

Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

2016

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

Preface

The Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria is a helping tool for Jordanian higher education institutions that apply for a quality assurance certificate. The present guide contains the approved quality assurance criteria, their sub-criteria and their indicators as stated in the Guide for Quality Assurance Procedures and Criteria for Higher Education Institutions issued by the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions for the year 2016. It also shows how to measure the degree of achievement or availability of the criteria by responding to a set of questions related to certain aspects of their indicators on a descriptive scale (Rubric) consisting of five gradual levels by identifying the exact level that applies to the subject institution. Higher education institutions can, by virtue of the present guide, evaluate themselves on the one hand, and prepare for external evaluation on the other. They can also take measures to prepare evidence and proofs to facilitate the work of the internal and external auditors on the one hand and to ensure that they get the ratings they deserve, on the other hand.

This guide has been prepared upon instructions from Prof. Dr. Bashir Al-Zu'bi, President of the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions as appearing in his letter Ref. 1/5/1096 of 24/5/2015, which provides for the formation of a committee consisting of:

Prof. Dr. Yousef Mohammad Sawalmeh, as Chairman

Prof. Dr. Khalid Mohammad Ali Al-Fawares, Member

Dr. Raed Salem Al-Shadfan, Member

Dr. Mohammad Mahmoud Al-Dalal'eh, Member

Dr. Hamza Mustafa Massad, Member

Dr. Ahmad Mohammad Mansour, Secretary of the Committee

The Committee was tasked with the preparation of this guide.

The task wasn't an easy one. In order to complete this guide, the committee made great efforts and held many long meetings until the guide was produced in its present form. It is the Commission's hope that those in charge of the quality assurance at the higher education institutions provide the Commission with their comments and suggestions on the content of this guide to enable the Commission to modify and update it in future editions.

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

Table of Contents

Preface

Foreword

Introduction

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning

2. Criterion Two: Governance

3. Criterion Three: Academic Programs

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Missions and Innovations

5. Criterion Five: Human, Financial and Facility Resources

6. Criterion Six: Student Services

7. Criterion Seven: Community Service and External Relations

8. Criterion Eight: Quality Assurance Management

The Overall Assessment of the Institution

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

Foreword

This Guide, which completes the set of guides for quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions and programs, has been prepared and issued in view of and implementation of the following points of consideration:

- The fact that the process of granting quality assurance certificates is one of the main tasks of the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions;
- Article (4) of Commission Law No. (20) of 2007, as amended, which identifies the objectives of the Commission as follows: to improve the quality of higher education in the Kingdom and ensure its quality, by motivating the higher education institutions to open up and interact with universities, scientific research institutions, accreditation bodies seeking the international quality control and its development of the higher education applying international measurement criteria.
- Article (7) item (a) of the Commission Act, which gives authority to the Commission to: develop quality assurance criteria and apply and review them periodically with a view to achieving the highest standard levels.
- A contribution by the Commission to the development of the outcomes of the Jordanian higher education institutions and the enhancement of their competitiveness on the national, regional and international levels.

It is out of the keen interest of the Commission to provide permanent and on-going assistance to the Jordanian higher education institutions and to partner with them to obtain the Quality Assurance Certificate in accordance with the Jordanian quality assurance criteria, that the Commission has the pleasure to present this comprehensive Guide for measuring the approved quality assurance criteria. The Guide has been prepared and evaluated by a team of specialists in the field of higher education quality control. It includes specific and clear qualitative and quantitative measurement indicators, while each indicator has been expressed through a set of precise questions that relate to five gradient levels to determine the level of quality applied.

The Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions extends its deep thanks and appreciation for the valuable contribution made by the members of the development and preparation committee, whether working for the Commission or for higher education institutions, as well as to the linguist Prof. Dr. Abdul-Ra'ouf Zuhdi Mustafa for all their efforts which lead to the issuance of this guide in its quality and content. We hope that this guide, which has benefited from previous experiences, will be a complete reference, a source and a mature product that will benefit Jordanian higher education institutions who are applying for a quality assurance certificate.

Our Prophet Mohammad (Peace May Be upon Him) says: God Loves That When One of You Does Something, He Does It Very Well.).

Prof. Dr. Bashir Al Zu'bi
President of the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

Introduction

The Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions aims to assist educational institutions and quality audit committees, both from inside and outside the institution, in issuing judgments about the quality of these institutions accurately, objectively and transparently.

The Quality System at Jordanian Higher Education Institutions adopted by the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions, as stated in the Guide for Quality Assurance Criteria and Procedures at Higher Education Institutions, is based on eight criteria approved for obtaining a quality assurance certificate. The present guide seeks to describe these criteria by showing the good practices applied at high-quality institutions. That is, describing the criteria through demonstrating the practices that higher education institutions should follow effectively to reach the levels of achievement that qualify them to obtain the appropriate level of quality assurance certificate.

The quality assurance system gives the educational institution the opportunity to develop itself through enhancing its on-going efforts to improve quality and recognizing the level of quality it achieves as reflected in the level of the certificate it obtains. The quality assurance certificate is granted to Jordanian higher education institutions in three levels: bronze, silver and gold.

To complete what the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Commission for Higher Education Institutions has performed, including identification of the quality criteria, dividing them into sub-criteria, dividing each sub-criterion into a set of elements and showing the indicators, evidence and documents required to achieve it, the determination of the quality level still requires designing and building descriptive gradations (Rubrics) so that these describe the levels of achieving the indicators of each sub-criterion of each of the quality criteria at the educational institution concerned.

This document provides measures for the level of achieving quality criteria at the higher education institutions. These measures can be used by the institutions themselves in conducting the self-assessment study and by committees auditing the level of achievement of quality criteria. The primary purpose of the self-study and auditing is to reach to an objective evaluation of the performance of the educational institution in the various areas and domains covered by the quality criteria of the higher education institutions. The objective evaluation helps those in of higher education institutions and guides them in the process of improving and upgrading the performance of their institutions. It also presents a clear picture of the strong points and opportunities for improvement at the institution, and highlights the challenges that should be addressed and the priorities that should be that should be implemented in order to get a quality assurance certificate.

The criteria and their sub-criteria give a description of these measures through a number of good practices followed by high-quality institutions. To evaluate the performance of the institution against the criteria, the institution must provide evidence that it applies these good practices and the level of the quality of this application. The measures require the evaluator to assess the quality of application against a scale of five ratings on the basis of appropriate evidence and proofs including some benchmarks with other similar institutions provided by the educational institute.

The evidence and proofs of performance are essential requirements for the process of objective and accurate assessment of quality. The educational institution is responsible for providing multiple and appropriate forms of evidence of the practices and processes it carries out. Good attention should be paid to the true significance of the evidence, and it should be interpreted properly. For example, the graduation of all university students who were admitted in a certain year in four years or less, with most of them getting high rates, may mean that teaching at the university is distinct, and, therefore, it will be given a high rating. However, this may also mean that the performance standards at the university are low and that it is easy for students to reach higher levels. Therefore, in this case, the university will be given a low rating. To arrive at honest ratings, it is necessary to interpret the evidence accurately.

Each educational institution is fully responsible for monitoring its performance and planning for improving that performance. It must document all the processes and procedures it performs in order to achieve its goals and objectives in compliance with its vision, mission and values. The documentation process helps in providing the necessary information which assists the institution itself, the Accreditation Commission and other parties concerned with performance quality control at higher education institutions in a clear picture of the actual situation of the institution and the changes taking place therein.

The degree of achievement of the quality criteria may be identified only through honest evaluation of performance and the work that is planned and implemented by the educational institution. The honest evaluation requires harmony and consistency between the self-assessment carried out by the educational institution and the independent verification carried out by the Accreditation Commission through the external evaluation process. In order to achieve objectivity and the highest degrees of consistency, the quality criteria should be translated into good practices that will include the standards of the level of achievement of quality standards whether they were used by the institution as self-assessment scales or by quality level auditing committees appointed by the Accreditation Commission. The level of achievement of these practices is evaluated by using a gradient system of assessment consisting of five levels of quality.

The present guide provides descriptive information about what should be available at the educational institution in respect of each criterion, followed by its descriptive assessment scale. The descriptive assessment scale is but a two-dimensional matrix. The first dimension consists of a set of features, benchmarks or good practices related to the criterion that must be evaluated, while the second dimension consists of the performance or quality levels adopted in the assessment system. To ensure a high degree of honesty and objectivity, the cells of this matrix have been filled with detailed descriptions of the elements of the first dimension in various levels of performance or quality.

Each feature or practice in the descriptive assessment scale requires the evaluator to identify its availability or quality at the institution by giving a score to the nearest whole number on a continuous scale from 0 to 4, guided by the detailed descriptions included in the descriptive assessment scale and in light of available and satisfactory evidence and proofs of the degree of availability of the feature or the quality of the practice. Grades shall have the following meanings:

Grade (0): Absence of quality or level is very poor.

Grade (1): Poor level of quality

Grade (2): Average level of quality

Grade (3): Good level of quality

Grade 4: Advanced level of quality

<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>																																																													4 Advanced level of quality	3 Good level of quality	2 Average level of quality	1 Poor level of quality	<table border="1"><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>																																																													0 Absence of quality
	3.5		2.5		1.5		0.5																																																																																																																							

After getting the grades attained by the institution on the different indicators of each criterion, the total assessment of the criterion can be obtained by calculating the arithmetic average of the ratings of its indicators (total sum of ratings of indicators divided by the number). The arithmetic mean shall be judged in accordance with the following criteria:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Arithmetic average less than 1.5 | indicates a low level of quality |
| Arithmetic average ranging from 1.5 to 2.49 | indicates an average level of quality |
| Arithmetic average ranging from 2.5 to 3.49 | indicates a good level of quality |
| Arithmetic average of 3.5 and above | indicates an advanced level of quality |

As the criteria do not have the same importance, they have been given different weights that reflect their relative importance. The approved weights range between (10) as a minimum limit for each of Strategic Planning, Student Services, Community Service, External Relations, Quality Assurance and (20) points as a maximum limit for each of Governance, Academic Programs, Scientific Research and Scholarships, and Financial, Physical and Human resources. These weights must be kept in mind when deriving the total assessment of the institution. This is done in accordance with the following formula:

$$\text{Overall Rating of Institution} = \frac{(w_1)(m_1) + \dots + (w_8)(m_8)}{w_1 + \dots + w_8} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^8 w_i m_i}{\sum_{i=1}^8 w_i}$$

Whereas w_i is the weight of criterion i which is represented by the number of its approved scores.

w_i is the arithmetic average of the ratings of indicators of criterion (i).

The overall rating, in this case, represents the weighted average of all the criteria on the same five-grade scale. When the assessment process is carried out by more than one evaluator, the arithmetic average of their assessments is to be calculated, a judgment on it is to be issued and a decision is to be made to award or block the quality assurance certificate in accordance with the following criteria:

Arithmetic average less than 1.5	indicates a low level of quality (Quality rejected)
Arithmetic average ranging from 1.5 to 2.49	indicates an average level of quality (Bronze Level)
Arithmetic average ranging from 2.5 to 3.49	indicates a good level of quality (Silver Level)
Arithmetic average of 3.5 and above	indicates an advanced level of quality (Gold Level)

It is noteworthy that in this guide, the indicators have been translated into questions related to the educational institution, and they have been placed in the first column of the assessment scale. Against each question, there is a four-digit serial number. The first digit from the right refers to the main criterion number, the second refers to the sub-criterion number, the third refers to the indicator number, and the fourth refers to the number of the question concerning the indicator. For example, the serial number 2.3.1.3 refers to the second question which relates to the third indicator of the first sub-criterion of the third main criterion. The status of the institution under evaluation in respect of the response to questions will be placed in one of the five other columns in light of the evidence and proofs it provides. These five columns reflect the approved assessment levels referred to earlier.

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning

1.1. Sub-Criterion One: Vision, Mission, Goals, and Values

Educational institutions are expected to establish a process for expressing their vision, mission, goals and values clearly. This process shall include written procedures that shall be developed, reviewed and approved by the appropriate management levels and accepted by the various stakeholders. This entails identification of the stakeholders and their expectations, effective communication with them in all possible ways, ensuring widest participation by them in discussing formulations proposed by selected committees and clarifying those formulations to ensure their consistency with expectations and with the basic activities as well as their correlation with each other. It is imperative to create a state of awareness of those formulations, to review them periodically and to reconsider them whenever need so requires. All this should be documented in comprehensive records that show all steps and practices.

The vision, mission, objectives and values shall be judged through indicators relating to:

1.1.1. Accuracy and clarity of formulation

1.1.2. Methodology of preparation

1.1.3. Compatibility and consistency

1.1.4. Means of awareness-raising and the media

1.1.5. Means and tools of review and evaluation

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

Descriptive Assessment of Performance

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning

1.1 Sub-criterion One: Vision, mission, goals and values

1.1.1. Accuracy and Clarity of Formulation	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.1.1.1. Does the institution have a vision that is declared, approved and formulated clearly and precisely?	(0) No, The institution has no any written and declared vision.	(1) Yes, There is an approved vision known to a small group of stakeholders, and with poor accuracy of clarity.	(2) Yes, There is an approved vision known to a small group of stakeholders, and with an average accuracy of clarity.	(3) Yes, There is an approved vision known to a large group of stakeholders, and with an average accuracy of clarity.	(4) Yes, There is an approved vision known to a large group of stakeholders, and with a good accuracy of clarity.
1.1.1.2. Does the institution have a vision that is declared, approved and formulated clearly and precisely?	(0) No, the institution has no written and declared mission.	(1) Yes, There is an approved mission known to a small group of stakeholders, and with poor accuracy of clarity.	(2) Yes, There is an approved mission known to a small group of stakeholders, and with an average accuracy of clarity.	(3) Yes, There is an approved mission known to a large group of stakeholders, and with an average accuracy of clarity.	(4) Yes, There is an approved mission known to a large group of stakeholders, and with good accuracy of clarity.
1.1.1.3. Does the institution have values that govern its business with declared and clearly identified activities?	(0) No, the institution has no values that govern its business and activities	(1) Yes, There are values known to a small group of stakeholders, and with a poor accuracy of identification.	(2) Yes, There are values known to a small group of stakeholders, and with an average accuracy of identification.	(3) Yes, There are values known to a large group of stakeholders, and with an average accuracy of identification.	(4) Yes, There are values known to a large group of stakeholders, and with an average accuracy of identification.
1.1.1.4. Do goals focus on deepening knowledge, scientific research and community service?	(0) No, not at all	(1) Yes, they focus on one topic of them.	(2) Yes, they focus on two topics of them.	(3) Yes, they focus on the three topics.	(4) Yes, they focus on the three topics and focus on genuine scientific research.

Total ratings given to the accuracy and clarity of formulation indicator=

The arithmetic average for the accuracy and clarity of formulation indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.1 Sub-criterion One: Vision, mission, goals and values					
1.1.2. Methodology of preparation	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.1.2.1. Is there a procedure for preparation of the vision, mission, goals and values?	(0) There is no any procedure	(1) Yes, there is a procedure, but it is not clear	(2) Yes, there is a partly clear procedure, whose steps are not logically sequenced	(3) Yes, there is a partly clear procedure, whose steps are logically sequenced but difficult to apply	(4) There is a perfectly clear procedure, whose steps are logically sequenced and easy to apply.
1.1.2.2. Were the procedures for the preparation of the vision, mission, goals and values documented in well-designed records?	(0) No, no procedures were documented.	(1) Yes, some procedures were documented in poorly designed records.	(2) Yes, most of the procedures were documented in records of an average design.	(3) Yes, most of the procedures were documented in records of a good design.	(4) Yes, all procedures were documented in records of a good design.
1.1.2.3. Were the procedures for the preparation applied?	(0) No, they were not applied.	(1) Yes, about 25% of them were applied.	(2) Yes, about 50% of them were applied.	(3) Yes, about 75% of them were applied.	(4) Yes, all procedures were completely applied.

Total ratings given to the methodology of preparation indicator =

The arithmetic average of the methodology of preparation indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.1 Sub-criterion One: Vision, mission, goals and values					
1.1.3. Compatibility and Consistency	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.1.3.1. Does the institution's mission express its vision?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it partly expresses an unspecified vision	(2) Yes, it partly expresses a partly specified vision	(3) Yes, it perfectly expresses a partly specified vision	(4) Yes, it perfectly expresses a precisely specified vision
1.1.3.2. Does the mission identify the primary goals and priorities of the institution in perfect clarity?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it partly identifies the institution's goals, but without any arrangement of priorities	(2) Yes, it partly identifies the institution's goals and partly arranges priorities.	(3) Yes, it perfectly identifies the institution's goals and partly arranges priorities.	(3) Yes, it perfectly identifies the institution's goals and arranges priorities in perfect clarity.
1.1.3.3. Are the institution's values consistent with its vision, mission and goals?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, a few of them are consistent with the vision, mission and goals.	(2) Yes, about half of them are consistent with the vision, mission and goals.	(3) Yes, many of them are consistent with the vision, mission and goals.	(4) Yes, all of them are consistent with the vision, mission and goals.

Total ratings given to the compatibility and consistency indicator =

The arithmetic average of the compatibility and consistency indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.1 Sub-criterion One: Vision, mission, goals and values					
1.1.4. Means of awareness raising and the Media	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.1.4.1. Was communication made with concerned parties for the process of preparing the vision, mission and goals as well as for their training?	(0) Never, No. No communication was made.	(1) Yes, communication was made, no training was given.	(2) Yes, communication was made, training was ineffective.	(3) Yes, communication was made, trainees showed some competencies.	(4) Yes, communication was made in an excellent manner, trainees showed good competencies.
1.1.4.2. Was the content of the vision and mission clarified to the concerned parties?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, through one, unsatisfactory, training workshop.	(2) Yes, through one training workshop, satisfactory to a selected group of staff..	(3) Yes, through several training workshops. Satisfactory to various categories of staff.	(4) Yes, through several training workshops and other forms of training satisfactory to various categories of staff.
1.1.4.3. Were the vision, mission, goals and values declared through multiple media?	(0) Never, No	(1) Yes, the promotion was made in a small number of media.	(2) Yes, promotion was made in a reasonable number of media.	(3) Yes, promotion was made in a reasonable number of media and official meeting.	(4) Yes, in all possible media and official and unofficial meetings.
1.1.4.4. Are means of awareness raising of the vision, mission and goals and information about it effective?	(0) Never, No. No one knows about them.	(1) Yes, there is a small group aware of them, and they do not understand them.	(2) Yes, there is a large group who know about it, and their understanding of it is poor.	(3) Yes, there is a large group who know about it, with an average understanding of it.	(4) Yes, there is a large group who know about it, with good understanding of it.

Total ratings given to the Means of awareness raising and information indicator=

The arithmetic average for the Means of awareness raising and information indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.1 Sub-criterion One: Vision, mission, goals and values					
1.1.5. Means and tools of review and evaluation	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.1.5.1. Does the institution follow clear procedures to review and evaluate the missions and objectives?	(0) Never, No. There are no any procedures.	(1) Yes, there are procedures that are not followed and are somewhat ambiguous	(2) Yes, there are procedures that are partly followed and are somewhat ambiguous	(3) Yes, there are procedures that are followed on a limited scale.	(4) Yes, there are perfectly clear procedures that are followed on a large scale.
1.1.5.2. Did the institution review its mission and objectives	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, one unofficial review was made.	(2) Yes, one official review was made.	(3) Yes, one official review was made, followed with an improvement plan.	(4) Yes, multiple official reviews were made, followed with improvement plans.
1.1.5.3. Were the review and evaluation procedures documented in well-designed records?	(0) No, No procedures were documented.	(1) Yes, some procedures were documented in poorly designed records.	(2) Yes, most procedures were documented in records of an average design.	(3) Yes, most procedures were documented in records of a good design.	(4) Yes, all procedures were documented in records of a good design.

Total ratings given to the Means and tools of review and evaluation indicator=

The arithmetic average for the Means and tools of review and evaluation indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

1.2. Sub-criterion Two: The Strategic Plan

The educational institution is expected to establish a process for developing its strategic plan in accordance with its vision, mission, goals and values. The process involves analyzing the internal and external environment and identification of the smart strategic objectives (Specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and time bound). This entails identification of the stakeholders and their roles, communication with, ensuring widest participation by them in planning and identifying the implementation, control, review and measurement structures of the plan. Implementation plans should be developed in all units of the institution in order to implement the stages of the strategic plan. All this should be documented in comprehensive records that show all steps and practices.

