terms of declarative knowledge (factual, conceptual, procedural), functional knowledge (knowledge transfer), metacognitive knowledge, cognitive skills, practical skills, habits of mind, performance and ways to respond to events and people as a result of the learning experiences in the course/module. It contains the measurable action verbs, the substance/content to be learned and the targeted competency level.
13.	Credit	A quantitative measurement that represents the learning volume or the academic load to achieve the respective learning outcomes.
14.	Credit transfer	<p>A process of transferring credits for a course that has been taken in a programme to a new programme. This process allows credit for these courses to be counted as part of the graduating credit of the new programme. Credit transfer can occur in two forms, i.e.</p> <p>i. Credit Transfer with Grade Applicable on the basis of horizontal credit transfer for students within the system (current students) – the credits earned will contribute to the graduating credits and the grades earned can be considered in the GPA and CGPA. Example: mobility programme or student pursuing a diploma programme and transfer to another diploma programme.</p> <p>ii. Credit Transfer without Grade Applicable mainly for vertical credit transfer for students outside the system (graduates) or students who have attained desired competency level for the course – the credits earned will contribute to the graduating credits but the grades earned will not be considered in the GPA and CGPA. Example: credit transfer from certificate to diploma, diploma to bachelor's degree, diploma to diploma, bachelor's degree to bachelor's degree, and APEL (C).</p>

NO.	TERMS	DESCRIPTION
15.	Curriculum	Structured sequence of lessons and academic content delivered in a specific programme giving learning experiences that are aligned to the programme outcomes.
16.	Educational goals	Statements defining generic graduate attributes of an institution. These statements shall form the basis of academic strategic plan of the institution in addition to other institutional goals.
17.	Educational resources	Resources that support teaching and learning activities. These resources include physical facilities, equipment, finance, expertise, library equipment, information and communication technology (ICT) facilities, research and development (R&D) facilities.
18.	External expert	An acknowledged expert in the relevant field of study external to the Higher Education Providers, tasked to assist in reviewing the programme (advisor) or to evaluate the programme's assessment system and the candidates (examiner).
19.	External stakeholders	Parties external to the Higher Education Providers who have interest in the programme. Examples are alumni, industries, parents, collaborators, fund providers and professional associations.
20.	Formal learning	A learning/programme of study delivered within an organised and structured context (preschool, primary school, secondary school, college and university) that may lead to formal recognition or a recognised qualification.
21.	Formative assessment	The assessment of student's progress throughout a course, in which the feedback from the learning activities are used to improve student attainment.
22.	Governance	Describes the organisational structure used to ensure that its constituent parts follow established policies, processes and procedures.
23.	Governing board	A policy making body established by Law or Statute or Regulations from MOHE that oversees the operations of an HEP.
24.	Head of the institution	The highest commanding officer in the institution with executive jurisdiction. He/she may be referred to as chief executive officer, vice chancellor, presidents, rector, etc.
25.	Higher education provider	A body, corporate, organisation or other body of persons which conducts higher education or training programmes leading to the award of a higher education qualification.
26.	Informal learning	Learning which takes place continuously through life and work experiences. It is often unintentional learning.
27.	Institutional goals	Statements defining the institutions upon which the strategic plans are developed and implemented.

NO.	TERMS	DESCRIPTION
		Statements may include the focus of the institution, e.g., research, comprehensive or technical universities and their role in community and nation building.
28.	Institutional leaders	Persons appointed to carry out the executive powers within the HEP.
29.	Instructional methods	An educational approach for turning knowledge into learning. Instructional methods are the “how to” in the delivery of training. The methods used in any learning situation are primarily dictated by the learning objectives decided upon by the course developers. In many cases a combination of methods is used to intensify the learning experiences.
30.	Internal and external feedback	See stakeholders’ feedback.
31.	Internal quality assurance (IQA)	A planned and systematic internal monitoring and self-review process of an institution or programme to determine that acceptable standards of education, scholarship, research, facilities and infrastructure as well as student’s total learning experience are being maintained and enhanced.
32.	Internal stakeholders	Internal parties who have direct interest in the programme. Examples are HEP management, supervisors and candidates.
33.	Learning outcomes	<p>Learning outcomes are statements on what learner should know, understand and can do or be demonstrated by the learner upon the completion of a period of study.</p> <p>Suggestion from programme standards: Learning outcomes are detailed statements describing in explicit terms the achievement of candidates and that they are to be assessed upon completion of a period of study.</p>
34.	Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF)	An instrument that classifies qualifications based on a set of criteria that are approved nationally and benchmarked against international best practices.
35.	Mission	A statement that defines the institution’s activities/business, its objectives and its approach to reach those objectives.
36.	Needs analysis	An analysis carried out to identify needs. (e.g., the training needs of staff and the market demand of a programme).
37.	Non-academic staff	See also administrative and management staff.
38.	Non-formal learning	Learning that takes place alongside the mainstream systems of education and training. It may be assessed but does not normally lead to formal certification.
39.	Physical and technological resources	Buildings, infrastructure and infostructure, facilities, equipment and information technology and system that

NO.	TERMS	DESCRIPTION
		support teaching and learning activities.
40.	Policy	A deliberate system of principles to guide decisions and achieve rational outcomes. A policy is a statement of intent, and is implemented as a procedure or protocol.
41.	Professional bodies	A body established under a written law (or any other body recognised by the Government) for purposes of regulating a profession and its qualifications.
42.	Professional programmes	Programmes that are governed by professional bodies established under the specific Parliament Acts, e.g., Board of Engineers, Nursing Board, Malaysian Medical Council, etc.
43.	Programme	An arrangement of courses/ subjects/modules that is structured for a specified duration and learning volume to achieve the stated learning outcomes, which usually leads to an award of a qualification.
44.	Programme educational objectives (PEO)	Broad statements that describe the career and professional accomplishments that the programme is preparing graduates to achieve after they graduated.
45.	Programme evaluation	The process whereby a qualification or accreditation unit collects data, information and evidence about a programme within an institution, in order to make a statement on the quality of programme learning outcomes attainment. Programme evaluation is normally carried out by a team of internal/external experts, peers or evaluators, and usually requires three distinct operations, i.e., analysis of the self-review portfolio/report; a site visit; and the drafting of an evaluation report.
46.	Programme learning outcomes (PLO)	Statements that describe the specific and general knowledge, skills, attitude and abilities that the programme graduates should demonstrate upon graduation. The graduates are expected to acquire the outcomes upon completion of all the courses in their programme.
47.	Programme monitoring	A regular and systematic process of collection and analysis of information to track the quality of the programme against set plans, and to identify areas of risk as they arise. Monitoring allows adaptation of the programme as needed to ensure that set programme objectives are achieved.
48.	Programme review	A two-phased process, where: (1) the programme team provides a report that reviews facts and includes self-reflections about the current status of an academic programme in relation to its goals and to established markers of academic quality; (2) The external panel reviews the report, undertakes a site

NO.	TERMS	DESCRIPTION
		visit to evaluate the status of the programme, and makes recommendations for improvement.
49.	Qualification descriptor	A generic statement that explains the main learning outcomes for qualifications at a particular level.
50.	Quality assurance	A planned and systematic process to ensure that acceptable standards of education, scholarship and infrastructure are being met, maintained and enhanced.
51.	Quality culture	Mindset within an institution related to shared beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviour patterns that characterise the members of the institution, which is integrated throughout the institution.
52.	Quality enhancement	Steps taken to bring about continual improvement in quality.
53.	Regular review	Thematic review and sectional review (continuous).
54.	Stakeholders feedback	Feedback gathered from stakeholders within the HEP, e.g., academic staff, non-academic staff and students and those gathered from sources outside the HEP, e.g., regulators, employers, external experts, fund provides, parents, community, etc.
55.	State-of-the-art instructional method	Instructional methods using the cutting edge technology and new knowledge to improve student learning experience in attaining the learning outcomes.
56.	Strategic plan	A plan that outlines a HEP's direction, priorities and goals that guide the allocation of resources as the strategic plan is implemented.
57.	Student articulation	A process whereby a student or a group of students progresses from one qualification to the study of a higher level qualification. Usually, this process involves credit transfer from the initial study to the new, higher level qualification.
58.	Student exchange	A programme in which students from a university study at one of their institution's partner institutions. A student exchange programme may involve international travel, but does not necessarily require the student to study outside his or her home country.
59.	Student learning experience	An experience which comprises the entire educational experience of a student whilst studying for a programme.
60.	Student mobility	A programme that initiates the exchange of students between two institutions for a short duration of study (anywhere between 3 to 12 months of study) that usually allows credit transfer to the existing degree programme in the student's home institution.
61.	Student support services	Support services that include physical amenities and services such as recreation, arts and culture, accommodation, transport, safety, food, health, finance, academic advice and counselling.

NO.	TERMS	DESCRIPTION
62.	Summative assessment	The assessment of learning which summarises the student progress at a particular time and is used to assign the student a course grade.
63.	Sustainability	Ability of an institution to sustain their academic program taking into consideration financial sustainability, program learning outcomes that are relevant and “future proof”, retaining and increasing resources such as staff and facilities.
64.	Teaching portfolio	A documented statement of a faculty member's philosophy, goals, teaching responsibilities, teaching methods and evaluation, and accomplishments.
65.	Vision	A statement that describes the desired future position of the institution.

Abbreviations

1. **COPIA** Code of Practice for Institutional Audit
2. **COPPA** Code of Practice for Programme Accreditation
3. **HEP** Higher Education Provider
4. **KPI** Key Performance Indicator
5. **MOHE** Ministry of Higher Education
6. **MQA** Malaysian Qualifications Agency
7. **MQF** Malaysian Qualifications Framework
8. **MQR** Malaysian Qualifications Register

Section 1

Introduction

The work of the MQA revolves around two major approaches to quality assure higher education in Malaysia. The first approach is to accredit programmes and qualifications. The second is to audit institutions or their components. The two are distinct approaches but highly interrelated.