The strategic plan will be judged through indicators relating to:

- 1.2.1. Consistency of the outcomes of the strategic analysis of the institution's strategic plan and its domains
- 1.2.2. Coverage of the educational institution's strategic objectives by the strategic objectives
- 1.2.3. Benchmarks on local, regional and global levels
- 1.2.4. Accuracy, clarity and measurability of the objectives
- 1.2.5. Completeness of the elements of the implementation plans
- 1.2.6. Availability of a risk management plan
- 1.2.7. Commitment to the mechanisms and means of review and evaluation

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.2 Sub-criterion Two: The Strategic Plan					
1.2.1. Consistency of the results of strategic analysis with the strategic plan	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.2.1.1. Does the institution have a strategic plan that is written, clear, approved and correlated elements?	(0) Never, No. There is no written plan.	(1) Yes. There is a written plan, unclear, and there is no evidence of its approval.	(2) Yes, there is a written and clear plan, and there is no evidence of its approval.	(3) Yes, there is a written, clear and approved the plan, with uncorrelated elements.	(4) Yes, there is a written, clear and approved the plan, with correlated elements.
1.2.1.2. Were the strategic objectives of the institution identified on the basis of its vision, mission and the results of environmental analysis?	(0) Never, No. The objectives were no identified.	(1) Yes, they were identified in light of the vision.	(2) Yes, they were identified in light of the vision and mission.	(3) Yes, they were identified in light of the vision, mission and the results of the internal analysis.	(4) Yes, they were identified in light of the vision, mission and the results of the internal and external analysis.
1.2.1.3. Does the strategic plan highlight the results of the environmental analysis (strong points, weak points, opportunities and challenges)?	(0) Never, No. The environmental analysis was not conducted.	(1) Yes, they highlight the institution's strong points.	(2) Yes, they highlight the institution's strong points and weak points.	(3) Yes, they highlight the institution's strong points, weak points and the available opportunities.	(4) Yes, they highlight the institution's strong points, weak points and the opportunities and challenges.

Total ratings given to the Consistency of the results of strategic analysis with the strategic plan indicator=

The arithmetic average for the Consistency of the results of strategic analysis with the strategic plan indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.2 Sub-criterion Two: The strategic Plan					
1.2.2. The strategic objectives' coverage of the institution's goals	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.2.2.1. Do the strategic objectives cover all the educational institution's goals?	(0) Never, No. They do not cover any of the goals.	(1) Yes, they cover one goal.	(2) Yes, they cover few goals.	(3) Yes, they cover most goals.	(4) Yes, they cover all goals.
1.2.2.2. Does the strategic planning process cover all academic and administrative units?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, they cover 25% of the units.	(2) Yes, they cover 50% of the units.	(3) Yes, they cover 75% of the units.	(4) Yes, they cover all units.
1.2.2.3. Does the strategic planning process cover all concerned parties?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, they cover the staff of the institution.	(2) Yes, they cover the staff and students of the institution.	(3) Yes, they cover the staff, students and the supporting parties.	(4) Yes, they cover all stakeholders.

Total ratings given to the strategic objectives' coverage of the strategic goals indicator=

The arithmetic average for the strategic objectives' coverage of the strategic goals =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.2 Sub-criterion Two: The strategic Plan					
1.2.3. Local, regional and global benchmarks	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.2.3.1. Did the institution make any benchmarking during the environmental analysis process?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it made benchmarking with itself.	(2) Yes. It made self-benchmarking and with similar local institutions.	(3) Yes. It made self-benchmarking and with similar local and regional institutions.	(4) Yes. It made self-benchmarking and with similar local, regional and global institutions.
1.2.3.2. Did the institution identify the key performance indicators during the environmental analysis process?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there are weak references to indicators of some objectives.	(2) Yes. There are indicators for some objectives.	(3) Yes. There are indicators for most of the objectives.	(4) Yes. There are indicators for all the objectives.
1.2.3.3. What is the quality level of the key performance indicators of the strategic objectives?	(0) Very poor. Most of them lack all quality elements (relevance, validity, stability and simplicity).	(1) Poor, most of them include one of the quality elements (relevance, validity, stability and simplicity).	(2) Average. Most of them include two of the quality elements (relevance, validity, stability and simplicity).	(3) Good. Most of them include three of the quality elements (relevance, validity, stability and simplicity).	(4) Very good. Most of them include all quality elements (relevance, validity, stability and simplicity).
1.2.3.4. Does the institution's implementation plan clarify its current and future situations?	(0) Never. It doesn't clarify its current nor future situation	(1) It partly clarifies the current situation.	(2) It partly clarifies the current and the future situations.	(3) It perfectly clarifies the current situation and partly the future situation.	(4) It perfectly clarifies the current situation and the future situation.

Total ratings given to the Local, regional and global benchmarks indicator=

The arithmetic average for the Local, regional and global benchmarks indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.2 Sub-criterion Two: The strategic Plan					
1.2.4. Accuracy, clarity and measurability of objectives	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.1.4.1. Does the institution have clear and declared objectives?	(0) No, the institution has no any written and declared objectives.	(1) Yes, there are partly clear objectives and known to about 25% of stakeholders.	(2) Yes, there are partly clear objectives and known to about 50% of stakeholders.	(3) Yes, there are perfectly clear objectives and known to about 50% of stakeholders.	(4) Yes, there are partly clear objectives and known to about 75% of stakeholders.
1.1.4.2. Are the objectives achievable and measurable?	(0) Never, No	(1) Yes, some of them are measurable and with low achievability	(2) Yes, all of them are measurable and with low achievability	(3) Yes, all of them are measurable and with average achievability	(4) Yes, all of them are measurable and with high achievability

Total ratings given to the accuracy, clarity and measurability of objectives indicator=

The arithmetic average for the of the ratings given to the accuracy, clarity and measurability of objectives indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.2 Sub-criterion Two: Strategic Plan					
1.2.5. Completeness of the elements of the implementation plan	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.2.5.1. Does the institution involve all its units in preparing the implementation plans?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it involves some administrative or academic units.	(2) Yes, it involves some administrative and academic units.	(3) Yes, it involves most of the administrative or academic units.	(4) Yes, it involves most of the administrative and academic units.
1.2.5.2. Did the institution identify all the responsibilities and tasks of the implementation plan implementation committees?	(0) Never, No. No responsibilities were identified.	(1) Yes, it identified some tasks and responsibilities for some committees.	(2) Yes, it identified some tasks and responsibilities for most of the committees.	(3) Yes, it identified all the tasks and responsibilities for most of the committees.	(4) Yes, it identified all the tasks and responsibilities for all the committees.
1.2.5.3. Are the elements of the institution's implementation plan complete?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it includes a reasonable number of strategic objectives.	(2) Yes, it includes a reasonable number of strategic and sub-objectives and performance indicators.	(3) Yes, it includes a reasonable number of strategic and sub-objectives, performance indicators and initiatives.	(4) Yes, it includes a reasonable number of strategic and sub-objectives, performance indicators, initiatives, responsibilities and resources
1.2.5.4. Is the institution's implementation plan applicable?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, with high costs and many risks.	(2) Yes, with high costs and few risks.	(3) Yes, with reasonable costs and few risks.	(4) Yes, with reasonable costs and no risks at all

Total ratings given to the completeness of the elements of the implementation plan indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Completeness of the elements of the implementation plan indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.2 Sub-criterion Two: Strategic Plan					
1.2.6. Availability of a risk management plan	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.2.6.1. Is there a comprehensive risk management plan?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there is a preliminary plan	(2) Yes, there is a plan that identifies risks and assesses their sizes.	(3) Yes, there is a plan that identifies risks and assesses their sizes and effects.	(4) Yes, there is a plan that identifies risks and assesses their sizes, effects and possible solutions.

Total ratings given to the availability of a risk management plan indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the availability of a risk management plan indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

1. Criterion One: Strategic Planning					
1.2 Sub-criterion Two: Strategic Plan					
1.2.7. Adherence to mechanisms for review and evaluation and their means.	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
1.2.7.1. Does the institution show adherence to the procedures for review and evaluation and their means	(0) Never, No	(1) There is poor adherence.	(2) There is an average adherence.	(3) There is high adherence.	(4) There is perfect adherence.

Total of the ratings given to the adherence to mechanisms and means of review and evaluation indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the adherence to mechanisms and means of review and evaluation indicator=

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion One: Strategic Planning		
1.1.1.	Accuracy of formulation and clarity:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
1.1.2.	Methodology of Preparation:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
1.1.3.	Compatibility and consistency:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
1.1.4.	Means of awareness raising and information:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
1.1.5.	Means of review and evaluation:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
1.2.1.	Coverage of objectives:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
1.2.2.	Consistency of the analysis and the plan:	Rating () X Number of items (3) = Rating () X Number of items (4) =
1.2.3.	Benchmarks:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
1.2.4.	Accuracy of objectives:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
1.2.5.	Completeness of the elements of the plan:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
1.2.6.	Availability of a risk management plan:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
1.2.7.	Adherence to the means of review:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
General Rating:	Total number of points _____ = _____ = <div style="text-align: center;">35</div> Total number of items	
The level achieved:		

2. Criterion Two: Governance

2.1. Sub-criterion One: Legislations

The institution should have a process for issuing various legislations, such as regulations, instructions and policies. These shall be circulated to the concerned parties, reviewed and applied. This process shall include guarantees of perfect consistency of the procedures with the regulations and instructions.

Legislations shall be evaluated through the following indicators:

- 2.1.1. Issuance of regulations, instructions and policies**
- 2.1.2. Compatibility and consistency**
- 2.1.3. Evaluation, review and development**
- 2.1.4. Documentation and publication**

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

Descriptive Assessment of Performance					
1. Criterion Two: Governance					
2.1. Sub-criterion One: Legislations					
2.1.1. Issuance of regulations, instructions and policies	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.1.1.1. Are there declared policies in the areas of the institution's work?	(0) No, the institution did not present any policies.	(1) Yes, there are declared policies in one area.	(2) Yes, there are declared policies in some areas of its work.	(3) Yes, there are declared policies in most of the areas of its work.	(4) Yes, there are declared policies in all areas of its work.
2.1.1.2. Did the institution issue the regulations provided for in the laws?	(0) Never, No	(1) Yes, it issued a limited number of regulations.	(2) Yes, it issued an acceptable number of insufficient regulations.	(3) Yes, it issued a good number of regulations.	(4) Yes, it issued all the regulations provided for in the laws.
2.1.1.3. Did the institution issue the instructions provided for in the regulations?	(0) Never, No	(1) Yes, it issued a limited number of instructions.	(2) Yes, it issued an acceptable number of insufficient instructions.	(3) Yes, it issued a good number of instructions.	(4)

Total ratings given to the issuance of regulations, instructions and policies indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Issuance of regulations, instructions and indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

2. Criterion Two: Governance					
2.1. Sub-criterion One: Legislations					
2.1.2. Compatibility and consistency:	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.1.2.1. What is the degree of consistency of the principles, procedures and standards applied at the institution with the regulations and instructions?	(0) The institution did not provide any principles, procedures or standards.	(1) The offered information indicates poor compatibility.	(2) The offered information indicates average compatibility.	(3) The offered information indicates good compatibility.	(4) The offered information indicates poor compatibility.

Total ratings given to the compatibility and consistency indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the compatibility and consistency indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

2. Criterion Two: Governance					
2.1. Sub-criterion One: Legislations					
2.1.3. Evaluation, review and development	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.1.3. 1. Were the legislations reviewed and developed periodically and regularly?	(0) Never, No. The legislations were not reviewed or developed.	(1) Yes, they were reviewed and developed once.	(2) Yes, they were reviewed and developed on need.	(3) Yes, they were reviewed and developed several times.	(4) Yes, they were reviewed and developed periodically and regularly.
2.1.3.2. Is the feedback provided by concerned parties taken into consideration in the evaluation and amendment of legislations?	(0) The institution did not provide proof of measuring feedback.	(1) There is feedback from a limited number of concerned parties, and it is not taken into consideration.	(2) There is feedback from most of the concerned parties, and some of it is taken into consideration.	(3) There is feedback from all concerned parties, and most of it is taken into consideration.	(4) There is feedback from all concerned parties, and all of it is taken into consideration.

Total ratings given to the Evaluation, review and development indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Evaluation, review and development indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

2. Criterion Two: Governance					
2.1. Sub-criterion One: Legislations					
2.1.4. Documentation and publication	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.1.4.1. Are the institution's legislations published in multiple and effective means?	(0) No, they haven't been published by any means.	(1) Yes, they were published in means with poor effectiveness that reach a small percentage of concerned parties.	(2) Yes, they were published in means with an average effectiveness that reach a small group of concerned parties.	(3) Yes, they were published in means of high effectiveness that reach a high percentage of concerned parties.	(4) Yes, they were published in very effective means that reach all concerned parties.
2.1.4.2. Are there effective procedures at the institution for documenting legislations?	(0) There are no procedures at the institution for documenting legislations.	(1) There are procedures for documenting some legislations.	(2) There are procedures for documenting all legislations.	(3) There are effective electronic procedures for documenting all legislations and keeping data.	(4) There are effective electronic procedures for documenting all legislations and they are periodically evaluated.

Total ratings given to the Documentation and publication indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Documentation and publication indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

2.2. Sub-criterion Two: Leadership and Management

The institution must have a process that regulates its organizational structure and clarifies the relationship between various administrative levels and councils. The process should include procedures for reviewing and updating the organizational structure in accordance with the legislations and the institution's strategic needs and reviewing the terms of reference of the various councils and committees and the job description of the decision maker and the various administrative bodies.

The institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

- 2.2.1. Availability of organizational structures and mechanisms for their adoption, approval and review
- 2.2.2. Availability of governance boards and determining their tasks and responsibilities
- 2.2.3. The mechanism for identifying, documenting and reviewing the job description
- 2.2.4. Procedures for performance evaluation and accountability

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

2.Criterion Two: Governance					
2.2 Sub-criterion Two: Leadership and Management					
2.2.1. Availability of organizational structures and mechanisms for their adoption, approval and review	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.2.1.1. Does the institution have total or partial organizational structures covering the academic and administrative areas?	(0) There are no organizational structures.	(1) There are organizational structures that cover one area, either the academic or the administrative area.	(2) There are un-updated organizational structures that cover some academic and administrative aspects.	(3) There are updated organizational structures that cover most of the academic and administrative aspects.	(4) There are updated organizational structures that cover all academic and administrative aspects.
2.2.1.2. Does the institution have a mechanism for building, approval, review and development of organizational structures so that they remain compatible with developments and needs?	(0) There is no mechanism for building organizational structures.	(1) Yes, there is a suitable mechanism for building organizational structures.	(2) Yes, there is a suitable mechanism for building and approval of organizational structures.	(3) Yes, there is a suitable mechanism for building, approval and development of organizational structures.	(4) Yes, there is a suitable mechanism for building, approval and development of organizational structures so that they remain compatible with developments and needs

Total ratings given to the Availability of organizational structure indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Availability of organizational structures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities

:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

2.Criterion Two: Governance					
2.2 Sub-criterion Two: Leadership and Management					
2.2.2. Availability of governance boards and determining their tasks and responsibilities	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.2.2.1. Are there at the institution governance boards at all levels?	(0) There are no governance boards at the institution	(1) There are governance boards at institution level.	(2) There are governance boards at the level of the institution and its faculties.	(3) There are governance boards at the level of the institution and its faculties and centres.	(4) There are governance boards at the level of the institution and its faculties, centres and academic departments.
2.2.2.2. Were the tasks and responsibilities of the various governance boards identified and documented?	(0) The tasks and responsibilities of the governance boards have not been identified.	(1) Some of the tasks and responsibilities of some governance boards have been identified, but not documented.	(2) Some of the tasks and responsibilities of some governance boards have been identified and documented.	(3) All the tasks and responsibilities of most of the governance boards have been identified and documented.	(4) All the tasks and responsibilities of all the governance boards have been identified and documented.
2.2.2.3. Are the tasks and responsibilities of the various governance boards reviewed at the institution?	(0) The tasks and responsibilities of the governance boards have not been reviewed.	(1) Some of the tasks and responsibilities of some governance boards have been reviewed.	(2) Most of the tasks and responsibilities of some governance boards are reviewed.	(3) All the tasks and responsibilities of most of the governance boards have been reviewed	(4) All the tasks and responsibilities of all the governance boards have been reviewed
2.2.2.4. Is the performance of the institution's governance boards reviewed and evaluated?	(0) The performance of the governance boards has not been reviewed nor evaluated.	(1) The performance of some governance boards is reviewed and evaluated every five years..	(2) The performance of most of the governance boards is reviewed and evaluated every five years.	(3) The performance of most of governance boards is reviewed and evaluated every two years.	(4) The performance of most of the governance boards is reviewed and evaluated annually

Total ratings given to the governance board indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the governance board indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

2.Criterion Two: Governance					
2.2 Sub-criterion Two: Leadership and Management					
2.2.3. The mechanism for identifying, documenting and reviewing the job description	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.2.3.1. Have the job descriptions of all institution jobs been identified and documented?	(0) The institution has no job descriptions.	(1) The institution has undocumented job descriptions for some jobs.	(2) The institution has documented job descriptions for some jobs.	(3) The institution has job descriptions for most jobs, but some of them are not documented.	(4) The institution has documented job descriptions for all jobs.
2.2.3.2. Are the institution's jobs reviewed and developed periodically and in consistency with developments?	(0) The institution's jobs have not been reviewed and developed.	(1) Some of the institution jobs were reviewed, but that wasn't followed with any development.	(2) Most of the institution jobs were reviewed, and some of them were developed.	(3) All institution jobs were reviewed, and that was followed with development of most of them.	(4) All institution jobs were reviewed in a regular periodic manner.

Total ratings given to the identification, documentation and review of the job description indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to identification, documentation and review of the job description indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

2.Criterion Two: Governance					
2.2 Sub-criterion Two: Leadership and Management					
2.2.4. Procedures for performance evaluation and accountability	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.2.4.1. Is the performance of all institution staff evaluated in light of the job descriptions of each of them?	(0) No performance evaluation of the institution staff is made.	(1) The performance of some staff is made, irregularly.	(2) The performance of all staff is made, irregularly.	(3) The performance of all staff is made, periodically and regularly.	(4) The performance of some staff is made, periodically and regularly, and they are made aware of the evaluation.
2.2.4.2. Are there specific procedures for accountability in case of default in performing the duties included in job descriptions?	(0) There are no procedures for accountability.	(1) There are procedures for accountability that cover some cases of default.	(2) There are procedures for accountability that cover most of the cases of default, but they are not applied.	(3) There are applied procedures for accountability that cover most of the cases of default.	(4) There are applied procedures for accountability that cover all cases of default.
2.2.4.3. Are the procedures for performance evaluation and accountability reviewed and developed?	(0) Procedures for performance evaluation and accountability have not been reviewed or developed.	(1) Some procedures for performance evaluation and accountability are reviewed.	(2) Most of the procedures for performance evaluation and accountability are reviewed and developed intermittently.	(3) Most of the procedures for performance evaluation and accountability are reviewed and developed.	(4) Most of the procedures for performance evaluation and accountability are reviewed and developed regularly.
2.2.4.4. Are there policies and procedures for evaluation of governance boards and the senior management at the institution?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there are some policies, but they are not applied.	(2) Yes, there are some policies and procedures, but they are partly applied sometimes.	(3) Yes, there are some policies and procedures, but they are partly applied in most cases.	(4) Yes, there are some policies and procedures, and they are perfectly applied in all cases.

Total ratings given to the evaluation and accountability indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the evaluation and accountability indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

2.3. Sub-criterion Three: Institutional Integrity

The institution shall apply integrity in all its actions, attainment of justice, granting prizes, issuance of sanctions and follow-up of grievances. Institutions shall be evaluated on the basis of this criterion through the following indicators:

2.3.1. Application of transparency in all institution actions

2.3.2. Procedures for attainment of justice and equal opportunities

2.3.3. Principles and procedures for granting incentives, issuance of sanctions and follow-up of grievances.

2.Criterion Two: Governance					
2.2 Sub-criterion Three: Institutional Integrity					
2.3.1. Application of transparency in the implementation of all institution actions	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.3.1.1 Does the institution apply integrity in the implementation of all its actions?	(0) Never, No	(1) It presented little information on the application of transparency in some of its actions.	(2) It presented adequate information on the application of transparency in some of its actions.	(3) It presented adequate information on the application of transparency in most of its actions.	(4) It presented adequate information on the application of transparency in all its actions.
2.3.1.2. Is there transparency in appointing members and heads of governance boards?	(0) There is no transparency in appointing any of them.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.3.1.3. Is the transparency policy documented, published and evaluated clearly and in an integrated form?	(0) No, The transparency policy has not been documented, published or evaluated.	(1) Sometimes there is transparency in appointing a small number of them.	(2) In most cases there is transparency in appointing a small number of them.	(3) There is always transparency in appointing most of them.	(4) There is always transparency in appointing all of them.