Institutional Audit takes many forms. It could be comprehensive or thematic; it could be by faculty or across faculties. It could take the form of a periodic academic performance audit on higher education provider (HEP) or an assessment to determine the continuation or maintenance of programme accreditation status. It could take the form of an exercise for purposes of verifying data, for purposes of public policy input or for rating and ranking of institutions and programmes.

The highest form of institutional audit is the self-accreditation audit, which can lead to a conferment of a self-accreditation status for the institution so audited, whereby the institution can accredit its own programmes. Sometimes called a “system audit”, the institutional audit for purposes of self-accreditation focuses on the capacity and capability of the internal quality assurance system of an institution to evaluate academic programmes that it offers. In a sense, a self-accreditation audit is an exercise in accrediting the internal quality assurance system of the institution.

The institutional audit process is guided by the Code of Practice for Institutional Audit (COPIA). The COPIA is dedicated to review HEP for specific purposes through comprehensive institutional and thematic audits. The COPIA has 114 benchmarked and 65 enhanced standards set across nine quality assurance areas to reflect the demands of establishing a quality assurance system. These standards became a key parameter in the assessment of self-accredited HEPs including maintenance audit of self-accrediting HEPs.

Maintenance audits will guide HEP to continually improve through a quality culture that enhances academic excellence and organisational excellence. Furthermore, the standards and their attainment levels were developed with the intention of transforming these HEPs into exemplary institutions that serve as benchmark for local and foreign institutions. The maintenance audits focus on the quality of institutions prescribed based on four areas of evaluation as follows:

- i. Institutional Leadership and Governance
- ii. Academic Development and Management
- iii. Talent and Resources
- iv. Continual Quality Improvement and Sustainability

In the remaining sections, specific standards of maintenance audit criteria as well as application submission requirements are spelt out for each of the four areas of evaluation. These serve as performance indicators of quality.

Section 2

Guide on Compliance Evaluation for Self-Accreditation Universities

AREA 1: INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

STANDARDS FOR AREA 1

1.1 Review of Vision, Mission and Educational Goals

- 1.1.1 The HEP must review or revisit its vision. Mission and educational goals, in line with national and global developments.
- 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.
- 1.1.3 The HEP must disseminate the vision, mission and educational goals to its internal and external stakeholders.

1.2 Formulation and Deployment of Strategic Plans

- 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.
- 1.2.2 The strategic plans must be disseminated and deployed to designated parties for implementation.
- 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.

1.3 Institutional and Academic Leadership

- 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.

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.

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.

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.

1.4 Governance Function and Mechanism

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.

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.

1.4.3 Mechanisms to ensure functional integration and comparability of educational quality must be established in HEPs which have geographically separated campuses.

1.5 Information Management

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.

1.5.2 The HEP must regularly review information management policies to ensure it is up to date.

AREA 2: ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT

STANDARDS FOR AREA 2

2.1 Formulation of Learning Outcomes

2.1.1 The HEP must conduct needs analysis which considers market and societal demand through engagement with stakeholders.

2.1.2 The HEP must align the learning outcomes of its programmes and courses with the Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF).

2.2 Curriculum Design, Delivery and Assessment

Curriculum structure and content

2.2.1 The HEP must have policy on curriculum design and delivery which must be regularly reviewed and improved.

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.

Instructional Method

2.2.3 The HEP must use appropriate instructional methods in a conducive learning environment to improve student learning experience.

Assessment

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.

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.

2.2.6 The methods of student assessment, policy on plagiarism, grading criteria and results must be documented, communicated to students at appropriate schedules.

Constructive Alignment

2.2.7 The curriculum structure, content, delivery and assessment must be aligned to the learning outcomes and reviewed periodically to ensure effectiveness.

2.3 Admission and Mobility

Student Selection and Admission

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.

Mobility, Articulation and Credit Transfer

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.

AREA 3: TALENT AND RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR AREA 3

3.1 Academic Staff

Policies

- 3.1.1 The HEP must have clear policies, transparent procedures and human resource planning to recruit, develop, assess, reward, and promote and academic staff in line with the vision, mission, and institutional goals.
- 3.1.2 The HEP must have a clear policy on academic integrity including plagiarism.
- 3.1.3 The HEP must regularly review policies, procedures and human resource plan to address the gaps between the institutional performance and goals.

Implementations

- 3.1.4 The HEP must have an adequate number of qualified academic staff with relevant experience to teach and assess student learning outcomes for each programme.
- 3.1.5 The academic staff must be given sufficient autonomy to focus on areas of their expertise, such as curriculum development and implementation, academic supervision of students, research and writing, scholarly activities, academically-related administrative duties, and community engagement.

Training and Development

- 3.1.6 The HEP must have appropriate and effective training and academic staff development programmes including leadership skills through participation in professional activities, research and industry linkages and other relevant activities.

Performance and Reward

3.1.7 The academic staff must be evaluated at defined intervals and rewarded for their performance based on their academic responsibilities and scholarly activities.

3.2 Non-academic Staff

3.2.1 The HEP must have adequate qualified non-academic staff to support the development and the implementation of academic programmes and related activities.