Total ratings given to the transparency application indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the transparency application indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

2.Criterion Two: Governance					
2.3. Sub-criterion Three: Institutional Integrity					
2.3.2. Procedures for Attainment of justice and equal opportunities	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.3.2.1. Are there procedures for the attainment of justice and equal chances at the institution?	(0) There are no policies or procedures.	(1) There are some procedures, but they are not applied.	(2) There are some policies and procedures that are applied in some cases.	(3) There are some policies and procedures that are applied in most cases.	(4) There are policies and procedures that are effectively applied in all cases.
2.3.2.2. Does the institution apply the disciplinary sanctions fairly?	(0) The institution does not apply any sanctions fairly.	(1) Yes, sanctions are applied fairly on a very small number of violations.	(2) Yes, sanctions are applied fairly on a small number of violations.	(3) Yes, sanctions are applied fairly on a large number of violations.	(4) Yes, sanctions are applied fairly on all violations.

Total ratings given to the procedures for attainment of justice and equal chances indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings of the procedures for attainment of justice and equal chances indicator=

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

2.Criterion Two: Governance					
2.3. Sub-criterion Three: Institutional Integrity					
2.3.3. Procedures for granting incentives, issuance of sanctions and follow-up of grievances	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
2.3.3.1. Does the institution apply transparent principles and procedures in granting incentives to those deserving?	(0) There are no principles or procedures for granting incentives.	(1) There are principles and procedures for granting incentives, but they are not applied.	(2) Sometimes transparent principles and procedures for granting incentives are applied.	(3) In most cases transparent principles and procedures for granting incentives are applied	(4) Transparent principles and procedures for granting incentives are always applied.
2.3.3.2. Does the institution apply transparent procedures in the issuance of sanctions in accordance with approved legislations?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Sometimes transparent procedures are applied in issuance of some sanctions.	(2)	(3)	(4)
2.3.3.3. Are the principles and procedures for incentives, disciplinary sanctions and grievance cases applied at the institution documented and published in a clear and integrated manner?	(0) There is no documentation or publication thereof.	(1) There is poor documentation thereof but no publication.	(2) There is good documentation thereof, and some of them are published.	(3) There is good documentation thereof, and most of them are published.	(4) There is excellent documentation thereof, and they are published in all possible means.
2.3.3.4. Are grievance procedures applied transparently in accordance with approved legislations?	(0) Procedures for grievances are not applied.	(1) Procedures for grievances are sometimes applied transparently.	(2) Procedures for grievances are in most cases applied transparently.	(3) Procedures for grievances are always applied transparently.	(4) Procedures for grievances are always applied with clear and declared transparency.
2.3.3.5. Have the principles and procedures for grievance at the institution being reviewed and developed?	(0) They were not reviewed or developed.	(1) Some of them are sometimes reviewed.	(2) Most of them are intermittently reviewed and developed.	(3) Most of the principles and procedures are reviewed and developed.	(4)

Total ratings given to the procedures for granting incentives, issuance of sanctions and follow-up of grievances indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the procedures for granting incentives, issuance of sanctions and follow-up of grievances indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion Two: Strategic Planning		
2.1.1.	Availability and Issuance:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
2.1.2.	Compatibility and Consistency:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
2.1.3.	Evaluation and Review:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
2.1.4.	Documentation and publication:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
2.2.1.	Organizational Structures:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
2.2.2.	Governance Boards:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
2.2.3.	Job Descriptions:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
2.2.4.	Performance Evaluation:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
2.3.1.	Application of Transparency:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
2.3.2.	Attainment of Justice:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
2.3.3.	Granting of Incentives:	Rating () X Number of items (5) =
General Rating:	Total number of points $\frac{\text{Total number of points}}{\text{Total number of items}} = \frac{\quad}{30} =$ Total number of items	
The level achieved:		

3. Criterion Three: academic programs.

3.1. Sub-Criterion One: Teaching and Learning Policies

The educational institutions are expected to establish a process to clearly reflect the teaching and learning policies. The process should include written procedures for the introduction and development of academic programs, admission and graduation policies, transfer and equalizing of courses policies, and improvement of the teaching and learning methods. All this should be documented in comprehensive records that show all steps and practices.

The teaching and learning policies will be judged through indicators relating to:

- 3.1.1. Policies on Introduction, Development and Termination of Academic Programs
- 3.1.2. Policies and procedures relating to admission and graduation.
- 3.1.3. Policies and procedures for student transfers and equalizing of courses
- 3.1.4. On-going improvement of the teaching and learning methods
- 3.1.5. The relationship between the teaching staff members and the staff working at the library and the databases
- 3.1.6. The role of the councils and their responsibility for the application and follow-up of the teaching and learning policies
- 3.1.7. Publication of anticipated learning outcomes of all academic programs offered
Publication of anticipated learning outcomes of all academic programs offered

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

Descriptive Assessment of Performance					
3. Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.1. Sub-criterion One: Teaching and Learning Policies					
3.1.1. Policies on Introduction, Development and Termination of Academic Programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.1.1.1. Does the institution have documented and declared policies and procedures for the introduction of academic programs?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are documented, declared and partly applied policies and procedures.	(4) Yes, there are documented, declared and perfectly applied policies and procedures.
3.1.1.2. Are the policies and procedures for admission consistent with the institution's mission and the requirements of the academic programs?	(0) Never, No	(1) Yes, few of them are consistent with the institution's mission and the requirements of the programs.	(2) Yes, some of them are consistent with the mission and the requirements of the programs.	(3) Yes, most of them are consistent with the mission and the requirements of the programs.	(4) Yes, all of them are consistent with the mission and the requirements of the programs.
3.1.1.3. Does the institution have documented and declared policies and procedures for the development of academic programs?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are documented, declared and partly applied policies and procedures.	(4) Yes, there are documented, declared and perfectly applied policies and procedures.
3.1.1.4. Does the institution have documented and declared policies and procedures for the termination of academic programs?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are documented, declared and partly applied policies and procedures.	(4) Yes, there are documented, declared and perfectly applied policies and procedures.
3.1.1.5. Does the institution have written and clear mechanisms for the review of the policies and procedures for introducing, development and termination of programs?	(0) The institution has no written and clear mechanisms.	(1) It has written mechanisms, but they are unclear and not applied.	(2) It has written and partly clear mechanisms, but they are not applied.	(3) It has written and partly clear mechanisms, with logically sequenced steps and difficult to apply.	(4) It has written and perfectly clear mechanisms, with logically sequenced steps and easy to apply.
3.1.1.6. Have the academic programs at the institution been developed?	(0) No, none of its programs has been developed.	(1) Yes, one program was developed, in a formal manner, in the previous five years.	(2) Yes, one program was substantially developed, in the previous five years.	(3) Yes, several programs were substantially developed, in the previous five years.	(4) Yes, all programs were substantially developed, in the previous five years.

Total ratings given to the Policies on Introduction, Development and Termination of Academic Programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies on Introduction, Development and Termination of Academic Programs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3.Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.1. Sub-criterion One: Teaching and Learning Policies					
3.1.2. Policies and Procedures related to Admission and Graduation	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.1.2.1. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for student admission?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are unclear and partly applied.	(3) . Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, but they are partly applied	(4) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, and they are perfectly applied
3.1.2.2. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for graduation and granting scientific degrees?	(0) Never, No. The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and with low adherence thereto.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and adherence thereto is average..	(3) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, and adherence thereto is average..	(4) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, and adherence thereto is high.
3.1.2.3. Are there at the institution documented and declared instructions and principles for success and failure?	(0) Never, No. The institution did not provide any documented principles or instructions.	(1) Yes, there are documented instructions and principles, but they are not declared and with low adherence thereto.	(2) Yes, there are documented procedures and principles, but they are not declared and adherence thereto is average.	(3) Yes, there are documented and declared procedures and principles, and adherence thereto is average..	(4) Yes, there are documented and declared procedures and principles, and adherence thereto is high.
3.1.2.4. Are there at the institution written and clear procedures for keeping grades?	(0) There are no any written and clear procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are unclear and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, but they are not applied.	(3) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures. Their steps are logically sequenced and difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear procedures. Their steps are logically sequenced and easy to apply.
3.1.2.5. Are there at the institution documented and declared instructions and principles for success and failure?	(0) There are no written and clear procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are unclear and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, but they are not applied	(3) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures. Their steps are logically sequenced and difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear procedures. Their steps are logically sequenced and easy to apply.

Total ratings given to the Policies and Procedures related to Admission and Graduation indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies and Procedures related to Admission and Graduation indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.1. Sub-criterion One: Teaching and learning policies					
3.1.3. Policies and procedures for student transfer and equalizing of courses	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.1.3.1. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for student transfer internally and externally?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are documented, declared and partly applied policies and procedures.	(4) Yes, there are documented, declared and perfectly applied policies and procedures
3.1.3.2. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for equalizing courses of study?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are good, documented, declared and partly applied policies and procedures.	(4) Yes, there are documented, declared and perfectly applied policies and procedures.
3.1.3.3. Are there at the institution procedures for reviewing policies and procedures for student transfer and equalizing courses of study?	(0) There are no any written and clear procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are not declared and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, but they are not applied.	(3) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures. Their steps are logically sequenced and difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear procedures. Their steps are logically sequenced and easy to apply.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for student transfer and equalizing of courses indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and procedures for student transfer and equalizing of courses indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.1. Sub-criterion One: Teaching and learning policies					
3.1.4. On-going improvement of the teaching and learning methods	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.1.4.1. Are there on-going improvement of the teaching and learning methods?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, for about 5% of the programs and courses of study	(2) Yes, for about 10% of the programs and courses of study	(3) . Yes, for about 30% of the programs and courses of study	(4) Yes, for about 50% of the programs and courses of study
3.1.4.2. Are there at the institution written and clear procedures to periodically evaluate program effectiveness?	(0) There are no written and clear procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are unclear and not applied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, but they are not applied.	(3) Yes, there are written and party clear procedures, logically sequenced and difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear procedures, logically sequenced and easy to apply.
3.1.4.3. Are there at the institution plans for improving academic programs?	(0) No plans were presented for improving the academic programs.	(1) The plans presented are unfinished and the improvement is unnoted.	(2) The plans presented are completed and the improvement is noted to a small extent.	(3) . The plans presented are completed and the improvement is noted to an average extent.	(4) The plans presented are excellent and the improvement is noted to a large extent.
3.1.4.4. Do the various specialized parties participate in supporting and enhancing the teaching and learning processes?	(0) The institution did not provide any results about the subject.	(1) The institution presented results indicating poor contributions.	(2) The institution presented results indicating average contributions.	(3) . The institution presented results indicating good contributions.	(4) The institution presented results indicating excellent contributions.

Total ratings given to the on-going improvement of the teaching and learning methods indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the on-going improvement of the teaching and learning methods indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.1. Sub-criterion One: Teaching and learning policies					
3.1.5. The relationship between the teaching staff members and the staff working at the library and the databases	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.1.5.1. Are there procedures that explain the relationship between the teaching staff members and the staff working at the library and the databases	(0) The institution did not provide any procedures.	(1) Yes, the institution presented poor procedures.	(2) Yes, the institution presented average procedures.	(3) Yes, the institution presented a number of effective procedures.	(4) Yes, the institution presented a number of very effective procedures.

Total ratings given to the relationship between the teaching staff members and the staff working at the library and the databases indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the relationship between the teaching staff members and the staff working at the library and the databases indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.1. Sub-criterion One: Teaching and learning policies					
3.1.6. The role of the councils and their responsibility for the application and follow-up of the teaching and learning policies	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.1.6.1. Do the various councils carry out their role in applying the teaching and learning policies?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, but the role they carry out is unclear and undocumented.	(2) Yes and the role they carry out is partly clear and undocumented.	(3) Yes, and the role they carry out is partly clear and documented.	(4) Yes, and the role they carry out is perfectly clear and documented.
3.1.6.2. Do the various councils follow up the application of the teaching and learning policies?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, but the follow-up is formal and undocumented.	(2) Yes, but the follow-up is formal and undocumented.	(3) Yes, and the follow-up is partly serious and documented.	(4) Yes, and the follow-up is always serious and documented.

Total ratings given to the role of the councils and their responsibility for the application and follow-up of the teaching and learning policies indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to The role of the councils and their responsibility for the application and follow-up of the teaching and learning policies indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.1. Sub-criterion One: Teaching and learning policies					
3.1.7. Publication of anticipated learning outcomes of all academic programs offered	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.1.7.1. Did the institution take action to publish the anticipated learning outcomes of the programs offered?	(0) Never, No. The outcomes are not available.	(1) Yes, for a small number of programs and in ineffective media.	(2) Yes, for all its programs and in effective media.	(3) Yes, for a small number of programs and in effective media.	(4) Yes, for all its programs and in multiple and effective media.
3.1.7.2. How much are the teaching staff members, staff and students aware of the learning outcomes anticipated of the programs offered?	(0) All do not know anything about them.	(1) There is little knowledge on the part of teaching staff members, staff and students.	(2) There is average knowledge on the part of teaching staff members, and little knowledge on the part of staff and students.	(3) There is full knowledge on the part of teaching staff members, and average knowledge on the part of staff and students.	(4) There is full knowledge on the part of teaching staff members, staff and students.
3.1.7.3. Did the institution publish the correlation matrix of the teaching objectives and the learning outcomes of each academic program?	(0) No correlation matrix is unavailable at any of the academic programs.	(1) Yes, it published them for one program.	(2) Yes, it published them for a small number of programs.	(3)	(4)

Total ratings given to the publication of anticipated learning outcomes of all academic programs offered indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the publication of anticipated learning outcomes of all academic programs offered indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

3.2. Sub-Criterion Two: Study Plans

The educational institutions are expected to have a process for developing clear study plans for all the academic programs offered therein and to seek to periodically evaluate and develop these plans. Each institution should develop these plans in a manner that is consistent with its mission and secures its continued ability to ensure the quality of the inputs, processes and outputs of the programs offered. All this should be documented in comprehensive records that show all steps and practices.

The study plans will be judged through indicators relating to:

- 3.2.1. Clarity and integration of the study plans of the offered programs**
- 3.2.2. Extent of consistency of the offered programs with the institution's vision, mission and goals**
- 3.2.3. Policies and procedures for periodic evaluation and development of the study plans**
- 3.2.4. Student academic guidance and counseling programs**
- 3.2.5. Provision of an adequate number of teaching staff and how appropriate are their qualifications and specializations with the offered programs and their levels**
- 3.2.6. Provision of educational resources as required for the academic programs**
- 3.2.7. Policies and procedures for following up the quality assurance of the inputs, processes and outputs of the offered programs**
- 3.2.8. Programs for exchange of students with other educational institutions**
- 3.2.9. Policies on admission into the Higher Diploma, Master's and Doctoral programs**
- 3.2.10. Inclusiveness, cognitive depth and logical sequence of the academic programs offered**
- 3.2.11. Policies and procedures for graduation requirements in respect of postgraduate programs**
- 3.2.12. Instructions and procedures for preparation of scientific dissertations and theses**
- 3.2.13. Adherence to the period allocated for the offered programs**
- 3.2.14. Grants and scholarships offered to postgraduate students**

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.1. Clarity and integration of the study plans of the offered programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.1.1. How much are the study plans of the offered programs clear?	(0) No study plans for the programs were presented.	(1) The plans presented are unclear and poorly designed.	(2) The plans presented are partly clear and of a satisfactory design.	(3) The plans presented are clear and of a good design.	(4) The plans presented are perfectly clear and of an excellent design.
3.2.1.2. Are the study plans of the offered programs integrated?	(0) No study plans for the programs were presented.	(1) The plans presented are poorly integrated.	(2) The plans presented are integrated to an average extent.	(3) The plans presented are integrated to a good extent	(4) The plans presented are integrated to an excellent extent
3.2.1.3. Do the study plan clearly show the general requirements of the offered programs?	(0) No study plans for the programs were presented.	(1) The plans presented show the general requirements of a small number of the offered programs.	(2) The plans presented show the general requirements of about half of the offered programs.	(3) The plans presented show the general requirements of most of the offered programs.	(4) The plans presented show the general requirements of all the offered programs.

Total ratings given to the clarity and integration of the study plans of the offered programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the clarity and integration of the study plans of the offered programs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.2. Extent of consistency of the offered programs with the institution's vision, mission and goals	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.2.1. Do the offered programs consist with the institution's vision, mission and objectives?	(0) No, the institution did not provide any evidence of consistency.	(1) Yes, the institution presented little evidence to poor consistency.	(2) Yes, the institution presented little evidence of satisfactory consistency.	(3) Yes, the institution presented sufficient evidence of satisfactory consistency.	(4) Yes, the institution presented sufficient evidence of excellent consistency.

Total ratings given to the consistency of the offered programs with the institution's vision, mission and objectives indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the consistency of the offered programs with the institution's vision, mission and objectives indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.3. Policies and procedures for the evaluation and development of the study plans	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.3.1. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for periodic evaluation and development of the study plans?	(0) No, the institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, the policies presented are documented, but they are not declared and unapplied.	(2) Yes, the policies are documented, but they are not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, the policies are documented and declared, and they are partly applied.	(4) Yes, the policies are documented, declared, and perfectly applied.
3.2.3.2. . Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for evaluation of the courses of study?	(0) No, the institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are documented, declared and partly applied policies and procedures.	(4) Yes, there are documented, declared, and perfectly applied policies and procedures are.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for evaluation and periodic development of study plans indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and procedures for evaluation and development of study plans indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.4. Student academic guidance and counseling programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.4.1. Does the institution provide academic guidance and counseling?	(0) There is no any academic guidance and counseling at the institution>	(1) Yes, it serves 5% of the students as a maximum.	(2) Yes, it serves between 5 and 10% of the students.	(3) Yes, it serves between 10 and 20% of the students.	(4) Yes, it serves more than 20% of the students.
3.2.4.2. Does the institution provide appropriate guides for student academic counseling?	(0) Never, No	(1) Yes, in few programs, and their appropriateness is poor.	(2) Yes, in few programs, and their appropriateness is average.	(3) Yes, in few programs, and their appropriateness is good.	(4) Yes, in few programs, and their appropriateness is high.
3.2.4.3. Are there specific procedures for dealing with students served with warnings for academic reasons?	(0) There are no written and clear procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, but they are unapplied.	(3) Yes, there are procedures that are written, partly clear and applied in many of the programs.	(4) Yes, there are procedures that are written, perfectly clear and applied in all programs.
3.2.4.4. Are there specific mechanisms for dealing with academically outstanding students?	(0) There are no written and clear mechanisms.	(1) Yes, there are written mechanisms, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear mechanisms, but they are unapplied.	(3) Yes, there are mechanisms that are written, partly clear and applied in many of the programs.	(4) Yes, there are mechanisms that are written, perfectly clear and applied in all programs.

Total ratings given to the student academic guidance and counseling programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the student academic guidance and counseling programs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.5. Provision of an adequate number of teaching staff with qualifications and specializations consistent with the offered programs and their levels	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.5.1. Does the institution have the adequate number of teaching staff at the various programs?	(0) All programs have shortages	(1) About 75% of the programs have shortages.	(2) About 50% of the programs have shortages.	(3) About 25% of the programs have shortages.	(4) Level (4) There are no shortages in any of the programs.
3.2.5.2. Are the qualifications of the teaching staff members consistent with the cognitive fields of the offered academic programs?	(0) Less than 25% of the teaching staff members have consistency.	(1) Between 25 and 50% of the teaching staff members have consistency.	(2) Between 50 and 75% of the teaching staff members have consistency.	(3) Between 75 and 99% of the teaching staff members have consistency.	(4) All teaching staff members have consistency.
3.2.5.3. Does the institution have the adequate number of the ranks of the teaching staff members that are consistent with levels of the programs?	(0) Never, No. All programs are in need of teaching staff members of certain grades.	(1) Yes, there is an adequate number of the ranks of teaching staff members in about 25% of the programs	(2) Yes, there is an adequate number of the ranks of teaching staff members in about 50 % of the programs	(3) Yes, there is an adequate number of the ranks of teaching staff members in about 75% of the programs	(4) Yes, there is an adequate number of the ranks of teaching staff members in all programs
3.2.5.4. Does the institution take into consideration the scientific qualifications of the teaching staff at the various programs?	(0) Never, No. Scientific qualifications were not taken into consideration in any of the programs.	(1) Yes, Scientific qualifications were taken into consideration in about 25% of the programs.	(2) Yes, Scientific qualifications were taken into consideration in about 50% of the programs.	(3) Yes, Scientific qualifications were taken into consideration in about 75% of the programs.	(4) Yes, Scientific qualifications were taken into consideration in all programs.