3.2.2 The HEP must have training scheme for the non-academic staff to fulfil the specific needs of academic programmes for example, safety and risk management, maintenance of specialised equipment, and additional technical skills.

3.2.3 The HEP must have a policy on work ethics and performance review scheme for continuous development and career advancement of the non-academic staff to ensure good university management.

3.3 Physical and Technological Resources

3.3.1 The HEP must have clear policies for managing educational resources which are regularly reviewed and improved to support the achievement of the programme learning outcomes and the institutional goals.

3.3.2 The HEP must regularly review and improve physical and technological resources including physical facilities, library, equipment and information and communication technology facilities that are distributed and scheduled according to educational and institutional needs.

3.4 Student Support Services

3.4.1 The HEP must have policies for managing student support services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation for total learning experience which must be regularly reviewed and improved.

3.4.2 The HEP must provide resources for student support services; such as physical, social, financial and recreational facilities, and counselling and health services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation for total learning experience which must regularly be reviewed and improved.

3.5 Financial Resources

3.5.1 The HEP must have a clear line of responsibility and authority for budgeting and resource allocation that takes into account the specific needs of each department.

3.5.2 Those responsible for an academic programme should be given sufficient autonomy to appropriately allocate resources to achieve the programme goals and to maintain high educational standards.

AREA 4: CONTINUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY

STANDARDS FOR AREA 4

4.1 Mechanisms for Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

Policy on Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

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.

Processes and Outcomes of Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

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.

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.

- 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.

4.2 Involvement of Stakeholders

- 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.

4.3 Quality Improvement and Enhancement

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

4.4 Institutional Sustainability

- 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.

4.4.2 Sufficient resources for establishing and maintaining an effective and sustainable quality culture within the institution must be provided.

Section 3

Submission for Compliance Evaluation of Self-Accreditation Universities

INTRODUCTION

This section is intended to assist the Higher Education Provider (HEP) in the preparation of its submission for Compliance Evaluation of Self-Accreditation Universities.

This Compliance Evaluation of Self-Accreditation Universities submission guidelines covers all the four areas of evaluation with examples of supporting documents. The HEP is required to provide appropriate information with evidence that support and best illustrate their specific case.

The HEP is also invited to furnish additional information that may not be specifically covered in this guidelines but useful in the evaluation. The information provided by the HEP for its submission should be valid and concise.

The Required Documentation

HEPs are required to submit Self-Review Portfolio (SRP) for Compliance Evaluation of Self-Accreditation Universities (MQA-03(P)) in the format prescribed below:

- **Part A:** General Information on the HEP
This is an institutional profile of the HEP.

- **Part B:** Information on Quality Assurance Activities
This provides information on the record of self-accredited programmes.

- **Part C:** Criteria and Standards Compliance Evaluation for Self-Accrediting Institution
This provides information and self-rating pertaining to standards in the four areas of evaluation.

PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDER

Part A of the SRP of this Compliance Evaluation of Self-Accreditation Universities seeks general information on the Higher Education Provider (HEP). It is basically an institutional profile of the HEP.

1. Name of the higher education provider (HEP):

2. Date of establishment:

3. Date of registration (if applicable):

4. Reference No. of registration (if applicable):

5. Name, title and designation of the chief executive officer (however designated):

6. Address (Headquarters):

7. Correspondence (if different from above):

8. Tel.:

9. Fax:

10. Email:

11. Website:

--

12. Names and addresses of Faculties/Schools/Departments/Centres (if located outside the main campus):

No.	Name of Faculties/ Schools/ Departments/ Centres	Address

13. Names and addresses of branch campuses:

No.	Name of Branch Campuses	Address

14. List of current Faculties/Schools/Departments/Centres in the HEP (and its branch campuses) and number of programmes offered:

No.	Name of Faculties/ Schools/ Departments/ Centres	Location and Address	Number of Programmes Offered

15. Details of all programmes currently conducted by the HEP (and its branch campuses including any offshore arrangements):

No.	Name of Programme and National Education Code (NEC)	MQF Level	Location Conducted	Method of Delivery (Conventional-traditional, online and blended learning/Open and Distance Learning, ODL)	*Type of Programme (Collaboration/Home grown/ External Programme) and Awarding Body	Name of Collaborative Institutions through MoA/ MoU (if applicable)	Student Enrolment
		Level 8 (Doctoral)					
		Level 7 (Masters)					
		Level 6 (Bachelors)					
		Level 5 (Advance Diploma)					
		Level 4 (Diploma)					
		Level 3 (Certificate)					
		Others					

* including any kind of programme offered in partnership with the HEP through the Memorandum of Agreement (MoA), Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with any other parties such as college, subsidiary, agent, etc.

16. Total number of academic staff:

Status	Academic Qualification	Number of Academic Staff		
		Malaysian	Non-Malaysian	Total
**Full-time (all types of designation including those on 1 year contract or more)	Doctoral (Level 8)			
	Masters (Level 7)			
	* Bachelors (Level 6)			
	Diploma (Level 4)			
	Certificate (Level 3)			
	Others			
	Sub-total			
**Part-time	Doctoral (Level 8)			
	Masters (Level 7)			
	* Bachelors (Level 6)			
	Diploma (Level 4)			
	Certificate (Level 3)			
	Others			
	Sub-total			
Total				

*including professional qualification, e.g. ACCA.