Total ratings given to the provision of an adequate number of teaching staff and appropriateness of their qualifications indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the provision of an adequate number of teaching staff and appropriateness of their qualifications indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.6. Provision of educational resources required for the academic programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.6.1. Does the institution provide the educational resources required for the offered academic programs?	(0) The available resources are little and with low quality.	(1) The available resources are little and with average quality.	(2) The available resources are reasonable and with average quality.	(3) The available resources are abundant and with average quality.	(4) The available resources are abundant and with high quality.
3.2.6.2. Does the institution provide teaching rooms and labs with equipment adequate for implementing the offered academic programs?	(0) The number of rooms and labs and their equipment is inadequate to implement any program.	(1) The number of rooms and labs and their equipment is adequate to implement one program.	(2) The number of rooms and labs and their equipment is adequate to implement some of the offered programs.	(3) The number of rooms and labs and their equipment is adequate to implement most of the offered programs.	(4) The number of rooms and labs and their equipment is adequate to implement all offered programs.
3.2.6.3. Does the institution provide the means of communication and information technology as needed for the offered academic programs?	(0) Yes, in a little quantity and not advanced	(1) Yes, in a little quantity and advanced to a small degree	(2) Yes, in a reasonable quantity and advanced to an average degree	(3) Yes, in a large quantity and advanced to an average degree	(4) Yes, in a large quantity and advanced to a large degree

Total ratings given to the provision of educational resources required for the academic programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the provision of educational resources required for the academic programs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.7. Policies and procedures for following up of the quality assurance of the inputs, processes and outputs of the offered programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.7.1. Are there documented and declared policies and procedures for follow-up of the quality assurance of the inputs, processes and outputs of the offered programs	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and partly applied not in a periodic manner.	(3) Yes, there are documented, declared and partly and periodically applied policies and procedures.	(4) Yes, there are documented, declared and perfectly and periodically applied policies and procedures.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for follow-up of the quality assurance of the inputs, processes and outputs of the offered programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies and procedures for follow-up of the quality assurance of the inputs, processes and outputs of the offered programs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.8. Programs for exchange of students with other educational institutions	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.8.1. Does the institution have programs for exchange of students with other educational institutions?	(0) Never, No. There are not any programs for exchange of students.	(1) Yes, the available information indicates the availability of one program, but it is unapplied.	(2) Yes, the available information indicates implementation of one program in cooperation with a national institution.	(3) Yes, the available information indicates implementation of one program with a global institution.	(4) Yes, the available information indicates implementation of several programs with national and global institutions.
3.2.8.2. What is the number of students benefiting from exchange of students with other institutions?	(0) No student benefited.	(1) Statistics show that beneficiaries were less than 5 in the previous five years.	(2) Statistics show that beneficiaries were between five and ten in the previous five years.	(3) Statistics show that beneficiaries were between eleven and fifty in the previous five years.	(4) Statistics show that beneficiaries were more than fifty in the previous five years, and the number is increasing.

Total ratings given to the programs for exchange of students with other educational institutions indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the programs for exchange of students with other educational institutions indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.9. Policies on admission into the Higher Diploma, Master's and Doctoral programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.9.1. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for student admission into the Higher Diploma program?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies and procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared, i.e., an open-door policy.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared. They are close to the open-door policy.	(3) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, which are selective and based on application of strict admission criteria.	(4) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, which are extremely selective and based on application of strict admission criteria.
3.2.9.2. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for student admission into the Master's program?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies and procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared, i.e., an open-door policy.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared. They are close to the open-door policy.	(3) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, and they are selective.	(4) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, which are of a high degree of selectivity.
3.2.9.3. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for student admission into the Doctoral program?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies and procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared, i.e., an open-door policy.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared. They are close to the open-door policy.	(3) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, and they are selective.	(4) Yes, there are documented and declared policies and procedures, which are of a high degree of selectivity.

Total ratings given to the policies on admission into the Higher Diploma, Master's and Doctoral programs Policies on admission into the Higher Diploma, Master's and Doctoral programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies on admission into the Higher Diploma, Master's and Doctoral programs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.10. Inclusiveness, cognitive depth and logical sequence of the academic programs offered	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.10.1. What is the level of achievement of inclusiveness (theoretical and practical) of the plans for the postgraduate programs offered?	(0) Very poor. No program achieves inclusiveness.	(1) Poor. Inclusiveness is achieved in a small number of programs.	(2) Average. Inclusiveness is achieved in about half of the programs.	(3) High. Inclusiveness is achieved in most of the programs.	(4) Very high. Inclusiveness is achieved in all programs.
3.2.10.2. What is the level of the focus of the postgraduate studies on the cognitive depth of the specialization?	(0) Very poor. No focus on cognitive depth in sequence in any of the programs offered.	(1) Poor. There is focus on cognitive depth in a small number of programs.	(2) Average. There is focus on cognitive depth in about half of the offered programs.	(3) High. There is focus on cognitive depth in most of the offered programs.	(4) Very high. There is focus on cognitive depth in all the offered programs.
3.2.10.3. What is the level of the logical sequence of the courses of study of the plans for the postgraduate programs offered?	(0) Very poor. No logical sequence in any of the offered programs.	(1) Poor. There is a logical sequence in a small number of the offered programs.	(2) Average. There is a logical sequence in about half of the offered programs.	(3) High. There is a logical sequence in most of the offered programs.	(4) Very high. There is a logical sequence in all offered programs.

Total ratings given to the inclusiveness, cognitive depth and logical sequence of the academic programs offered indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the inclusiveness, cognitive depth and logical sequence of the academic programs offered indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.11. Policies and procedures for graduation requirements in respect of postgraduate programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.11.1. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for graduation at the Higher Diploma?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but not declared and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented, declared and partly applied.	(4) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented, declared and perfectly applied.
3.2.11.2. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for graduation at the Master's program?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but not declared and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented, declared and partly applied.	(4) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented, declared and perfectly applied.
3.2.11.3. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for graduation at the Doctoral program?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but not declared and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but not declared and partly applied.	(3) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented, declared and partly applied.	(4) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented, declared and perfectly applied.

Total ratings given to the Policies and procedures for graduation requirements in respect of postgraduate programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies and procedures for graduation requirements in respect of postgraduate programs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.12. Instructions and procedures for preparation of scientific dissertations and theses	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.12.1. Are there written and clear instructions and procedures for preparation of scientific dissertations and theses?	(0) There are no written or clear instructions and procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written instructions, but not clear and help students to a small degree.	(2) Yes, there are written and clear instructions that help students to an average degree.	(3) Yes, there are written and clear instructions that help students to a high degree.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear instructions that help students to a very high degree.
3.2.12.2. What is the level of adherence to the instructions on defense, and the seriousness of the defense, of theses and dissertations?	(0) Very poor. No adherence; and all discussions are a dummy.	(1) Very poor. Little adherence; and the level of seriousness is poor in most of the discussions.	(2) Average. There is reasonable adherence, and the level of seriousness is average in most of the discussions.	(3) High. There is reasonable adherence, and the level of seriousness is high in most of the discussions.	(4) Very high. There is strong adherence; and the level of seriousness is high in all discussions.

Total ratings given to the instructions and procedures for preparation of scientific dissertations and theses indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the instructions and procedures for preparation of scientific dissertations and theses indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.13. adherence to the period allocated for the offered programs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.13.1. Does the institution adhere to the period allocated for the offered program	(0) There is no evidence of the institution's adherence to the period allocated for the offered program	(1) There is little evidence of poor adherence by the institution to the period.	(2) There is little evidence of reasonable adherence by the institution to the period.	(3) There is sufficient evidence by the institution to the period.	(4) There is sufficient and strong evidence of excellent adherence by the institution to the period.

Total ratings given to the adherence to the period allocated for the offered programs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the adherence to the period allocated for the offered program indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.2. Sub-criterion Two: Study Plans					
3.2.14. Grants and scholarships offered to postgraduate students	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.2.14.1. Are there written and clear principles and procedures for the subsidies and grants offered to postgraduate students?	(0) There are no written and clear principles and procedures for the subsidies and grants offered to postgraduate students?	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are unclear and there is little transparency in application thereof.	(2) Yes, there are written and clear procedures, and there is average transparency in application thereof.	(3) Yes, there are written and clear procedures, and there is high transparency in application thereof.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear procedures, and there is very high transparency in application thereof.
3.2.14.2. Is there follow-up of the research works and projects conducted by subsidy students?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, in a small number of the postgraduate programs	(2) Yes, in about half of the postgraduate programs	(3) Yes, in 75% of the postgraduate programs offered	(4) Yes, in all the postgraduate programs offered
3.2.14.3. What is the number of students benefiting from subsidies and grants?	(0) Statistics show that no student benefited.	(1) Statistics show that the number is one student in a small number of programs.	(2) Statistics show that the number is one student in most of the programs.	(3) Statistics show that the number is more than one student in most of the programs.	(4) Statistics show that the number is more than one student in all programs.

Total ratings given to the subsidies and grants offered to postgraduate students indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the subsidies and grants offered to postgraduate students indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

3.3. Sub-criterion Three: Evaluation of Educational Outcomes

The educational institutions are expected to establish a process for evaluating the learning outcomes. This process should include evaluation of student performance and teaching staff members and compatibility of the learning outcomes with the labour market requirements, including the provision of appropriate training. All this should be documented in comprehensive records that show all steps and practices.

The evaluation of educational outcomes will be judged through indicators relating to:

- 3.3.1. Policies and procedures for the student performance evaluation process**
- 3.3.2. Policies and procedures for the teaching staff members' evaluation process**
- 3.3.3. Compatibility and consistency of educational outcomes with the labour market requirements**
- 3.3.4. Cooperation agreements related to student training**

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.3. Sub-criterion Two: Evaluation of Educational Outcomes					
3.3.1. Policies and procedures for the student performance evaluation process	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.3.1.1. Does the institution have documented and declared policies and procedures for evaluating student performance?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and applied in some courses	(2) Yes, there are documented policies and procedures, but they are not declared and applied in about half of the courses	(3) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented and declared and applied in most of the courses	(4) Yes, there are policies and procedures that are documented and declared and applied in all courses
3.3.1.2. Does the institution conduct analytical studies of the student results?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, the institution conducted occasional studies.	(2) Yes, the institution conducted poor analytical studies of students' results without making recommendations for improvement.	(3) Yes, the institution conducted good analytical studies of students' results which resulted in recommendations for improvement.	(4) Yes, the institution conducted excellent analytical studies of students' results which resulted in recommendations for substantial improvement.
3.3.1.3. Does the institution apply tools for measuring students' achievement of learning outcomes?	(0) No, there are no tools.	(1) There are tools that measure some learning outcomes of some programs.	(2) There are tools that measure most of the learning outcomes of most of the programs.	(3) There are tools that measure all learning outcomes of most of all programs.	(4) There are tools that measure all learning outcomes of most of all programs with excellent results.
3.3.1.4. What is the extent of diversification of the forms of student evaluation?	(0) Very poor. One evaluation form is used.	(1) Poor. Two evaluation forms are used.	(2) Average. Three evaluation forms are used.	(3) High. Four evaluation forms are used.	(4) Very high. Five or more evaluation forms are used.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for the student performance evaluation process indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies and procedures for the student performance evaluation process indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.3. Sub-criterion Two: Evaluation of Educational Outcomes					
3.3.2. Policies and procedures for the teaching staff members evaluation process	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.3.2.1. Does the institution have documented policies and procedures for evaluating the teaching staff members' performance?	(0) The institution did not provide any documented policies or procedures.	(1) Yes, but they are unapplied.	(2) Yes, and they are applied on a small random sample of the teaching staff members.	(3) Yes, and they are applied on a large random sample of the teaching staff members.	(4) Yes, and they are applied to all teaching staff members.
3.3.2.2. Does the institution conduct analytical studies of the outcomes of the evaluation of the teaching staff members?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, but they are occasional.	(2) Yes, and they are of a poor design and did not result in any recommendations for improvement.	(3) Yes, and they are of a good design and resulted in recommendations for improvement.	(4) Yes, and they are of an excellent design and resulted in recommendations for substantial improvement.
3.3.2.3. What is the level of the total performance of the teaching staff members from student perspectives?	(0) The institution did not provide any results about that.	(1) The presented results indicate a poor level.	(2) The presented results indicate an average level.	(3) The presented results indicate a good level.	(4) The presented results indicate an excellent level.
3.3.2.4. What is the extent of diversification of the forms of teaching staff members' evaluation?	(0) Very poor. No evaluation form was used.	(1) Poor. One evaluation form is used.	(2) Average. Two evaluation forms are used.	(3) High. Three evaluation forms are used.	(4) Very high. Four or more evaluation forms are used.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for the teaching staff members evaluation process indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and procedures for the teaching staff members evaluation process indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.3. Sub-criterion Two: Evaluation of Educational Outcomes					
3.3.3. Compatibility and consistency of educational outcomes with the labour market requirements	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.3.3.1. Are the educational program outcomes consistent with labour market requirements?	(0) There is no evidence of consistency.	(1) There is little evidence that indicates poor consistency.	(2) There is little evidence that indicates average consistency.	(3) There is sufficient evidence that indicates good consistency.	(4) There is sufficient and strong evidence that indicate excellent consistency.
3.3.3.2. Did the institution conduct analytical studies of the needs and requirements of the labour market?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, in a small number of programs	(2) Yes, in about half of the programs	(3) Yes, in most of the programs	(4) Yes, in all programs
3.3.3.3. What is the total level of the student evaluation of the educational outcomes of the educational programs?	(0) Very poor. Less than 10% of them see that they meet the market need.	(1) Poor. Less than 20% of them see that they meet the market need.	(2) Average. About 50% of them see that they meet the market need.	(3) Hi. About 80% of them see that they meet the market need.	(4) Very high. More than 90% of them see that they meet the market need.
3.3.3.4. What is the total level of the teaching staff members' evaluation of the outcomes of the educational programs?	(0) Very poor. Less than 10% of them see that they meet the market need.	(1) Poor. About 20% of them see that they meet the market need.	(2) Average. About 50% of them see that they meet the market need.	(3) High. About 80 % of them see that they meet the market need.	(4) Very high. More than 90% of them see that they meet the market need.
3.3.3.5. What is the total level of the employers' evaluation of the outcomes of the educational programs?	(0) Very poor. Less than 10% of them see that they meet the market need.	(1) Poor. About 20% of them see that they meet the market need.	(2) Average. About 50% of them see that they meet the market need.	(3) High. About 80 % of them see that they meet the market need.	(4) Very high. More than 90% of them see that they meet the market need.

Total ratings given to the compatibility and consistency of educational outcomes with the labour market requirements indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Compatibility and consistency of educational outcomes with the labour market requirements indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

3 Criterion Three: Academic Programs					
3.3. Sub-criterion Two: Evaluation of Educational Outcomes					
3.3.4. Cooperation agreements related to student training	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
3.3.4.1. Are there cooperation agreements and partnerships between the institution and other parties for training its students?	(0) The institution has no cooperation agreements or partnerships for training its students.	(1) Yes, with one institution, and no training was given.	(2) Yes, with one institution, and the training covered one area in an average form.	(3) Yes, with one institution, and the training covered several areas in a good form.	(4) Yes, with several institutions, and the training covered various areas in good form.

Total ratings given to the cooperation agreements related to student training indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the cooperation agreements related to student training indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion Three: Academic Programs		
3.1.1.	Introduction of Programs:	Rating () X Number of items (6) =
3.1.2.	Admission and Graduation:	Rating () X Number of items (5) =
3.1.3.	Transfer of Students:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.1.4.	On-going Improvement:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
3.1.5.	Integrated Relationship:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
3.1.6.	Role of Councils:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
3.1.7.	Publication of Outcomes:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.2.1.	Clarity of Plans:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.2.2.	Consistency with the Vision:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
3.2.3.	Evaluation of Plans:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
3.2.4.	Academic Counseling:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
3.2.5.	Teaching Staff Members	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
3.2.6.	Educational Resources	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.2.7.	Follow-up of Quality Assurance	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
3.2.8.	Exchange of Students	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
3.2.9.	Admission into Postgraduate Studies	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.2.10.	Inclusiveness and Depth	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.2.11.	Requirements of Postgraduate Studies	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.2.12.	Scientific Theses	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
3.2.13.	Time Frame	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
3.2.14.	Grants and Scholarships	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
3.3.1.	Evaluation of Students	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
3.3.2.	Evaluation of Teachers	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
3.3.3.	Outcomes and the Labour Market	Rating () X Number of items (5) =
3.3.4.	Agreements on Training of Students	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
General Rating:	Total number of points $\frac{\text{Total number of points}}{\text{Total number of items}} = \frac{\quad}{73} =$ Total number of items	
The level achieved:		
Improvement Priorities:		

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations

4.1. Sub-Criterion One: Scientific Research

The institution is expected to establish a process for managing scientific research with both of its theoretical and applied elements, being the activity that directs the building of theories and using them in knowledge and technology transfer activity, meeting the developmental needs of the community, development of the productive and service sectors. This should include policies and procedures for the support and follow up of scientific research and cooperation with research centres. This should be documented in accurate records.

Institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

4.1.1. Policies, Regulations, Instructions and Procedures related to Supporting and Publication of Scientific Research

4.1.2. Scientific research follow-up and evaluation plan

4.1.3. Identification of Research Priorities and Concerns

4.1.4. Research Cooperation with Educational Institutions

4.1.5. Providing financial, physical and informational support for conducting research, authoring of books and publication thereof.

4.1.6. Research papers published in refereed and specialized journals and conferences.

4.1.7. Instructions and procedures related to granting incentives and incentive prizes

4.1.8. The role and responsibilities of the committees and councils concerned with scientific research

4.1.9. The extent to which postgraduate students benefit from supported scientific research projects

4.1.10 The extent to which the local community and productive and service sectors benefit from supported scientific research projects

4.1.11. Marketing of scientific research

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.1. Policies, Regulations, Instructions and Procedures related to Supporting and Publication of Scientific Research	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.1.1. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and regulations related to supporting and publication of scientific research?	(0) No, the institution has no written or declared policies or regulations.	(1) Yes, there are written and undeclared policies and regulations that provide poor support.	(2) Yes, there are written and declared policies and regulations that provide acceptable support.	(3) Yes, there are written and declared policies and regulations that provide good support.	(4) Yes, there are written and declared policies and regulations that provide excellent support.
4.1.1.2. Does the institution apply documented and clear instructions and procedures for supporting and publication of scientific research projects?	(0) There are no documented instructions or procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written instructions and procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are documented and partly clear instructions and procedures, but they are unapplied.	(3) Yes, there are documented and clear instructions and procedures with logically sequenced steps, but difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are documented and perfectly clear instructions and procedures with logically sequenced steps, and easy to apply.
4.1.1.3. Are the means of raising awareness of scientific research legislations effective?	(0) No, the institution did not provide any means of raising awareness of scientific research legislations.	(1) Yes, with poor effectiveness and few teaching staff members understand them.	(2) Yes, with average effectiveness and 50% of the teaching staff members understand them.	(3) Yes, with good effectiveness and 75% of the teaching staff members understand them.	(4) Yes, with excellent effectiveness and more than 90% of the teaching staff members understand them.
4.1.1.4. Are there databases that document research projects, authored books and university theses?	(0) The institution has no databases that documents that.	(1) The available databases are acceptable, of small capacity, of low speed and difficult to access.	(2) The available databases are good, of adequate capacity, of a good speed and difficult to access.	(3) The available databases are very good, of a large capacity, of a high speed and easy to access.	(4) The available databases are excellent, of a large capacity, of a high speed and easy to access.