17. Designation of academic staff:

Designation	Number				Total
	Malaysian		Non-Malaysian		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time	
Professor					
Associate Professor					
Senior Lecturer					
*Lecturer					
*Junior Lecturers including tutors, teaching assistants					
Total					

*however designated

18. Total number of current students:

	Number of Students		Total	Number of Disabled Students
	Malaysian	Non-Malaysian		
Male				
Female				
Total				

19. Total number of students graduating for the past five years:

Period	Year	Total Number of Students
Past 1 year		
Past 2 years		
Past 3 years		
Past 4 years		
Past 5 years		

20. Student attrition for the past five years:

Period	Year	Student Enrolment (A)	Number of students leaving the institution without graduating (B)	Attrition Rate (%) (B/A)*100	Main Reasons for leaving
Past 1 year					
Past 2 years					
Past 3 years					
Past 4 years					
Past 5 years					

21. Total number of administrative and support staff:

No.	*Designation	Number of Administrative and Support Staff (Current Year)
1.	Management/ Executive Group	
2.	Supporting/ Non-Executive Group	

*according to HEP

22. Provide audited financial statement for last three consecutive years:

Year	Financial Statement	
	Profit / Surplus (RM)	Loss / Deficit (RM)
Past 1 year		
Past 2 years		
Past 3 years		

Note: Profit and loss reporting is based on after tax

23. Provide the latest, dated and signed organisational chart of the HEP.

--

24. Details of liaison officer (Quality Assurance Unit of the HEP):

i. Name and Title:	
ii. Designation:	
iii. Tel.:	
iv. Fax:	
v. Email:	

PART B: INFORMATION ON QUALITY ASSURANCE ACTIVITIES

3.1 Record of self-accredited programmes

- i. List of provisional accredited programmes from the date of self-accreditation status

No.	Name of Programme	Programme Reference No.	*Programme Standards/ Applicable Guidelines	Date and Duration of Provisional Accreditation/ Full Accreditation/ Professional Body
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

ii. List of full-accredited programmes from the date of self-accreditation status

No.	Name of Programme	Programme Reference No.	*Programme Standards/ Applicable Guidelines	Date and Duration of Provisional Accreditation/ Full Accreditation/ Professional Body
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

*Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF)/ Programme Standards/Standards: Master's and Doctoral Degree.

PART C: CRITERIA AND STANDARDS FOR COMPLIANCE EVALUATION OF SELF-ACCREDITING UNIVERSITIES

Part C of the MQA-03(P) requires the HEP to furnish information and evidences on all the standards in the four areas of evaluation for maintenance of self-accreditation universities purpose. The following provide a guide to the HEP in furnishing such information.

In Area 1 (Institutional Leadership and Governance), there are 15 standards.

In Area 2 (Academic Development and Management), there are 11 standards.

In Area 3 (Talent and Resources), there are 16 standards.

In Area 4 (Continual Quality Improvement and Sustainability), there are 11 standards.

Sets of attainment levels with descriptions are provided under each sub area for HEP to conduct self-rating. 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.

AREA 1: INSTITUTIONAL LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE

STANDARDS FOR AREA 1

1.1 Review of Vision, Mission and Educational Goals

Standards	*Examples of Supporting Documents
<p>1.1.1 The HEP must review or revisit its vision, mission and educational goals, in line with national and global developments.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>1.1.3 The HEP must disseminate the vision, mission and educational goals to its internal and external stakeholders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report or minute of meeting, workshop or forum conducted to review the HEP's statements of purpose (vision, mission and institutional/educational goals); • Booklet, brochure or pamphlet for publishing and disseminating the statement of purpose; • Website/Internet portals containing the statement of purpose.

**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

Attainment Level	Description
	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 a wider range of stakeholders that may include the community, civil society, international peers, alumni, industry, professional bodies, funding agencies, and the government, in line with national and global developments. There is internalisation of vision and mission among the HEP community.
5	The approved and disseminated vision, mission and educational goals have reflected the institutional responsiveness to current change and future development of higher education landscape.

1.2 Formulation and Deployment of Strategic Plans

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report or minute of meeting, 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.
1.2.2 The strategic plans must be disseminated and deployed to designated parties for implementation.	
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.	

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 educational goals, are translated into the HEP's strategic plans, in consultation with a wider range of stakeholders, representing national and international community, which are then effectively implemented, monitored and reviewed 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	Examples of Supporting Documents
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Job description and appointment criteria for institutional and academic positions; • Any advertisement for institutional and academic positions; • Systems, procedures and guidelines for appointing institutional and academic leaders;
1.3.2 The selection process for the appointment of institutional and academic leaders must ensure that the right candidate with appropriate	

Standards		Examples of Supporting Documents
1.3.3	qualifications and experience is appointed for a particular position. 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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Succession plan for institutional and academic leaders; • Professional development and leadership training programmes for institutional and academic leaders;
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance appraisal system for institutional and academic leaders; • Teaching permit for both full-time and part-time teaching personnel.