Total ratings given to the Policies, Regulations, Instructions and Procedures related to Supporting and Publication of Scientific Research indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies, Regulations, Instructions and Procedures related to Supporting and Publication of Scientific Research indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.2. Scientific research follow-up and evaluation plan	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.2.1. Does the institution have a clear plan for scientific research and follow-up and evaluation thereof?	(0) No, it has no plan for scientific research.	(1) Yes, it has an annual plan that is poor and does not identify procedures for implementation, follow-up or evaluation.	(2) Yes, it has an acceptable annual plan that identifies procedures for implementation.	(3) Yes, it has a good annual plan that identifies procedures for implementation and follow-up.	(4) Yes, it has an excellent annual plan that identifies procedures for implementation, follow-up and evaluation.
4.1.2.2. Does the institution have clear procedures for evaluating scientific research in accordance with objective evidence and proofs?	(0) The institution has no procedures for evaluating scientific research.	(1) Yes, it has unclear procedures, and the evidence and proofs are of poor objectivity.	(2) Yes, it has clear procedures, and the evidence and proofs are of average objectivity.	(3) Yes, it has clear procedures, and the evidence and proofs are of high objectivity.	(4) Yes, it has perfectly clear procedures, and the evidence and proofs are of perfect objectivity.
4.1.2.3. Do the scientific research evaluation standards at the institution keep pace with global trends and standards?	(0) The institution has no standards for evaluating scientific research.	(1) Yes, the institution's standards keep pace with global standards to a little degree.	(2) Yes, the institution's standards keep pace with global standards to an average degree.	(3) Yes, the institution's standards keep pace with global standards to a high degree.	(4) Yes, the institution's standards keep pace with global standards to a very high degree.
4.1.2.4. Does the institution hold scientific conferences, seminars and workshops to discuss the achieved results and importance of research?	(0) The institution did not hold any such events.	(1) It held one conference or seminar or workshop with little participation and little support.	(2) It held several conferences, seminars and workshops with large participation and average support.	(3) It held several conferences, seminars and workshops with large participation and large support.	(4) It held several conferences, seminars and workshops with large participation and full support.

Total ratings given to the scientific research plan, follow-up and evaluation indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the scientific research plan, follow-up and evaluation indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations

4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research

4.1.3. Identification of Research Priorities and Concerns	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.3.1. Does the institution identify the scientific research priorities and concerns?	(0) There are no research priorities and concerns.	(1) Yes, the research priorities and concerns are identified with poor accuracy.	(2) Yes, the research priorities and concerns are identified with average accuracy.	(3) Yes, the research priorities and concerns are identified with good accuracy.	(4) Yes, the research priorities and concerns are identified with excellent accuracy.
4.1.3.2. Does the institution periodic review of the applied scientific research priorities and research concerns?	(0) The institution did not conduct any review of the scientific research priorities and concerns.	(1) The reviews presented are acceptable, but they are with no reference	(2) The reviews presented are good, but their referentiality is unclear.	(3) The reviews presented are very good, and their referentiality is clear.	(4) The reviews presented are excellent and periodic, and their referentiality is clear.
4.1.3.3. Is the nature and fields of the published research compatible with the identified research priorities and concerns?	(0) The institution has no identified research priorities.	(1) There is poor compatibility with the research priorities and concerns, for a small number of published research papers.	(2) There is average compatibility with the research priorities and concerns, for a small number of published research papers.	(3) There is average compatibility with the research priorities and concerns, for a large number of published research papers.	(4) There is good compatibility with the research priorities and concerns, for a large number of published research papers.

Total ratings given to the Identification of Research Priorities and Concerns indicator =

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Identification of Research Priorities and Concerns indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.4. Research Cooperation with Educational Institutions	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.4.1. Are there at the institution documented and declared policies and procedures for research cooperation with research institutions and centres?	(0) The institution has no policies and procedures for research cooperation with research institutions and centres.	(1) Yes, there are poor policies and procedures that did not lead to concluding research agreements.	(2) Yes, there are acceptable policies and procedures that lead to concluding some research agreements, yet, without application.	(3) Yes, there are good policies and procedures that lead to concluding some research agreements some of which were applied.	(4) Yes, there are excellent policies and procedures that lead to concluding some research agreements most of which were applied.
4.1.4.2. What is the quality level of research cooperation between the institution and other research institutions and centres?	(0) There is no research cooperation with research institutions and centres	(1) There is cooperation of poor effectiveness and it covers few research activities.	(2) There is cooperation of average effectiveness and it covers few research activities.	(3) There is cooperation of average effectiveness and it covers many research activities.	(4) There is cooperation of good effectiveness and it covers many research activities.
4.1.4.3. How much are researchers satisfied with research cooperation with other research institutions and centres?	(0) Satisfaction has not been measured.	(1) Measurement was made, and the percentage of those satisfied was less than 25%.	(2) Measurement was made, and the percentage of those satisfied ranged between 25 and 50%.	(3) Measurement was made, and the percentage of those satisfied ranged between 50 and 75%.	(4) Measurement was made, and the percentage of those satisfied was more than 75%.
4.1.4.4. Are forms of research cooperation with educational institutions and research centres diversified?	(0) There is no research cooperation with other institutions.	(1) Yes, there is one form of cooperation.	(2) Yes, there are two forms of cooperation.	(3) Yes, there are three forms of cooperation.	(4) Yes, there are more than three forms of cooperation.

Total ratings given to the Research Cooperation with Educational Institutions indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Research Cooperation with Educational Institutions indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.5. Providing financial, physical and informational support for conducting research, authoring of books and publication thereof.	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.5.1. Does the institution provide support for conducting research, authoring of books and publication thereof?	(0) No, it does not provide any support.	(1) Yes. It provides financial support that covers a modest part of the requirements.	(2) Yes. It provides financial and physical support that covers half of the requirements.	(3) Yes. It provides financial, physical and informational support that covers most of the requirements.	(4) Yes. It provides financial, physical and informational support that covers all requirements.

Total ratings given to the Providing financial, physical and informational support for conducting research, authoring of books and publication thereof indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Providing financial, physical and informational support for conducting research, authoring of books and publication thereof indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.6. Research papers published in refereed and specialized journals and conferences.	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.6.1. Are research papers published in refereed, specialized and indexed journals and conferences?	(0) Most of the research papers are published in local journals and conferences.	(1) Most of the research papers are published in local and Arab journals and conferences.	(2) Most of the research papers are published in local, Arab and regional journals and conferences.	(3) Most of the research papers are published in indexed regional and global journals and conferences.	(4) Most of the research papers are published in indexed global journals.

Total ratings given to the Research papers published in refereed and specialized journals and conferences indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Research papers published in refereed and specialized journals and conferences indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.7. Instructions and procedures related to granting incentives and incentive prizes	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.7.1. Does the institution have Instructions and procedures related to granting incentives and incentive prizes to researchers?	(0) No, it has no such things.	(1) Yes, it has such things, but they are unapplied.	(2) Yes, it has such things, but they are not applied regularly.	(3) Yes, it has such things, and they are applied regularly in some faculties.	(4) Yes, it has such things, and they are applied regularly in all faculties.
4.1.7.2. Are the incentives and prizes motivating?	(0) No, because there are no incentives or prizes.	(1) Yes, but to a small extent.	(2) Yes, but in degrees varying between poor and average.	(3) Yes, but in degrees varying between average and good.	(4) Yes, but in good degrees in all faculties

Total ratings given to the Instructions and procedures related to granting incentives and incentive prizes indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Instructions and procedures related to granting incentives and incentive prizes indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.8. The role and responsibilities of the committees and councils concerned with scientific research	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.8.1. Do the committees and councils concerned with scientific research carry out their roles bear their responsibilities effectively?	(0) No, there are no committees or councils for scientific research.	(1) Yes, they carry out a poor role because their responsibilities are unclear.	(2) Yes, they carry out an average role and bear their responsibilities in an average effectiveness.	(3) Yes, they carry out a big role and bear their responsibilities with high effectiveness.	(4) Yes, they carry out a very big role and bear their responsibilities with an outstanding effectiveness.

Total ratings given to the role and responsibilities of the committees and councils concerned with scientific research indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the role and responsibilities of the committees and councils concerned with scientific research indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations

4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research

4.1.9. The extent to which postgraduate students benefit from supported scientific research projects	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.9.1. To what extent do postgraduate students benefit from supported scientific research projects?	(0) No student benefited.	(1) There is partial support for five student projects.	(2) There is partial support for ten student projects.	(3) There is partial support for fifteen student projects.	(4) There is partial support for more than fifteen student projects.

Total ratings given to the extent to which postgraduate students benefit from supported scientific research projects indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the extent to which postgraduate students benefit from supported scientific research projects indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.10 The extent to which the local community and productive and service sectors benefit from supported scientific research projects	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.10.1. To what extent do the local community and productive and service sectors benefit from supported scientific research projects?	(0) They made no benefit at all	(1) Little benefit. One project only was supported, and it contributed to serving one service sector to a small extent.	(2) Average benefit. Two projects were supported, and they contributed to serving service sectors to an average extent.	(3) Big benefit. Three projects were supported, and they contributed to serving several service and productive sectors to a good extent.	(4) Very big benefit. A collection of projects were supported, and they contributed to serving several service and productive sectors to an excellent extent.

Total ratings given to the extent to which the local community and productive and service sectors benefit from supported scientific research projects indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the extent to which the local community and productive and service sectors benefit from supported scientific research projects indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.1. Sub-criterion One: Scientific Research					
4.1.11. Marketing scientific research	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.1.11.1. Does the institution exert effort to market the outcomes of scientific research effectively?	(0) No, it has no scientific research, or it has no means to market the outcomes of research.	(1) Yes, it circulates reports on them within the institution.	(2) Yes, it explains their scientific and applied importance in special seminars, bulletins and debates.	(3) Yes, it invites the parties that can benefit from them and explains the optimal method to benefit therefrom.	(4) Yes, it partners with specialized parties to transfer them into productive projects.

Total ratings given to the marketing scientific research indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the marketing scientific research Marketing scientific research indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

4.2. Sub-Criterion Two: Missions

The Scholarship activity is a vital factor in the march of the institution. It helps in the rehabilitation and development of teaching staff members and in helping them acquire new knowledge and skills that enhance the educational and research outputs and maintains the institution's sustainability and continuity. The institution should establish a process for selecting persons for Scholarships and the entities that will receive them, and following them up in a transparent and fair manner. All procedures should be documented accurately.

Institutions will be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

- 4.2.1. Availability of a declared policy and integrated plan for scholarships**
- 4.2. 2. Regulations and instructions related to scholarships**
- 4.2. 3. Transparency and fairness in the selection of persons for scholarships**
- 4.2. 4. Follow-up of persons on scholarships**
- 4.2.5. Instructions and procedures related to convening and participation in training courses**
- 4.2. 6. Consistency of training courses with the research and teaching needs**
- 4.2.7. The role of the concerned committees and councils**
- 4.2. 8. Expenditure on scholarships and training courses**

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations

4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships

4.2.1. Availability of a declared policy and integrated plan for Scholarships	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2.1.1. Does the institution have documented and declared policies and procedures for Scholarships?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, documented, but undeclared.	(2) Yes, documented and declared, but with little allocations	(3) Yes, documented and declared, and with big allocations	(4) Yes, documented and declared, and with very big allocations
4.2.1.2. . Does the institution have a clear and integrated plan for Scholarships?	(0) There is no plan for scholarships.	(1) There is an unclear and non-integrated plan for scholarships.	(2) There is a clear plan for scholarships, but it is non-integrated.	(3) There is a clear and integrated plan for scholarships.	(4) There is a clear and integrated plan for scholarships that is continuously developed.
4.2.1.3. To what extend did the institution manage to get scholarships?	(0) The institution did not get any scholarship	(1) It got one scholarship.	(2) It got several scholarships.	(3) It got ten scholarships.	(4) It got scores of scholarships.

Total ratings given to the availability of a declared policy and integrated plan for scholarships indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the availability of a declared policy and integrated plan for scholarships indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, scholarships and Innovations

4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships

4.2. 2. Regulations and instructions related to scholarships	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2. 2.1. Does the institution have clear and declared regulations and instructions for scholarships?	(0) The institution has no regulations or instructions for scholarships .	(1) Yes, there are unclear and undeclared regulations and instructions	(2) Yes, there are clear and undeclared regulations and instructions	(3) Yes, there are clear and declared regulations and instructions, but their application is difficult.	(4) Yes, there are clear and declared regulations and instructions, but their application is possible.

Total ratings given to the regulations and instructions related to scholarships indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the regulations and instructions related to scholarships indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships					
4.2. 3. Transparency and fairness in the selection of persons for scholarships	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2. 3.1. Does the institution use specific criteria in the selection of persons for scholarships?	(0) No, because they are un-available.	(1) Yes, but with varying and of undeclared weights	(2) Yes, with declared but varying weights	(3) Yes, with declared but varying weights	(4) Yes, with declared and fixed weights
4.2. 3.2. Are there accurate records that that document the review and audit procedures related to the selection of persons for scholarships?	(0) The institution has no records for the selection of persons for scholarships.	(1) Yes, there are records for the selection of persons for scholarships, but they are inaccurate.	(2) Yes, there are records for the selection of persons for scholarships with an average degree of accuracy.	(3) Yes, there are records for the selection of persons for scholarships with a good degree of accuracy.	(4) Yes, there are records for the selection of persons for scholarships with a very good degree of accuracy.

Total ratings given to the transparency and fairness in the selection of persons for scholarships indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the transparency and fairness in the selection of persons for scholarships indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships					
4.2. 4. Follow-up of persons on scholarships	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2. 4.1. Does the institution follow clear and effective procedures in following up persons on scholarships?	(0) The institution does not follow up persons on scholarships	(1) Yes, the follow-up is formal, non-academic and with little effectiveness	(2) Yes, the follow-up is academic and is effective to a little degree.	(3) Yes, the follow-up is academic and is effective to a good degree.	(4) Yes, the follow-up is academic, periodic and is effective to an excellent degree.
4.2. 4.2. Does the institution have accurate records about the situations of the persons on scholarships?	(0) Yes, it has records that show the numbers of persons on scholarships.	(1) Yes, it has records that show their numbers and specializations.	(2) Yes, its records show their numbers, specializations and universities.	(3) Yes, its records show their numbers, specializations, universities and programs.	(4) Yes, its records show their numbers, specializations, universities, programs and the times of their graduation.

Total ratings given to the follow-up of persons on scholarships indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the follow-up of persons on scholarships indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships					
4.2.5. Instructions and procedures related to convening and participation in training courses	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2. 5.1. Are there at the institution instructions and procedures related to convening or participation in training courses?	(0) There are no instructions or procedures related to convening and participation in training courses	(1) Yes, there are poor instructions and procedures, no training courses were convened and its participations are poor.	(2) Yes, there are acceptable instructions and procedures, no training courses were convened and its participations are acceptable.	(3) Yes, there are good instructions and procedures, some training courses were convened and its participations are good.	(4) Yes, there are excellent instructions and procedures, some training courses were convened and its participations are excellent.

Total ratings given to the instructions and procedures related to convening and participation in training courses indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the instructions and procedures related to convening and participation in training courses indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships					
4.2. 6. Consistency of training courses with the research and teaching needs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2.6.1. What is the level of the consistency of the training courses with the research and teaching needs of the teaching staff members?	(0) Very poor	(1) Poor. They meet a maximum of 25% of participant needs.	(2) Average. They meet about 50% of participant needs.	(3) Good. They meet about 75% of participant needs.	(4) Excellent. It plans to meet all participant needs.
4.2.6.2. Are research and training courses evaluated and documented?	(0) Training courses are not evaluated or documented.	(1) Some training courses are documented but not evaluated.	(2) Some training courses are documented and they are evaluated in a formal manner.	(3) Most of the training courses are documented and they are evaluated in a constructive manner.	(4) All training courses are documented and they are evaluated in a comprehensive manner.

Total ratings given to the consistency of training courses with the research and teaching needs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the consistency of training courses with the research and teaching needs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships					
4.2.7. The role of the concerned committees and councils	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2. 7.1 What is the role of the committees and councils concerned with scholarships?	(0) Advertising scholarships	(1) Advertising scholarships and identification of criteria	(2) Advertising scholarships, identification of criteria and studying applications	(3) Advertising scholarships, identification of criteria, studying applications and selection of successful applicants	(4) Advertising scholarships, identification of criteria, studying applications, selection of successful applicants and helping them to get admissions into prestigious universities and following them up

Total ratings given to the role of the concerned committees and councils indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the role of the concerned committees and councils role of the concerned committees and councils indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scholarships					
4.2. 8. Expenditure on scholarships and training courses	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.2.8.1 What is the trend of the institution's annual expenditure on scholarships in the previous five years?	(0) The institution does not allocate a part of its budget for scholarships or expenditure decreases.	(1) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for scholarships, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(2) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for scholarships, and this allocation increases through the years.	(3) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for scholarships, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(4) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for scholarships, and this allocation increases through the years.
4.2.8.2. What is the trend of the indicator of the institution's annual expenditure on training courses in the previous five years?	(0) The institution does not allocate a part of its budget for training courses, or expenditure decreases.	(1) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for training courses, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(2) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for training courses, and this allocation increases through the years.	(3) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for training courses, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(4) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for training courses, and this allocation increases through the years.

Total ratings given to the expenditure on scholarships and training courses indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Expenditure on missions and training courses expenditure on scholarships and training courses indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

4.3. Sub-Criterion Three: Innovation

Innovations and patents are an important component of a distinct university. The institution should establish a process to provide an appropriate environment that encourages artistic and literary innovations, patents and entrepreneurship projects. The procedures used for this purpose should be documented in accurate records.

Institutions will be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

4.3.1. Instructions and procedures related to registration of patents and protection of intellectual property

4.3.2. Instructions and procedures related to supporting artistic and literary innovations and documenting and publishing them

4.3.3. Policies and procedures for introduction and development of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators

4.3.4. Evaluation and follow-up of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators

4.3.5. Expenditure on innovations of all sorts

4.3.6. The role of the committees and councils concerned with innovations

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.3. Sub-criterion Three: Innovation					
4.3.1. Instructions and procedures related to registration of patents and protection of intellectual property	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.3.1.1. Does the institution apply documented and clear policies and procedures for the registration of patents and protection of intellectual properties?	(0) There are no written and clear policies and procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written policies and procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear policies and procedures, but they are unapplied.	(3) Yes, there are written and partly clear policies and procedures, and their steps are logically sequenced, and they are difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear policies and procedures, their steps are logically sequenced, and they are actually applied.

Total ratings given to the instructions and procedures related to registration of patents and protection of intellectual properties indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the instructions and procedures related to registration of patents and protection of intellectual properties indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.3. Sub-criterion Three: Innovation					
4.3.2. Instructions and procedures related to supporting artistic and literary innovations and documenting and publishing them	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.3.2.1. Does the institution have documented and clear policies and procedures on supporting, documentation and publication of artistic, literary and scientific policies and procedures?	(0) There are no written and clear policies and procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written policies and procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear policies and procedures, but they are unapplied.	(3) Yes, there are written and partly clear policies and procedures, their steps are logically sequenced, and they are difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear policies and procedures, their steps are logically sequenced, and they are actually applied.
4.3.2.2. Does the institution document the various innovations in records in an appropriate manner?	(0) No, the institution did not document the innovations.	(1) Yes, the institution documented innovations in an unclear manner in plainly designed records.	(2) Yes, the institution documented innovations in an acceptable manner in records with difficult accessibility.	(3) Yes, the institution documented innovations in a good manner in records with easy accessibility.	(4) Yes, the institution documented innovations in an excellent manner in organized and easily accessible records.

Total ratings given to the instructions and procedures related to supporting artistic and literary innovations and documenting and publishing them indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the instructions and procedures related to supporting artistic and literary innovations and documenting and publishing them indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations					
4.3. Sub-criterion Three: Innovation					
4.3.3. Policies and procedures for introduction and development of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.3.3.1. Does the institution have documented and clear policies and procedures for introduction and development of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators?	(0) No, it has no written and clear policies and procedures.	(1) Yes, it has written policies and procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, it has written policies and procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(3) Yes, it has written and partly written policies and procedures, their steps are logically sequenced and difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, it has written and perfectly written policies and procedures, their steps are logically sequenced and they are actually applied.
4.3.3 2. Does the institution leadership (the senior management) encourage innovation and initiatives?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, partly and morally.	(2) Yes, perfectly and morally.	(3) Yes, perfectly morally and partly physically	(4) Yes, completely morally and physically

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for introduction and development of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and procedures for introduction and development of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations

4.3. Sub-criterion Three: Innovation

4.3.4. Evaluation and follow-up of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.3.4.1. Does the institution follow clear procedures for following up entrepreneurship projects and business incubators?	(0) There are no written and clear procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, but they are not applied.	(3) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, their steps are logically sequenced and they are difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear procedures, their steps are logically sequenced and they are easy to apply.
4.3.4.2. Does the institution follow clear procedures for evaluating entrepreneurship projects and business incubators?	(0) There are no written and clear procedures.	(1) Yes, there are written procedures, but they are unclear and unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, but they are not applied.	(3) Yes, there are written and partly clear procedures, their steps are logically sequenced and they are difficult to apply.	(4) Yes, there are written and perfectly clear mechanisms, instructions and procedures, their steps are logically sequenced, they are easy to apply and they are actually applied.
4.3.4.3. What is the quality level of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators in the evaluation outcomes?	(0) There are no results at all.	(1) Evaluation outcomes indicate a poor level.	(2) Evaluation outcomes indicate an average level.	(3) Evaluation outcomes indicate a good level.	(4) Evaluation outcomes indicate an excellent level.
4.3.4.4. Do the entrepreneurship projects applied at the institution contribute to its competitiveness?	(0) No, no entrepreneurship projects materialized.	(1) Yes, there is a slight improvement in the institution's competitiveness.	(2) Yes, there is an average improvement in the institution's competitiveness.	(3) Yes, there is a great improvement in the institution's competitiveness.	(4) Yes, there is a very great and steady improvement in the institution's competitiveness.