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

Attainment Level	Description
	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	Examples of Supporting Documents
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green Playbook; • Organization Chart; • Governance Chart; • Policy on Limits of Authority; • On-line systems for approval and monitoring;
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrity Pact for meetings; • Minutes of Board Meeting;
1.4.3 Mechanisms to ensure functional integration and comparability of educational quality must be established in HEPs which have geographically separated campuses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minutes of Senate Meeting; • Minutes of Coordination Meeting between Campuses; • Minutes of Management Review Meeting.

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.

Attainment Level	Description
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	Examples of Supporting Documents
<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.

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.

Attainment Level	Description
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.

AREA 2: ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT

STANDARDS FOR AREA 2

2.1 Formulation of Learning Outcomes

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
<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.

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

Curriculum structure and content

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
2.2.1 The HEP must have policy on curriculum design and delivery which must be regularly reviewed and improved.	<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.
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.	

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.
--	--

Instructional Method

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
2.2.3 The HEP must use appropriate instructional methods in a conducive learning environment to improve student learning experience.	<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.

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.

Assessment

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
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	<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

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
<p>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>	<p>autonomy granted to the relevant department in developing and reviewing the assessment criteria and methods;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for the management of student assessment and its records.

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.

Constructive Alignment

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
2.2.7 The curriculum structure, content, delivery and assessment must be aligned to the learning outcomes and reviewed periodically to ensure effectiveness.	<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.

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

Student Selection and Admission

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
2.3.1 The HEP must have published policy, criteria, and processes of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission policy;

student selection, admission and appeal, including transfer and exchange students as well as those with special needs which are regularly reviewed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
---	---

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.

Mobility, Articulation and Credit Transfer

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
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.	<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.

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.

AREA 3: TALENT AND RESOURCES

STANDARDS FOR AREA 3

3.1 Academic Staff

Policies

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
3.1.1 The HEP must have clear policies, transparent procedures and human resource planning to recruit, develop, assess, reward, and promote academic staff in line with the vision, mission, and institutional goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HR Handbook/policies – recruitment, promotion and appraisal; • Policy on academic integrity including plagiarism, and research ethics;
3.1.2 The HEP must have a clear policy on academic integrity including plagiarism.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HR Development and Strategy Plan and initiatives;
3.1.3 The HEP must regularly review policies, procedures and human resource plan to address the gaps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance analysis report and revised policies/procedures.

between the institutional performance and goals.	
--	--

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policies, transparent procedures and human resource planning.
2	The HEP has adequate policies, transparent procedures and human resource planning but not regularly reviewed.
3	The HEP has clear policies, transparent procedures on academic integrity and human resource planning to recruit, develop, assess, reward, and promote academic staff in line with the vision, mission, and institutional goals which are regularly reviewed to address the gap between the institutional performance and goals.
4	The HEP uses the result of the review process to further enhance the talent management plan and institutional performance.
5	The HEP regularly improve their practices to ensure the achievement of institutional goals.

Implementations

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
<p>3.1.4 The HEP must have an adequate number of qualified academic staff with relevant experience to teach and assess student learning outcomes for each programme.</p> <p>3.1.5 The academic staff must be given sufficient autonomy to focus on areas of their expertise, such as curriculum development and implementation, academic supervision of students, research and writing, scholarly activities, academically-related administrative duties, and community engagement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on staff-student ratio per programme/semester; • Table of staff qualification levels; • Percentage of staff with PhD; • Percentage of full time staff and turnover rate; • Staff JTOR and KPIs; • Staff Workload per semester; • Data showing trend of academic productivity.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate, qualified and experienced academic staff.
2	The HEP has adequate, qualified and experienced academic staff with limited autonomy.
3	The HEP has adequate, qualified and experienced academic staff who are given sufficient autonomy to focus on areas of their expertise, such as curriculum development and implementation, academic assessment and supervision of students, research and writing, scholarly activities, academically-related administrative duties, and community engagement and internationalisation.
4	The HEP has created a conducive environment and work culture which resulted in improved academic performance and productivity arising from the given autonomy.
5	The HEP strives to expand the boundaries of academic autonomy to reflect the progression of intellectual maturity within the institution in achieving academic excellence.

Training and Development

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
3.1.6 The HEP must have appropriate and effective training and academic staff development programmes including leadership skills through participation in professional activities, research and industry linkages and other relevant activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of trainings offered to staff based on needs analysis; • Data on staff active in research – external grant, publication, PG students, collaboration/linkages with other institution/industry; • Data on staff professional membership and external engagement.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP has limited training and academic staff development programmes.
2	The HEP has basic training and academic staff development programmes.

3	The HEP has appropriate and effective training and academic staff development programmes including leadership skills through participation in professional activities, research and industry linkages and other relevant activities.
4	The HEP regularly reviews and aligns their training and academic staff development programmes to ensure academic staff are able to fulfil their roles and responsibilities in achieving institutional goals.
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.

Performance and Reward

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
3.1.7 The academic staff must be evaluated at defined intervals and rewarded for their performance based on their academic responsibilities and scholarly activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Appraisal Exercise records; • Staff Awards – research, teaching, publication, etc. • Statistics on staff promotion.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have clear criteria for evaluation and appropriate reward system for academic staff.
2	The HEP's evaluation and reward system is not aligned with the staff performance.
3	The academic staff has been evaluated at defined intervals and rewarded for their performance based on their academic responsibilities and scholarly activities.
4	The HEP regularly reviews its evaluation and reward system to attract and retain skilled, experienced and motivated academic staff.
5	The HEP's evaluation and reward system created a conducive environment and work culture to achieve academic excellence.

3.2 Non-academic Staff

Standards	Sample of Documents	
3.2.1 The HEP must have adequate qualified non-academic staff to support the development and the implementation of academic programmes and related activities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table of staff qualification levels and managerial experience; • Staff development plan and training scheme based on needs analysis; • Annual appraisal exercise records; • Record on innovative contributions by staff. • Personal file; • Policy on work ethics. 	
3.2.2 The HEP must have training scheme for the non-academic staff to fulfil the specific needs of academic programmes for example, safety and risk management, maintenance of specialised equipment, and additional technical skills.		
3.2.3 The HEP must have a policy on work ethics and performance review scheme for continuous development and career advancement of the non-academic staff to ensure good university management.		

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate non-academic staff to support the development and the implementation of academic programmes and related activities.
2	The HEP does not have adequate training programme and performance review mechanism.
3	The HEP has adequate qualified non-academic staff to support the development and the implementation of academic programmes and related activities. The HEP has training scheme including continuous development and career advancement for the non-academic staff to fulfil the specific needs of educational programmes for example, safety and risk management, maintenance of specialised equipment, and additional technical skills. The HEP has a policy on work ethics and performance review scheme for continuous development and career advancement of the non-academic staff to ensure good university management.
4	The HEP has developed and implemented training programme and talent management plan for its non-academic staff.
5	The non-academic staff are enabled to contribute towards

	promoting and maintaining a conducive environment as well as in embracing culture of innovation within the HEP.
--	---

3.3 Physical and Technological Resources

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
3.3.1 The HEP must have clear policies for managing educational resources which are regularly reviewed and improved to support the achievement of the programme learning outcomes and the institutional goals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies, procedures and methods of managing educational resources including Information and Communication Technology; • Policies, procedures and methods of managing University Record and Archives; • Plans to review policies, procedures and methods of managing educational resources; • Minutes of meetings related to managing educational resources; • Survey and feedback on educational resources from relevant stakeholders; • Action/improvement plan to maintaining and upgrading physical and IT facilities; • List of trainings related to using, maintaining, and upgrading physical and IT facilities.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policies for managing educational resources which is not reviewed and improved.
2	The HEP has reviewed the policies for managing educational resources but does not address new requirements.

3	The HEP has policies for managing educational resources which are regularly reviewed and improved to support the achievement of programme learning outcomes and the institutional goals.
4	The HEP uses the result of the review process to provide conducive learning environment to achieve institutional goals.
5	The HEP regularly improve their policies to achieve teaching and learning excellence in response to current and future challenges.

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
<p>3.3.2 The HEP must regularly review and improve physical and technological resources including physical facilities, library, equipment and information and communication technology facilities that are distributed and scheduled according to educational and institutional needs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of facilities, e.g., lecture rooms, seminar rooms, examinations halls, strong rooms, oral examination rooms, students activities facilities, resources centre, reading rooms, library, laboratories, students residences, health centre, mosque, parking, banks, café, transport facilities, internet and Wi-Fi facilities, computer centre, sports and recreation centres and centres of excellences; • Library brochure with complete information on available facilities such as smart reading rooms, discussion rooms, postgraduate lounge, carrels, helpdesk, database of books and journals, data bases of e-books and journals and other facilities; • Surveys on customers satisfaction towards educational resources of the university;

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subscription of electronic/online database and resources; • University Complaints and Suggestions System.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not provide adequate educational resources.
2	The HEP has provision for educational resources but not in line with educational and institutional needs.
3	The HEP regularly reviews and improves educational resources including physical facilities, library, equipment, and information and communication technology facilities that are distributed and scheduled according to educational and institutional needs.
4	The HEP uses the result of the review process to assess its quality and appropriateness for current educational needs, and regularly improved to keep up with the development in educational practices and changes.
5	The HEP provides state-of-the-art educational resources to achieve academic excellence.

3.4 Student Support Services

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
3.4.1 The HEP must have policies for managing student support services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation for total learning experience which must be regularly reviewed and improved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies for managing student support services, extracurricular activities and student representation and participation; • Quality procedures and documents for students support services; • Guidelines/Manual for managing student activities.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policies for managing student support services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation which is not reviewed and improved.
2	The HEP has reviewed the policies for managing student support services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation but does not address new requirements.
3	The HEP has policies for managing student support services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation for total learning experience which are regularly reviewed and improved.
4	The HEP uses the result of the review process to provide conducive environment for total learning experience.
5	The HEP regularly improve their policies to create transformative learning experience in producing innovative and holistic graduates.