Total ratings given to the evaluation and follow-up of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the evaluation and follow-up of entrepreneurship projects and business incubators indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations

4.3. Sub-criterion Three: Innovation

4.3.5. Expenditure on innovations of all sorts	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.3.5.1. What is the trend of the indicator of the institution's annual expenditure on the various innovations in the previous five years?	(0) The institution does not allocate a part of its budget for innovations, or expenditure decreases.	(1) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for innovations,, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(2) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for innovations, and this allocation increases through the years.	(3) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for innovations, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(4) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for innovations, and this allocation increases through the years.
4.5.5 2. What is the trend of the indicator of the institution's annual expenditure on incentives and incentive awards to innovators in the previous five years?	(0) The institution does not allocate a part of its budget for incentive awards for innovators, or expenditure decreases.	(1) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for incentive awards to innovators, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(2) The institution allocates a small part of its budget for incentive awards to innovators, and this allocation increases through the years.	(3) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for incentive awards to innovators, and this allocation is stable through the years.	(4) The institution allocates a large part of its budget for incentive awards to innovators, and this allocation increases through the years.

Total ratings given to the expenditure on innovations of all sorts indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the expenditure on innovations of all sorts indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

4. Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations

4.3. Sub-criterion Three: Innovation

4.3.6. The role of the committees and councils concerned with innovations	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
4.3.6.1. What is the role of the institution's committees and councils on innovations?	(0) There are no committees or councils on innovations.	(1) They disseminate the innovation culture.	(2) They disseminate the innovation culture and identify its standards.	(3) They encourage innovation, disseminate the innovation culture, and identify its standards.	(4) They encourage innovation, disseminate the innovation culture, identify its standards and evaluate it.

Total ratings given to the role of the committees and councils concerned with innovations indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the role of the committees and councils concerned with innovations indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion Four: Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations			
4.1.1.	Supporting and publication of scientific research:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =	
4.1.2.	Plan for follow-up of research:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =	
4.1.3.	Research priorities:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =	
4.1.4.	Research cooperation:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =	
4.1.5.	Financial support:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.1.6.	Published research:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.1.7.	Incentives:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.1.8.	Role of councils:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.1.9.	Benefit by students:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.1.10.	Benefit by the community:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.1.11.	Marketing of research:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.2.1.	Plan for Scholarships:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =	
4.2.2.	Instructions on scholarships:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.2.3.	Transparency of scholarships	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.2.4.	Follow-up of persons on scholarships:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.2.5.	Training courses:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.2.6.	Consistency with requirements:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.2.7.	Role of committees:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.2.8.	Expenditure on scholarships:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.3.1.	Patents:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
4.3.2.	Support of innovations:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.3.3.	Development of incubators:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.3.4.	Evaluation of incubators:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =	
4.3.5.	Expenditure on innovations:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =	
4.3.6.	Role of the committees and councils:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =	
General Rating:	Total number of points $\frac{\text{Total number of points}}{\text{Total number of items}} = \frac{\quad}{49} =$ Total number of items		
The level achieved:			
Improvement Priorities:			

5. Criterion One: Financial, Physical and Human Resources

5.1. Sub-Criterion One: Financial Sources.

Educational institutions are expected to establish a process for managing their financial resources in a responsible and transparent manner that takes into account the legal and accounting standards. The process should include financial planning that enables the institution to secure funds, draft budget and implement its institutional policies and plans in line with its vision and objectives. The budget and financial statements should be audited in a good manner (Internally and externally). The institution should also have a process for managing revenues, expenditure and investments in accordance with the previously prepared budget. The process should also include a plan for managing financial risks and measuring the effectiveness of financial planning. The institution should keep all financial records in an appropriate manner.

Institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

5.1.1. Financial planning policies and procedures

5.1.2. Budget preparation policies and procedures

5.1.3. Financial allocation policies and procedures

5.1.4. Income, expenditure and investment policies

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.1. Sub-criterion One: Financial Resources					
5.1.1. Financial planning policies and procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.1.1.1. Are financial planning policies linked to the institution's mission, objectives and strategic plan?	(0) The institution did not provide any polices on financial planning.	(1) The policies presented are poor and are not linked to the institution's vision and objectives.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable, and some of them are linked to the institution's vision and objectives.	(3) The policies presented are good and are well-linked to the institution's vision and objectives.	(4) The policies presented are excellent and are linked to the institution's vision, objectives and strategic plan in an excellent manner.
5.5.1.1.2. What is the adequacy and clarity of the financial planning procedures?	(0) The institution did not provide any procedures.	(1) The procedures are unclear and of poor sequence.	(2) The procedures are partly clear, of poor sequence and difficult to understand and apply.	(3) The procedures are clear, of good sequence, easy to understand and difficult to apply.	(4) The procedures are very clear, of good sequence, and easy to understand and apply.
5.5.1.1.3. How well are the financial planning records completed?	(0) There are no records	(1) There are partial records with low quality.	(2) There are partial records with average quality.	(3) There are adequate records with high quality.	(4) All records are available with very high quality.
5.5.1.1.4. Is the application of the financial planning procedures subject to supervision?	(0) No supervision was made on the application of any of the procedures.	(1) Supervision was made on the application of some procedures.	(2) Supervision was made on the application of most of the procedures.	(3) Supervision was made on the application of all procedures.	(4) Supervision was made on the application of all procedures in an excellent manner.
5. 5.1.1.5. Does the institution measure the efficiency and effectiveness of financial plans and their decline?	(0) No results were presented.	(1) The results presented are poor.	(2) The results presented are good and reflect an average performance.	(3) The results presented are very good and reflect a good performance.	(4) The results presented are excellent and reflect an excellent performance.
5.1.1.6. Does the institution have a plan to manage financial risks and ensure continuity?	(0) No plans were presented to manage financial risks.	(1) The plan presented is poor and includes few expected elements.	(2) The plan presented is good and includes most of the expected elements.	(3) The plan presented is good and includes all expected elements.	(4) The plan presented is excellent and can be seen as an example to be followed..

Total ratings given to the financial planning policies and procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Financial planning policies and procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources

5.1. Sub-criterion One: Financial Resources

5.1.2. Budget preparation policies and procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.1.2.1. Does the institution have policies on financial budget preparation?	(0) The institution did not provide any policies.	(1) The policies presented are weak and are not correlated to the institution's mission and objectives.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable and are partly correlated to the institution's mission and objectives.	(3) The policies presented are good and are well correlated to the institution's mission and objectives.	(4) The policies presented are excellent and are correlated to the institution's mission and objectives in an excellent manner.
5.1.2.2. How adequate are the budget preparation procedures?	(0) The institution did not provide any procedures.	(1) The procedures are unclear and of poor sequence.	(2) The procedures are partly clear, with poor sequence, which affects understanding and application.	(3) The procedures are clear, with good sequence, but they are difficult to apply.	(4) The procedures are very clear, with good sequence, and they are easy to understand and apply.
5.1.2.3. What is the quality of the institution's records related to budget preparation procedures?	(0) There are no records	(1) There are no records.	(2) Records are unfinished and lack accuracy.	(3) Records are unfinished but of high accuracy.	(4) Records are finished and of high accuracy.
5.1.2.4. What is the quality of the institution's budget?	(0) The budget presented is very weak and does not take account of accounting standards and financial planning requirements.	(1) The budget presented is weak and does not take account of accounting standards and financial planning requirements.	(2) The budget presented is acceptable and takes account of accounting standards but not of financial planning requirements.	(3) The budget presented is good and takes account of accounting standards and financial planning requirements.	(4) The budget is good and takes account of accounting standards, financial planning requirements, the institution's mission and objectives and other requirements..

Total ratings given to the budget preparation policies and procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the budget preparation policies and procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.1. Sub-criterion One: Financial Resources					
5.1.3. Financial allocation policies and procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.1.3.1. Does the institution have policies for identifying and allocation of financial resources?	(0) The institution has not presented any policies.	(1) The presented policies are weak and do not meet the institutional requirements.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable and have good prospects to cover the institutional requirements.	(3) The policies presented are good, covering institutional requirements, and are well correlated to the institutional planning.	(4) The policies presented are excellent, cover the institutional requirements and assist in planning and achieving the mission.
5.1.3.2. What is the adequacy of the procedures for identifying financial sources and allocation procedures?	(0) The institution has not presented any procedures.	(1) The procedures are unclear and/or of poor sequence.	(2) The procedures are partly clear and of a weak sequence, which affects understanding and application.	(3) The procedures are clear, of a good sequence, easy to understand, but difficult to apply.	(4) The procedures are very clear, of a good sequence, which makes them easy to understand and apply.
5.1.3.3. Are financial allocations in the institution consistent with financial requirements and plans?	(0) There is no evidence of consistency.	(1) There is little evidence of poor consistency.	(2) There is little evidence of poor consistency.	(3) There is adequate evidence of good consistency.	(4) There is adequate and strong evidence of excellent consistency.

Total ratings given to the financial allocation policies and procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the financial allocation policies and procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.1. Sub-criterion One: Financial Resources					
5.1.4. Income, expenditure and investment policies and procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.1.4.1. Does the institution have policies to manage revenues, expenditures and investments?	(0) The institution did not present any policies.	(1) The presented policies are weak and/or inadequate.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable and have good prospects to cover the institutional requirements.	(3) The policies presented are good and cover the institutional requirements.	(4) The policies presented are excellent, cover the institutional requirements and allows good control.
5.1.4.2. Do the financial statements comply with legal and accounting rules and standards?	(0) There are no financial statements.	(1) The financial statements are partial, and their compatibility with accounting rules is poor.	(2) The financial statements are partial, and their compatibility with accounting rules is reasonable.	(3) The financial statements are adequate, and their compatibility with accounting rules is reasonable.	(4) The financial statements are adequate, and their compatibility with accounting rules is good.
5.1.4.3. Has the institution reviewed its revenues and expenditures in comparison with the budget?	(0) No review has been made.	(1) A review has been made and there are significant discrepancies between the financial statements and the budget.	(2) A review has been made and there are few discrepancies between the financial statements and the budget.	(3) A review has been made and there are no discrepancies between the financial statements and the budget.	(4) It conducts periodic reviews to ensure that there are no differences between the budget and the financial statements.
5.1.4.4. Is the institution keen on transparency and informing stakeholders about the financial statements?	(0) There is no evidence of that.	(1) There is little, illicit and poor evidence of this.	(2) There is little direct evidence of this.	(3) There is adequate direct evidence of this.	(4) There is sufficient direct evidence, and data transparency and accuracy are expressed in multiple channels.
5.1.4.5. Does the institution audit its accounts internally and externally?	(0) No audit has been made.	(1) Audit has been made by internal parties only.	(2) Audit has been made internally and externally, but not in a professional manner.	(3) Audit has been made internally and externally, and in a professional manner that takes account of accounting standards.	(4) Audit has been made internally and externally in a professional and in full compatibility.

Total ratings given to the income, expenditure and investment policies and procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the income, expenditure and investment policies and procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

5.2. Sub-Criterion Two: Physical Resources

The educational institution is expected to establish a process for managing its physical resources used for managing its academic and administrative activities. These resources should be utilized and used in a manner that satisfies its users and should be sufficient for all institution staff and students. The process should include the asset record and management, safety and security measures, maintenance of buildings (including classrooms and laboratories), equipment maintenance and calibration, infrastructure and Information Technology services, facilities for persons with special needs, the library services and learning resource management and procedures for their evaluation and review as well as for measuring their effectiveness. The institution should keep all financial records in an appropriate manner.

The institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

5.2.1. Availability, accessibility and efficient use

5.2.2. Quality and appropriateness

5.2.3. Safety and security policies and procedures.

5.2.4. Appropriateness of facilities for persons with special needs

5.2.5. Improvement and development plans and procedures

5.2.6. Quality management of facilities and their services, and controlling and improving it

5.2.7. Maintenance procedures and effectiveness

5.2.8. Employers' satisfaction with the facilities

5.2.9. Diversity of learning resources, including books, databases and periodicals

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.1. Availability, accessibility and efficient use	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.1.1. Are there adequate physical resources available at the institution?	(0) The physical resources are few and there are no records about them.	(1) The physical resources are few and there are unorganized records about them.	(2) The physical resources are reasonable and there are partly organized records about them.	(3) The physical resources are adequate and there are partly organized records about them.	(4) The physical resources are reasonable and there are well- organized records about them.
5.2.1.2. Did the institution provide appropriate training on the use of physical resources?	(0) No training was provided.	(1) Little training of a low level is available for a small number of staff members.	(2) Little training of an acceptable level is available for a small number of staff members.	(3) Little training of an acceptable level is available for a large number of staff members.	(4) Multiple training of a good level is available for all staff in light of their needs.
5.2.1.3. What is the efficiency level of the physical resources at the institution?	(0) No information is available about that.	(1) The information available indicates a low level of efficiency.	(2) The information available indicates an average level of efficiency.	(3) The information available indicates a high level of efficiency.	(4) The information available indicates a very high level of efficiency.

Total ratings given to the availability and efficiency of use indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the availability and efficiency of use indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.2. Quality and appropriateness	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.2.1. Are there clear procedures for measuring and reviewing the quality and appropriateness of resources?	(0) No procedures were presented.	(1) The procedures presented are unclear and of poor sequence.	(2) The procedures presented are partly clear but of poor sequence.	(3) The procedures presented are clear, of good sequence and easy to understand.	(4) The procedures are very clear, of excellent sequence and easy to understand and apply.
5.2.1.2. Are the physical resources available of a good quality and appropriate for their use?	(0) Resources are unavailable or of a poor quality.	(1) Yes, they are partly appropriate and of a low quality.	(2) Yes, they are partly appropriate and of a low or good quality.	(3) Yes, they are very appropriate and of a good or high quality	(4) Yes, they are very appropriate and of an excellent or very high quality

Total ratings given to the quality and appropriateness indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the quality and appropriateness indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.3. Safety and security policies and procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.3.1. Does the institution have policies on safety and security?	(0) The institution did not present any policies.	(1) The security policies are weak, and they do not meet the institutional requirements.	(2) The security policies are acceptable, and they meet many of the institutional requirements.	(3) The security policies are good, and they meet most of the institutional requirements.	(4) The security policies are excellent, and they meet all the institutional requirements.
5.2.3.2. Is the implementation of the safety and security at the institution being under supervision?	(0) There are no procedures for safety and security.	(1) Procedures for safety and security are applied on a small scale with no supervision.	(2) Procedures for safety and security are applied on a small scale with partial supervision.	(3) Procedures for safety and security are applied on a large scale with reasonable supervision.	(4) Procedures for safety and security are applied on a large scale with good supervision.
5.2.3.3. Has the institution produced a sufficient number of instructions and guides for safety and security and published them?	(0) No instructions or guides for safety and security have been presented.	(1) The safety and security instructions and guides are weak, they are not published and do not meet the institutional requirements.	(2) The safety and security instructions and guides are acceptable, they are published and they meet many of the institutional requirements.	(3) The safety and security instructions and guides are good, they are well published and they meet most of the institutional requirements.	(4) The safety and security instructions and guides are excellent, they are well published and understood and they meet all requirements.

Total ratings given to the safety and security policies and procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the safety and security policies and procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for measuring quality assurance criteria for higher education institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.4. appropriateness of facilities for persons with special needs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.4.1. Does the institution provide facilities for persons with special need?	(0) There are no facilities at all.	(1) Few facilities are available, and they meet the needs of a small proportion of persons with special needs	(2) Few facilities are available, and they meet the needs of an average proportion of persons with special needs	(3) A reasonable number of facilities is available, and they meet the needs of a large proportion of persons with special needs	(4) A large number of facilities is available, and they meet the needs of all persons with special needs
5.2.4.2. Does the institution measure and review the effectiveness and efficiency of the facilities for persons with special needs.	(0) No results are presented.	(1) The results presented are weak and express poor performance.	(2) The results presented are average and express average performance.	(3) The results presented are good, they express good performance and are well-reviewed.	(4) The results presented are excellent, they express excellent performance and are well-reviewed.
5.2.4.3. Does the institution provide guides and guidelines for the persons with special needs?	(0) The institution does not provide any guides or guidelines for the persons with special needs.	(1) The institution provides guidelines, but they are insufficient and serve the purposes poorly.	(2) The institution provides adequate guidelines that serve the purposes in a reasonable manner.	(3) The institution provides adequate guidelines that serve the purposes in a good manner.	(4) The institution provides adequate guidelines that serve the purposes in an excellent manner.

Total ratings given to the appropriateness of facilities for persons with special needs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the appropriateness of facilities for persons with special needs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.5. Improvement and development plans and procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.5.1. Are there any procedures at the institution to ensure the approval and implementation of developmental plans for the physical resources?	(0) No procedures were presented.	(1) The procedures presented are weak, and the implementation of developmental plans is poor.	(2) The procedures presented are adequate, and the implementation of developmental plans is poor.	(3) The procedures presented are adequate, the improvement plans are approved and they are reasonably implemented.	(4) The procedures presented are excellent, the improvement plans are approved and they are fully implemented.
5.2.5.2 Does the institution's review of its resources result in improvement plans?	(0) No review of the institution's resources has been made.	(1) A formal review was conducted, but no improvement plans resulted.	(2) One official review was conducted, resulting in a weak plan for improvement	(3) Several official reviews were conducted, resulting in reasonable plans for improvement.	(4) Several official reviews were conducted, resulting in excellent and easy-to-implement plans for improvement.

Total ratings given to improvement and development plans and procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the improvement and development plans and procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.6. Quality management of facilities and their services, and controlling and improving it	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.6.1. Does the institution maintain comprehensive and updated records of physical and technological assets?	(0) The institution does not maintain any records.	(1) The institution maintains old, incomprehensive and unorganized records.	(2) The institution maintains organized, but old and incomprehensive records.	(3) The institution maintains recent and organized, but incomprehensive records.	(4) The institution maintains recent, comprehensive and organized records.
5.2.6.2. Is there follow-up and monitoring of the institution's facilities and assets?	(0) Never, No.	(1) There is weak and ineffective follow-up.	(2) There are some fairly effective and formal follow-ups to maintain the quality of facilities.	(3) There are some fairly effective and formal follow-ups to maintain and improve the quality of facilities.	(4) There are some very effective and formal follow-ups to maintain and improve the quality of facilities.

Total ratings given to the quality management, control and improvement of facilities and services indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the quality management, control and improvement of facilities and services indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.7. Maintenance procedures and effectiveness	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.7.1. Does the institution provide a sufficient number of maintenance procedures?	(0) No procedures were presented.	(1) The maintenance procedures are unclear and of poor sequence.	(2) Maintenance procedures are partly clear and poorly sequenced.	(3) Maintenance procedures are clear, well sequenced and easy to understand.	(4) Maintenance procedures are very clear, sequenced in an excellent manner and easy to understand and apply.
5.2.7.2. Are the various maintenance works being supervised?	(0) There is no any supervision.	(1) There is very weak supervision, and maintenance works are ineffective.	(2) There is weak supervision, and maintenance works are partly effective.	(3) There is reasonable supervision, and maintenance works are effective.	(4) There is professional supervision, and maintenance works are very effective.