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
3.4.2 The HEP must provide resources for student support services; such as physical, social, financial and recreational facilities, and counselling and health services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation for total learning experience which must regularly be reviewed and improved.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoU/MoA and student mobility reports (inbound and outbound); • Bulletin for student's participation in sports at university/national and international levels; • List of centres and their functions that support students' needs and students' activities; • Student insurance and welfare scheme.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not provide adequate resources for student support services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation.
2	The HEP provides resources for student support services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation but insufficient to support total learning

Attainment Level	Description
	experience.
3	The HEP provides resources for student support services; such as physical, social, financial and recreational facilities, and counselling and health services, extra-curricular activities and student representation and participation for total learning experience which are regularly reviewed and improved.
4	The HEP uses the result of the review process to assess its quality and appropriateness of the resources for total learning experience in line with student developmental needs.
5	The HEP regularly improves the resources to create transformative learning experience in producing innovative and holistic graduates.

3.5 Financial Resources

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
<p>3.5.1 The HEP must have a clear line of responsibility and authority for budgeting and resource allocation that takes into account the specific needs of each department.</p> <p>3.5.2 Those responsible for an academic programme should be given sufficient autonomy to appropriately allocate resources to achieve the programme goals and to maintain high educational standards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Governance Structure; • SOP for budget application and budget allocation; • Guidelines for HOD on budget utilization; • Samples of allocated and expenditure for selected academic programmes; • New infrastructure or equipment acquired to improve existing or introduce programmes.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have a line of responsibility and authority for budgeting and resource allocation.
2	The HEP does not clearly define the line of responsibility and authority for budgeting and resource allocation. Academic leaders responsible for an academic programme are given insufficient autonomy to appropriately allocate resources to achieve the programme goals and to maintain high educational

Attainment Level	Description
	standards.
3	The HEP has a clear line of responsibility and authority for budgeting and resource allocation that takes into account the specific needs of each department. Academic leaders responsible for an academic programme are given sufficient autonomy to appropriately allocate resources to achieve the programme goals and to maintain high educational standards.
4	The clear line of responsibility and authority resulted in effective budgeting and resource allocation in fulfilling the needs of the departments. The high degree of autonomy resulted in academic programme improvement.
5	The clear line of responsibility and authority together with the high degree of autonomy resulted in efficient and effective response to current and future challenges.

AREA 4: CONTINUAL QUALITY IMPROVEMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY

STANDARDS FOR AREA 4

4.1 Mechanisms for Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

Policy on Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
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.	<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).

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.

Processes and Outcomes of Programme Monitoring, Review and Evaluation

Standards	Examples of Supporting Documents
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment letters and terms of reference for coordinators for programme monitoring, review and evaluation exercises;
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surveys or studies on need analysis; • Programme benchmarking reports; • Programme performance/ review reports; • Programme assessment/ evaluation reports;
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme self-review portfolios; • List of programme assessors; • Committee for overseeing programme evaluation exercises;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minutes of HEP's senate and/or management regarding programme assessment/evaluation.
--	--

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	Examples of Supporting Documents
<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.

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	Examples of Supporting Documents
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies, guidelines and procedures for reviewing/updating of internal quality assurance (IQA) system and continual quality improvement (CQI);
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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;
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment criteria and terms of reference for head of the IQA department/unit; • Quality manuals, documentation and procedures for HEP's internal processes;
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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Attainment Level	Description
1	The HEP does not have adequate policies and procedures for regular reviewing and updating of its internal quality assurance activities.

Attainment Level	Description
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	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. 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.
4	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.
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	Examples of Supporting Documents
4.4.1 The HEP's strategic and internal processes, including governance,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies, guidelines and procedures related to

<p>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>	<p>institutional autonomy, and sustainability.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.
---	---

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.

COMMITTEE REPRESENTATION

No.	Name	Institution
1.	Prof. Sr. Ir. Dr. Suhaimi Abdul Talib	Universiti Teknologi MARA
2.	Prof. Dr. Ong Duu Sheng	Multimedia University
3.	Prof. Dr. Rio Sumarni Shariffudin	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia
4.	Prof. Dr. Ir. Shahrir Abdullah	Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia
5.	Dr. Andy Liew Teik Kooi	HELP University
6.	Mr. Mohamed Nadzri Mohd Yusoff	Universiti Teknologi MARA
7.	Madam Lilian Kek Siew Yick	Accreditation Subsector, Malaysian Qualifications Agency
8.	Madam Halinordina Mat Saat	Institutional Audit Division, Malaysian Qualifications Agency
9.	Mr. Helmi Sebaweh @ Ahmad	Institutional Audit Division, Malaysian Qualifications Agency
10.	Madam Nabisah K. Kunheen	Engineering and Technology Accreditation Division, Malaysian Qualifications Agency
11.	Mr. Zamrin Salim	Standards Division, Malaysian Qualifications Agency