Total ratings given to the maintenance procedures and effectiveness indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the maintenance procedures and effectiveness indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.8. Employers' satisfaction with the facilities	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.8.1. Does the institution measure the stakeholders' satisfaction with the physical resources?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there are low-level attempts in few units.	(2) Yes, there are low-level attempts in many units.	(3) Yes, there are attempts of a good level in few units.	(4) Yes, there are attempts of an excellent level in all units, and they are periodically reviewed.
5.2.8.2. How satisfied are stakeholders with the physical resources?	(0) No results were presented about that.	(1) The results presented are poor and express a low-level satisfaction.	(2) The results presented are good and detailed and express an average degree of satisfaction.	(3) The results presented are good and detailed and express a good degree of satisfaction.	(4) The results presented are excellent and detailed and express an excellent degree of satisfaction.

Total ratings given to the stakeholders' satisfaction with the facilities indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the stakeholders' satisfaction with the facilities indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.2. Sub-criterion Two: Physical Resources					
5.2.9. Diversity of learning resources	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.2.9.1. Does the institution diversify learning resources?	(0) No, there is no diversification.	(1) There is weak diversification.	(2) There is average diversification.	(3) There is good diversification.	(4) There is excellent diversification.
5.2.9.2. Does the institution measure and review the ease of using its educational resources and technological facilities?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, for a very small number of resources and facilities	(2) Yes, for small number of resources and facilities	(3) Yes, for most of the resources and facilities	(4) Yes, for all resources and facilities

Total ratings given to the diversity of learning resources indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the diversity of learning resources indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

5.3. Sub-Criterion Three: Human Resources

The institution is expected to establish a process for managing its academic and non-academic human resources and apply it effectively. The process should include planning for human resources, attraction, appointment, employment, confirmation, promotions, incentives, services, sabbatical leaves, professional development, evaluation, review of the efficiency and effectiveness of the process and producing plans as necessary for improving it. The institution should keep all necessary records in an appropriate manner.

The institution shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

5.3.1. Policies and procedures for attraction, employment and appointment

5.3.2. Policies and procedures for confirmation and promotion

5.3.3. Policies and procedures for sabbatical leaves

5.3.4. Policies on professional and career development

5.3.5. Care and services provided to staff

5.3.6. Maternity Benefits

5.3.7. Staff satisfaction with services

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.3. Sub-criterion Three: Human Resources					
5.3.1. Policies and procedures for attraction, employment and appointment	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.3.1.1. Does the institution have appropriate policies and procedures for attraction, employment and appointment?	(0) The institution did not present any policies or procedures.	(1) The policies presented are weak and the procedures are unclear.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable, and the procedures are partly clear.	(3) The policies presented are good, and the procedures are clear and of good consequence.	(4) The policies presented are excellent, and the procedures are very clear and of excellent consequence.
5.3.1.2. What is the quality of the records resulting from employment and appointment procedures and what is the degree of their completeness?	(0) No records have been produced.	(1) There is a small number of poor records with a poor degree of completeness.	(2) There is a small number of acceptable records with an average degree of completeness.	(3) There is a large number of good records with a high degree of completeness.	(4) All records were produced very well and with a very high degree of completeness
5.3.1.3. Is the implementation of employment and appointment procedures supervised?	(0) There is no evidence of that at all.	(1) There is a small number of partial evidence of poor supervision.	(2) There is a small number of direct evidence of average supervision.	(3) There is a reasonable number of strong and direct evidence of good supervision.	(4) There is a large number of strong and direct evidence of excellent supervision.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for attraction, employment and appointment indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and procedures for attraction, employment and appointment indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.3. Sub-criterion Three: Human Resources					
5.3.2. Policies and procedures for confirmation and promotion	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.3.2.1. Does the institution have appropriate policies and procedures for confirmation and promotion?	The institution did not present any policies or procedures.	(1) The policies presented are weak, and the procedures are unclear.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable, and the procedures are partly clear.	(3) The policies are good, and the procedures are clear and of good sequence.	(4) The policies are excellent, and the procedures are very clear and of excellent sequence.
5.3.2.2. What is the quality of the records resulting from the confirmation and promotion procedures and what is the degree of their completeness?	(0) No records have been produced.	(1) There is a small number of poor records with a poor degree of completeness.	(2) There is a small number of acceptable records with an average degree of completeness.	(3) There is a large number of good records with a high degree of completeness.	(4) All records were produced very well and with a very high degree of completeness
5.3.2.3. Is the implementation of confirmation and promotion procedures supervised?	(0) There is no evidence of that at all.	(1) There is a small number of partial evidence of poor supervision.	(2) There is a small number of direct evidence of average supervision.	(3) There is a reasonable number of strong and direct evidence of good supervision.	(4) There is a large number of strong and direct evidence of excellent supervision.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for confirmation and promotion indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and procedures for confirmation and promotion indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.3. Sub-criterion Three: Human Resources					
5.3.3. Policies and procedures for sabbatical leaves	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.3.3.1. Does the institution have appropriate policies and procedures for sabbatical leaves?	The institution did not present any policies or procedures.	(1) The policies presented are weak, and the procedures are unclear.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable, and the procedures are partly clear.	(3) The policies are good, and the procedures are clear and of good sequence.	(4) The policies are excellent, and the procedures are very clear and of excellent sequence.
5.3.3.2. What is the quality of the records resulting from sabbatical leave procedures and what is the degree of their completeness?	(0) No records have been produced.	(1) There is a small number of poor records with a poor degree of completeness.	(2) There is a small number of acceptable records with an average degree of completeness.	(3) There is a large number of good records with a high degree of completeness.	(4) All records were produced very well and with a very high degree of completeness
5.3.3.3. Is the implementation of scientific leave procedures supervised?	(0) There is no evidence of that at all.	(1) There is a small number of partial evidence of poor supervision.	(2) There is a small number of direct evidence of average supervision.	(3) There is a reasonable number of strong and direct evidence of good supervision.	(4) There is a large number of strong and direct evidence of excellent supervision.

Total ratings given to the policies and procedures for sabbatical leaves indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and procedures for sabbatical leaves Policies and procedures for sabbatical leaves indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.3. Sub-criterion Three: Human Resources					
5.3.4. Policies on professional and career development	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.3.4.1. Does the institution have appropriate policies and procedures for professional and career development?	(0) The institution did not present any policies or procedures.	(1) The policies presented are weak, and the procedures are unclear.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable, and the procedures are partly clear.	(3) The policies presented are good, and the procedures are clear and of good sequence.	(4) The policies are excellent, and the procedures are very clear and of excellent sequence.
5.3.4.2. What is the quality of the training workshops held by the institution to develop its staff?	(0) The institution did not held any workshop.	(1) There is a small number of workshops with a poor degree of quality.	(2) There is a small number of acceptable workshops with an average degree of quality.	(3) There is a large number of workshops of a good quality.	(4) There is a large number of workshops of an excellent quality.

Total ratings given to the policies on professional and career development indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies on professional and career development indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.3. Sub-criterion Three: Human Resources					
5.3.5. Care and services	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.3.5.1. Does the institution provide health care to its staff?	(0) The institution did not provide any health care.	(1) It provides a simple health care to its staff within its premises.	(2) It provides a good health care to its staff and their families bearing a simple portion of costs of coverage.	(3) It provides a good health care to its staff and their families bearing about half of the costs of coverage.	(3) It provides an excellent health care to its staff and their families, bearing almost all costs of coverage.
5.3.5.2. Does the institution provide adequate services to its staff?	(0) The institution did not provide any services.	(1) It provides a poor system for leaves and savings.	(2) It provides an average system of leaves, savings and education of children.	(3) It provides a good system of leaves, savings, education of children and housing.	(3) It provides an excellent system of leaves, savings, education of children, housing and investment and others.

Total ratings given to the care and services indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the care and services indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.3. Sub-criterion Three: Human Resources					
5.3.6. Maternity Benefits	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.3.6.1. Does the institution provide benefits to female staff members in respect of brief departures and maternity leaves?	(0) It did not provide any benefits.	(1) It provides a weak system of brief departures and maternity leaves.	(2) It provides an average system of brief departures and maternity leaves.	(3) It provides a good system of brief departures and maternity leaves.	(4) It provides an excellent system of brief departures and maternity leaves.

Total ratings given to the Maternity Benefits indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Maternity Benefits indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

5. Criterion Five: Financial, Physical and Human Resources					
5.3. Sub-criterion Three: Human Resources					
5.3.7. Staff satisfaction with services	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
5.3.7.1. How satisfied are staff members with the training and developmental workshops and programs?	(0) It did not provide any results about that.	(1) The results of satisfaction surveys are weak and reflect a low degree of satisfaction.	(2) The results of satisfaction surveys are average and reflect an average degree of satisfaction.	(3) The results of satisfaction surveys are good and detailed and reflect a good degree of satisfaction.	(3) The results of satisfaction surveys are excellent and detailed and reflect an excellent degree of satisfaction.
5.3.7.2. How satisfied are staff members with the basic services and benefits?	(0) It did not provide any results about that.	(1) The results of satisfaction surveys reflect a low degree of satisfaction.	(2) The results of satisfaction surveys reflect an average degree of satisfaction.	(3) The results of satisfaction surveys reflect a good degree of satisfaction.	(3) The results of satisfaction surveys reflect an excellent degree of satisfaction.
5.3.7.3. How satisfied are institution's staff with the health care available thereat?	(0) Satisfaction has not been measured.	(1) The results of polls reflect a weak degree of satisfaction.	(2) The results of polls reflect an average degree of satisfaction.	(3) The results of polls reflect a large degree of satisfaction.	(3) The results of polls reflect a very large degree of satisfaction.

Total ratings given to the staff satisfaction with service indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the staff satisfaction with service indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion Five: Financial, physical and human resources		
5.1.1.	Financial Planning:	Rating () X Number of items (6) =
5.1.2.	The Budget:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
5.1.3.	Financial Allocation:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
5.1.4.	revenues and expenses:	Rating () X Number of items (5) =
5.2.1.	Availability and Efficiency:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
5.2.2.	Quality:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.2.3.	Safety and Security	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
5.2.4.	Facilities for Persons with Special Needs:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
5.2.5.	Improvement Plans:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.2.6.	Quality Management of Facilities:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.2.7.	Maintenance:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.2.8.	Satisfaction with Facilities:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.2.9.	Diversity of Resources:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.3.1.	Attraction and Employment:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
5.3.2.	Confirmation and Promotion:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
5.3.3.	Sabbatical Leaves:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
5.3.4.	Professional Development:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.3.5.	Care and Services:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
5.3.6.	Maternity Benefits:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
5.3.7.	Satisfaction with Services:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
General Rating:	Total number of points $\frac{\text{Total number of points}}{\text{Total number of items}} = \frac{\quad}{56} =$ Total number of items	
The level achieved:		
<u>Improvement Priorities:</u>		

6. Sub-Criterion Six: Student Services

6.1. Sub-Criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling.

The institution should have a process for guiding and counseling students. The process should include clear policies and objectives and official procedures for presenting and reviewing student activities, communication, evidence, behavioral guidance (rights and duties), psychological and social guidance and professional guidance.

Institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

- 6.1.1. Policies and Procedures for Student Awareness-Raising**
- 6.1.2. Policies on Students' Rights and Responsibilities**
- 6.1.3. Psychological and social counseling procedures**
- 6.1.4. Professional counseling Procedures**
- 6.1.5. Training courses conducted for students**
- 6.1.6. The role of the committees and councils in student guidance and counseling**
- 6.1.7. Plans for development and follow-up of guidance and counseling**

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.1. Sub-criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling					
6.1.1. Policies and Procedures for Student Awareness-raising	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.1.1.1. Are there documented and declared policies and procedures for student awareness raising at the institution?	(0) There are no policies or procedures for student awareness-raising	(1) There are undocumented policies on student awareness-raising	(2) There are documented policies on student awareness-raising, but they are undeclared.	(3) There are documented and declared policies, and they reflect in partly clear procedures.	(4) There are documented and declared policies, and they reflect in perfectly clear procedures.
6.1.1.2. Are there at the institution procedures for measuring the effectiveness of the student awareness-raising policies?	(0) There are no procedures for measuring the effectiveness of the student awareness-raising policies.	(1) There are poor measurement procedures that indicate poor effectiveness.	(2) There are average measurement procedures that indicate average effectiveness.	(3) There are good measurement procedures that indicate good effectiveness.	(4) There are excellent measurement procedures that indicate excellent effectiveness.

Total ratings given to the Policies and Procedures for Student Awareness-raising indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies and Procedures for Student Awareness-raising indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.1. Sub-criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling					
6.1.2. Policies on Students' Rights and Responsibilities	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.1.2.1. Are there documented, declared and published policies on students' rights and responsibilities?	(0) There are no policies on student's rights and responsibilities	(1) There are policies on students' rights and responsibilities, but they are not documented, declared or published.	(2) There are documented policies on students' rights and responsibilities, but they are not declared or published.	(3) There are documented, declared and published policies on students' rights.	(4) There are documented and declared policies on students' rights and responsibilities published in multimedia.
6.1.2.2. Are policies on students' rights and responsibilities reflected in effective procedures?	(0) There are no procedures concerning students' rights and responsibilities.	(1) The procedures are of poor effectiveness, as the students who are aware of their rights and responsibilities are less than 5%.	(2) The procedures are of average effectiveness, as the percentage of the students who are aware of their rights and responsibilities range between 5% and 20%.	(3) The procedures are of good effectiveness, as the percentage of the students who are aware of their rights and responsibilities range between 20% and 50%.	(4) The procedures are of excellent effectiveness, as the percentage of the students who are aware of their rights and responsibilities exceeds 50%.

Total ratings given to the Policies on Students' Rights and Responsibilities indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Policies on Students' Rights and Responsibilities indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.1. Sub-criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling					
6.1.3. Psychological and social counseling procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.1.3.1. Does the institution have clear, declared and published instructions and procedures for psychological and social counseling procedures?	(0) There are no instructions or procedures for psychological or social counseling procedures at the institution.	(1) It has some instructions and procedures, but they are not clear or documented.	(2) It has clear and documented instructions and procedures, but they are undeclared.	(3) It has clear, documented, declared and published instructions and procedures.	(4) It has excellent instructions and procedures that are clear, documented, declared and published.
6.1.3.2. What is the students' evaluation of the psychological and social counseling activities?	(0) No results were presented.	(1) The results presented are poor and indicate low effectiveness.	(2) The results presented are average and indicate average effectiveness.	(3) The results presented are good and indicate good effectiveness.	(4) The results presented are excellent and indicate high effectiveness.

Total ratings given to the Psychological and social counseling procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Psychological and social counseling procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.1. Sub-criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling					
6.1.4. Professional counseling Procedures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.1.4.1. Does the institution have clear, documented and published procedures for professional counseling?	(0) There are no procedures for professional counseling at the institution.	(1) It has some procedures, but they are not clear, documented, declared or published.	(2) It has clear and documented procedures, but they are not declared or published.	(3) It has clear, documented and declared procedures, but they are not published.	(4) It has excellent procedures that are clear, documented, declared and published.
6.1.4.2. . What is the students' evaluation of the units or offices concerned with professional counseling?	(0) There are no units or offices concerned with professional counseling.	(1) The results presented are poor and indicate low effectiveness.	(2) The results presented are average and indicate average effectiveness.	(3) The results presented are good and indicate good effectiveness.	(4) The results presented are excellent and indicate high effectiveness.

Total ratings given to the Professional counseling Procedures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Professional counseling Procedures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.1. Sub-criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling					
6.1.5. Training courses conducted for students	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.1.5.1. Does the institution hold training courses for its students on life skills needed by them?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it conducted one course on one skill and partly achieved the target.	(2) Yes, it conducted one course on more than one skill and achieved the target in an acceptable manner.	(3) Yes, it conducted more than one course on multiple skills and achieved the target in an acceptable manner.	(4) Yes, it conducted more than one course on multiple skills based on student needs and achieved targets in an excellent manner.
6.1.5.2. What is the percentage of the students benefiting from training courses?	(0) There are no courses.	(1) Less than 1% of the institution's students	(2) Between 1% and 5% of the institution's students	(3) Between 5% and 10% of the institution's students	(4) More than 10% of the institution's students
6.1.5.3. Does the institution develop a plan for training the trainers and those involved in student guidance and counseling and implement them to upgrade their efficiency?	(0) The institution does not conduct any training.	(1) The institution sometimes trains a very small number of trainers, with no plan for that.	(2) The institution develops a plan for training the trainers, but does not implement it properly.	(3) The institution develops a plan for training the trainers, and fully implements it.	(4) The institution develops a plan for training the trainers, fully implements it and verifies its effectiveness.

Total ratings given to the Training courses conducted for students indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Training courses conducted for students indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.1. Sub-criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling					
6.1.6. The role of the committees and councils in student guidance and counseling	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.1.6.1. Do the student guidance and counseling committees and councils perform their role and bear responsibility efficiently?	(0) No results were presented on that.	(1) The results presented are weak.	(2) The results presented are average and indicate average effectiveness.	(3) The results presented are good and indicate good effectiveness.	(4) The results presented are excellent and indicate excellent and effective performance.

Total ratings given to the role of the committees and councils in student guidance and counseling indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the role of the committees and councils in student guidance and counseling indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.1. Sub-criterion One: Student Guidance and Counseling					
6.1.7. Plans for development and follow-up of guidance and counseling	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.1.7.1. Does the institution review and develop student guidance and counseling plans with all its components?	(0) The institution does not review student guidance and counseling plans	(1) The institution reviews student guidance and counseling plans without taking any further action.	(2) The institution reviews student guidance and counseling plans without taking any further action and analyzes measuring outcomes.	(3) The institution reviews student guidance and counseling plans, analyzes measuring outcomes and recommends development plans..	(4) The institution develops student guidance and counseling plans in an excellent and on-going manner on the basis of measurement and analysis outcomes.
6.1.7.2. Are student guidance and counseling plans effective?	(0) There are no evidence of that.	(1) The evidence available indicate partial effectiveness.	(2) The evidence available indicate average effectiveness.	(3) The evidence available indicate high effectiveness.	(4) The evidence available indicate very high effectiveness.

Total ratings given to the Plans for development and follow-up of guidance and counseling indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Plans for development and follow-up of guidance and counseling indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

6.2. Sub-Criterion Two: Support Services:

The institution should have a process for managing the various student activities and services. The process includes instructions and procedures for offering these services and following up their implementation.

Institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

- 6.2.1. Instructions and procedures for student elections
- 6.2.2. Instructions and procedures for grants and student loans
- 6.2.3. Instructions and procedures for provision of support services
- 6.2.4. Institution's policy on extra-curricular activities
- 6.2.5. The role of student clubs in upholding support services
- 6.2.6. Following up and developing the performance of support services

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.2. Sub-criterion Two: Support Services					
6.2.1. Instructions and procedures for student elections	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.2.1.1. Does the institution apply documented, clear and declared instructions and procedures for student elections?	(0) The institution did not present any instructions or procedures for student elections.	(1) The institution has documented instructions and procedures for student elections, but they are unapplied.	(2) The institution sometimes applies documented instructions and procedures for student elections.	(3) The institution annually applies documented, clear and declared instructions and procedures for student elections.	(4) The institution transparently applies on annual basis documented, clear and declared instructions and procedures for student elections.
6.2.1.2. Do the elected student committees and councils perform their role and bear responsibility efficiently?	(0) There is no evidence of effectiveness.	(1) There is little evidence of poor effectiveness.	(2) There is little evidence of acceptable effectiveness.	(3) There is adequate evidence of good effectiveness.	(4) There is adequate evidence of acceptable effectiveness.

Total ratings given to the Instructions and procedures for student elections indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Instructions and procedures for student elections indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.2. Sub-criterion Two: Support Services					
6.2.2. Instructions and procedures for grants and student loans	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.2.2.1. Does the institution apply the instructions and procedures for offering grants and loans to students?	(0) The institution did not present any instructions or procedures for offering grants and loans to students.	(1) The institution has instructions and procedures for offering grants and loans, but they are not applied.	(2) The institution sometimes applies instructions and procedures for offering grants and loans.	(3) The institution applies on annual basis instructions and procedures for offering grants and loans.	(4) The institution generously applies on annual basis instructions and procedures for offering grants and loans.
6.2.2.2. What is the effectiveness of the instructions and procedures for offering grants and loans to students?	(0) There are no statistics on any beneficiaries.	(1) Statistics reveal very few beneficiaries.	(2) Statistics reveal that the percentage of beneficiaries is less than 5% of those eligible.	(3) Statistics reveal that the percentage of beneficiaries is around 50% of those eligible.	(4) Statistics reveal that the percentage of beneficiaries exceeds 50% of those eligible.

Total ratings given to the Instructions and procedures for grants and student loans indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Instructions and procedures for grants and student loans indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.2. Sub-criterion Two: Support Services					
6.2.3. Instructions and procedures for provision of support services	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.2.3.1. Does the institution apply documented, clear and published instructions and procedures for the provision of support services?	(0) The institution did not present any instructions or procedures	(1) The institution has instructions and procedures, but in most cases they are not applied.	(2) The institution sometimes apply some instructions and procedures for provision of services.	(3) In most cases the institution applies documented, clear and published instructions and procedures for provision of services.	(4) In all cases the institution applies documented, clear and published instructions and procedures for provision of services in an excellent manner.
6.2.3.2. Does the institution effectively implement sports services to students?	(0) There is no evidence of that.	(1) There is little evidence of poor effectiveness.	(2) There is little evidence of acceptable effectiveness.	(3) There is adequate evidence of good effectiveness.	(4) There is adequate and strong evidence of excellent effectiveness.
6.2.3.3. Does the institution effectively implement health services to students?	(0) There is no evidence of that.	(1) There is little evidence of poor effectiveness.	(2) There is little evidence of acceptable effectiveness.	(3) There is adequate evidence of good effectiveness.	(4) There is adequate and strong evidence of excellent effectiveness.
6.2.3.4. Does the institution effectively implement other student facilities (restaurants, banks, ...)to students?	(0) There is no evidence of that.	(1) There is little evidence of poor effectiveness.	(2) There is little evidence of acceptable effectiveness.	(3) There is adequate evidence of good effectiveness.	(4) There is adequate and strong evidence of excellent effectiveness.
6.2.3.5. How satisfied are students with the services offered to them?	(0) Has not been measured.	(1) Low	(2) Average	(3) High	(4) Very high

Total ratings given to the Instructions and procedures for provision of support services indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Instructions and procedures for provision of support services indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.2. Sub-criterion Two: Support Services					
6.2.4. Institution's policy on extra-curricular activities	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.2.4.1. Does the institution have a clear, documented, declared and published policy on extracurricular activities?	(0) The institution did not present any policy on extra-curricular activities.	(1) The institution has a policy on extra-curricular activities, but it is not implemented.	(2) The institution has a documented policy on extra-curricular activities, but it is not declared or published.	(3) The institution has a documented and declared policy on extra-curricular activities.	(4) The institution has an excellent and documented declared policy on all extra-curricular activities.
6.2.4.2. What is the effectiveness of the policy on extracurricular activities?	(0) There are no statistics on any activities or participants.	(1) Statistics reveal a very small number of activities and participants.	(2) Statistics reveal a small number of activities and participants.	(3) Statistics reveal an acceptable number of activities and participants.	(4) Statistics reveal many activities and participants.

Total ratings given to the Institution's policy on extra-curricular activities indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Institution's policy on extra-curricular activities indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.2. Sub-criterion Two: Support Services					
6.2.5. The role of student clubs in upholding support services	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.2.5.1. Do student clubs play an efficient role in upholding support services?	(0) There is no evidence of that.	(1) There is little evidence of poor efficiency in upholding support services.	(2) There is little evidence of reasonable efficiency in upholding support services.	(3) There is adequate evidence of good efficiency in upholding support services.	(4) There is adequate and strong evidence of excellent efficiency in upholding support services.
6.2.5.2. What is the number of student clubs at the institution?	(0) There is no any club.	(1) There is one club.	(2) There are two clubs with various objectives.	(3) There are several clubs with objectives not covering all fields.	(4) There are several clubs with objectives covering all fields.

Total ratings given to the role of student clubs in upholding support services indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the role of student clubs in upholding support services indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.2. Sub-criterion Two: Support Services					
6.2.6. Follow-up of the performance of support services and developing them	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.2.6.1. Does the institution measure, analyze and develop student services?	(0) The institution does not follow up the student services provided.	(1) The institution measures the student services provided without taking any subsequent action.	(2) The institution measures the student services provided and analyzes the measurement outcomes..	(3) The institution measures the student services provided, analyzes the measurement outcomes and recommends development thereof.	(4) The institution continuously develops the student services provided on the basis of the measurement and analysis outcomes.
6.2.6.2. Does the institution look into student complaints and benefit from them?	(0) No information available	(1) It sometimes looks into student complaints, and there is no evidence of benefit therefrom.	(2) In most cases it looks into student complaints, and there are few indicators of benefit therefrom.	(3) In most cases it looks into student complaints, and there are strong indicators of benefit therefrom.	(4) It always looks into student complaints, and there are strong and adequate indicators of benefit therefrom.

Total ratings given to the follow-up of the performance of support services and developing them indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Follow-up of the performance of support services and developing them indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

6.3. Sub-Criterion Three: Communication with the Graduates

The institution should have a process for planning, implementation and evaluation of activities and mechanisms for communication with the graduates. The process should have procedures for safeguarding and updating graduate and employer records and graduate participation in decision-making councils within the institution.

Institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

6.3.1. Procedures for strengthening relationships with the graduates

6.3.2. Representation of graduates on governance boards

6.3.3. Coordination and cooperation with employers and employing parties

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Six: Student Services					
6.3. Sub-criterion Three Communication with the Graduates					
6.3.1. Procedures for strengthening relationships with the graduates	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.3.1.1. Does the institution collect, update and develop data on graduates?	(0) Never, No.	(1) The institution sometimes collects data on some graduates.	(2) The institution each term collects data on graduates.	(3) The institution each term collects data on graduates and communicates with them to update the data.	(4) The institution each term collects data on graduates and communicates with them through all means of communication.
6.3.1.2. Does the institution effectively develop and update means of communication with the graduates?	(0) The institution does not communicate with the graduates.	(1) The institution communicates with the graduates through all means of communication.	(2) The institution poorly updates means of communication with the graduates.	(3) The institution updates means of communication with the graduates in a good manner.	(4) The institution updates means of communication with the graduates in an excellent manner.
6.3.1.3. Does the university support alumni clubs?	(0) The institution did not establish any club.	(1) It provides poor support to the clubs.	(2) It provides acceptable support to the clubs.	(3) It provides good support to the clubs.	(4) It provides excellent support to the clubs.
6.3.1.4. What is the effectiveness of the alumni clubs?	(0) No club activities at all	(1) It implemented one activity in a year with a small number of participants.	(2) It implemented one activity in a year with a large number of participants.	(3) It implemented two activities in a year with a large number of participants.	(4) It implemented several important activities in a year with a large number of participants.

Total ratings given to the procedures for strengthening relationships with the graduates indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the procedures for strengthening relationships with the graduates indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Five: Student Services					
6.3. Sub-criterion Three: Communication with the Graduates					
6.3.2. Representation of graduates on governance boards	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.3.2.1. Do graduates take part in the institution's governance boards effectively?	(0) Graduates do not take part in the governance boards.	(1) Graduates take part in some governance boards in a weak manner.	(2) Graduates take part in governance boards in an acceptable manner.	(3) Graduates take part in governance boards in a good manner.	(4) Graduates take part in governance boards in an excellent manner.

Total ratings given to the representation of graduates on governance boards indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the representation of graduates on governance boards indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

6. Criterion Five: Student Services					
6.3. Sub-criterion Three: Communication with the Graduates					
6..3.3. Coordination and cooperation with employers and employing parties	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
6.3.3.1. Does the institution coordinate and cooperate with the employers and employing parties of its graduates?	(0) There is no coordination with employers.	(1) There is poor coordination with a very small number of employers.	(2) There is acceptable coordination and cooperation with a small number of employers.	(3) There is good coordination and cooperation with a large number of employers.	(4) There is excellent coordination and cooperation with all employers.
6.3.3.2. Does the institution hold recruitment days for marketing its graduates?	(0) The institution does not organize recruitment days.	(1) The institution organized one recruitment day in the past.	(2) The institution holds recruitment days intermittently.	(3) The institution holds recruitment days regularly.	(4) The institution holds recruitment days regularly and effectively.
6.3.3.3. Does the institution explore the views of employers towards the graduate level?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Sometimes, within narrow limits	(2) Sometimes, within reasonable limits	(3) Often within expanded limits	(4) Always within expanded limits

Total ratings given to the coordination and cooperation with employers and employing parties indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the coordination and cooperation with employers and employing parties indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion Six: Student Services		
6.1.1.	Student Awareness Raising:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.1.2.	Students' Rights:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.1.3.	Psychological Counseling:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.1.4.	Professional Counseling:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.1.5.	Student Courses :	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
6.1.6.	Awareness-raising Committees:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
6.1.7.	Counseling Plans:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.2.1.	Elections:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.2.2.	Grants and Loans:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.2.3.	Support Services:	Rating () X Number of items (5) =
6.2.4.	Extra-curricular activities:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.2.5.	Student Clubs:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.2.6.	Follow-up of Performance:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
6.3.1.	The Relationship with the Graduates:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
6.3.2.	Representation of Graduates:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
6.3.3.	Employing Parties:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
General Rating:	Total number of points $\frac{\quad}{37} = \frac{\quad}{\quad} =$ Total number of items	
The level achieved:		
<u>Improvement Priorities:</u>		

7. Criterion Seven: Community Service and External Relations

7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service

The institution is expected to establish a process for managing the planning, implementation and reviewing the various community services activities. The institution is also expected to build up the necessary arrangements for ensuring effective participation of local community representatives in the various decision-making councils and committees within the institution.

Institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

7.1.1. Policies and plans on the relation with the community

7.1.2. Studies and research on sustainable development

7.1.3. Developmental and awareness-raising training courses and lectures

7.1.4. Participatory initiatives and developmental projects

7.1.5. Health services and medical days

7.1.6. Financial and physical support for meeting the community's developmental needs

7.1.7. Representation of the local community on governance boards

7.1.8. Contributions of the teaching staff and students in community service

7.1.9. The institution's contributions towards the preservation of the environment and natural resources

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

Descriptive Assessment of Performance					
7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.1. Policies and plans on the relation with the community	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.1.1. Does the institution have appropriate policies and plans on the relation with the community?	(0) The institution did not present any policies or plans.	(1) The policies presented are weak and the plans are unclear.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable and the plans are partly clear.	(3) The policies presented are good and the plans are clear and of good sequence.	(4) The policies presented are excellent and the plans are very clear and of excellent sequence.
7.1.1.2. Did the community service planning team identify an adequate number of the major members from the local community?	(0) No members were identified.	(1) Few local community members were identified.	(2) Few local community members were identified, but they are insufficient to cover requirements.	(3) A sufficient number was identified to cover requirements.	(4) All possible members of the community were identified to ensure collection of adequate requirements.
7.1.1.3. Did the community service planning team identify an adequate number of requirements to explain valid and comprehensive objectives?	(0) No requirements were identified.	(1) Few requirements were identified. These requirements are inadequate to explain objectives, and hardly cover a good mix of services.	(2) Reasonable requirements were identified to explain reasonable objectives. And they cover a reasonable mix of services.	(3) Requirements were well identified to explain good objectives, and they cover a good mix of services.	(4) Excellent requirements were identified that allow explanation of very good objectives, and they cover a distinct mix of services.
7.1.1.4. What is the quality of the objectives of the community service plan, and its relevance to the requirements of the community and the mission of the institution and its objectives?	(0) Very poor and does not fit the requirements, mission and objectives.	(1) Poor, and the level of relevance to the requirements, mission and objectives is weak.	(2) Average, they are specific, measurable and the level of relevance to the requirements, mission and objectives is average.	(3) Good, they are specific, measurable and achievable, and level of relevance to the requirements, mission and objectives is good.	(4) Excellent, they are specific, realistic, measurable and achievable, and the level of relevance to the requirements, mission and objectives is excellent.
7.1.1.5. Was the community service plan implemented effectively?	(0) Never, No. As there is no plan for community service.	(1) Yes, in a poor manner, and achieved 30% of the objectives.	(2) Yes, in an average manner, and achieved 50% of the objectives.	(3) Yes, in a good manner, and achieved 50-75% of the objectives.	(4) Yes, in an excellent manner, and achieved more than 75% of the objectives.

Total ratings given to the policies and plans on the relation with the community indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies and plans on the relation with the community indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.2. Studies and research on sustainable development	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.2.1. Does the community service plan include studies and research related to the sustainable development of the community?	(0) The plan does not include studies or research related to development.	(1) It includes one study.	(2) It includes between two and three studies.	(3) It includes between four and ten studies.	(4) It includes more than ten studies.
7.1.2.2. Have studies been conducted on the sustainable development of the community?	(0) No study was conducted.	(1) One study was conducted, with poor results.	(2) One study was conducted, with average results.	(3) Several studies were conducted, with good results.	(4) Several studies were conducted, with excellent results.

Total ratings given to the studies and research on sustainable development indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the studies and research on sustainable development indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.3. Developmental and awareness-raising training courses and lectures	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.3.1. Does the community service plan include developmental and awareness-raising training courses and lectures?	(0) The plan does not include developmental and awareness-raising training courses and lectures	(1) It includes one training course.	(2) It includes 2-5 courses or lectures.	(3) It includes 6-10 courses or lectures.	(4) It includes more than 10 courses or lectures.
7.1.3.2. Have the outcomes of the developmental and awareness-raising training courses and lectures been measured?	(0) No outcomes were measured.	(1) The outcomes presented are poor.	(2) The outcomes presented are average and reflect average performance.	(3) The outcomes presented are good and reflect good performance.	(4) The outcomes presented are excellent and reflect excellent performance.

Total ratings given to the developmental and awareness-raising training courses and lectures indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the developmental and awareness-raising training courses and lectures indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.4. Participatory initiatives and developmental projects	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.4.1. Does the community service plan include participatory initiatives and developmental projects?	(0) The plan does not include participatory initiatives and developmental projects .	(1) It includes one initiative or one developmental project.	(2) I includes 2-3 initiatives or projects.	(3) I includes 4-5 initiatives or projects	(4) I includes more than 5 initiatives or projects
7.1.4.2. Have the outcomes of the participatory initiatives and developmental projects been measured?	(0) No outcomes have been presented.	(1) The outcomes presented are poor.	(2) The outcomes presented are average and reflect average performance.	(3) The outcomes presented are good and reflect good performance.	(4) The outcomes presented are excellent and reflect excellent performance.

Total ratings given to the participatory initiatives and developmental projects indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the participatory initiatives and developmental projects indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.5. Health services and medical days	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.5.1. Does the community service plan include health services and medical days?	(0) The plan does not include health services or medical days.	(1) It includes health services and medical days, but less than the expected.	(2) It includes health services and medical days in an acceptable manner.	(3) It includes the expected number of health services and medical days.	(4) It includes health services and medical more than expected.
7.1.5.2. Have the outcomes of the health services and medical days been measured?	(0) No outcomes have been presented.	(1) The outcomes presented are poor.	(2) The outcomes presented are average and reflect average performance.	(3) The outcomes presented are good and reflect good performance.	(4) The outcomes presented are excellent and reflect excellent performance.

Total ratings given to the health services and medical days indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the health services and medical days indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

7. Criterion ثلاثي : Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.6. Financial and physical support for meeting the community's developmental needs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.6.1. Does the community service plan include the financial and physical support for meeting the community's developmental requirements?	(0) It does not include any financial or physical support.	(1) It includes poor support that is insufficient for the plan.	(2) It includes average support that is sufficient for half of the plan.	(3) It includes good support that is sufficient for 75% of the plan.	(4) It includes full support for the whole plan.
7.1.6.2. Have the results of the financial and physical support for meeting the community's developmental requirements for meeting the community's developmental requirements been measured.	(0) No results have been presented.	(1) The results presented are weak.	(2) The results presented are average and reflect average performance.	(3) The results presented are good and reflect good performance.	(4) The results presented are excellent and reflect excellent performance.

Total ratings given to the financial and physical support for meeting the community's developmental requirements indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the financial and physical support for meeting the community's developmental requirements indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.7. Representation of the local community on governance boards	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.7.1. What is the level of representation of the local community in the various governing boards of the institution?	(0) There is no representative of the local community on any of the governance boards.	(1) The local community has one representative on one of the governance boards.	(2) The local community has one representative on some governance boards.	(3) The local community has one representative on most of the governance boards.	(4) The local community has at least one representative on all governance boards.
7.1.7.2. What is the impact of the representation of the local community on the various governing boards of the institution?	(0) The institution did not present any results of the representation impact.	(1) Representation has poor impact as representatives absent themselves in most of council meetings.	(2) Representation has an average impact as representatives absent themselves in about half of the council meetings.	(3) Representation has a good impact as representatives absent themselves in few council meetings only.	(4) Representation has an excellent impact as representatives take part in all council meetings.

Total ratings given to the representation of the local community on governance boards indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the representation of the local community on governance boards indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.8. Contributions of the teaching staff and students in community service	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.8.1. What is the level of the contributions of the teaching staff and students in community service?	(0) Very poor. They do not contribute to community service.	(1) Poor. They make little contributions to few services.	(2) Average. They make average contributions to few services.	(3) Good. They contribute a lot to few services.	(4) Very good. They contribute a lot to many services.
7.1.8.2. How effective are the contributions of the teaching staff and students in community service?	(0) The institution did not present any results about that.	(1) Contributions are ineffective or has a poor impact.	(2) Contributions are somewhat effective or have an average impact.	(3) Contributions are effective or have a great impact.	(4) Contributions are very effective or have a very great impact.

Total ratings given to the contributions of the teaching staff and students in community service indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the contributions of the teaching staff and students in community service indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.1. Sub-criterion One: Community Service					
7.1.9. The institution's contributions towards the preservation of the environment and natural resources	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.1.9.1. What is the level of the institution's contributions to the preservation of the environment and natural resources?	(0) It does not make contributions to the preservation of the environment.	(1) It makes little contribution to the preservation of the environment.	(2) It makes average contribution to the preservation of the environment.	(3) It contributes a lot to the preservation of the environment.	(4) It always contribute to the preservation of the environment.
7.1.9.2. What is the effectiveness of the institution's contributions to the preservation of the environment and natural resources?	(0) The institution did not present any results about that.	(1) The contribution is ineffective or has a poor impact.	(2) The contribution has an average impact on the preservation..	(3) The contribution has a good impact on the preservation..	(4) The contribution has an excellent impact on the preservation..

Total ratings given to the institution's contributions to the preservation of the environment and natural resources indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the institution's contributions to the preservation of the environment and natural resources indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

7.2. Sub-Criterion Two: External Relations

The institution is expected to establish a process for managing the planning, application and review of the activities of external relations with national, regional and global institutions and organizations. Those activities should include relations with the Ministry of Higher Education The Higher Education Council, Commissions on Higher Education Accreditation and the parties that offer grants and funding for joint studies, projects, conferences and seminars, as well as recruitment of graduates and attraction of students.

Institutions shall be evaluated against this criterion through the following indicators:

7.2.1. The policies governing the building of relations at all levels

7.2.2. Cooperation procedures and mechanisms on all levels

7.2.3. Grants and assistance provided by national and external organizations

7.2.4. Joint studies and projects

7.2.5. Joint courses, conferences and workshops

7.2.6. Marketing of graduates

7.2.7. Mechanisms and activities for attracting students

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services

7.2. Sub-criterion Two: External Relations

7.2.1. The policies governing the building of relations at all levels	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.2.1.1. Does the institution have policies governing the building of relations on national, regional and global levels?	(0) The institution did not present any policies.	(1) The policies presented are poor and are not related to the institution's mission or objectives.	(2) The policies presented are acceptable and there is some relation to the institution's mission and objectives.	(3) The policies presented are good and they are related to the institution's mission, objectives and strategic objectives	(4) The policies presented are excellent and there is excellent relation to the institution's mission, objectives and strategic objectives
7.2.1.2. What is the quality of the plans for relations on the national, regional and global levels?	(0) No plans were presented.	(1) Less than average and includes some of the elements of the plan.	(2) Average and includes all elements of the plan.	(3) Above average and includes all elements of the plan in a good manner.	(4) Excellent, and can be seen as an example to be followed.
7.2.1.3. Does the organization measure the effectiveness and efficiency of the objectives and plans for internal and external relations?	(0) No results were presented.	(1) The results presented are poor.	(2) The results presented are average and reflect average performance.	(3) The results presented are good and reflect good performance.	(4) The results presented are excellent and reflect excellent performance.

Total ratings given to the policies governing the building of relations at all levels indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the policies governing the building of relations at all levels indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.2. Sub-criterion Two: External Relations					
7.2.2. Cooperation procedures on all levels	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.2.2.1. Does the institution have procedures for cooperation on the local and regional levels?	(0) No procedures were presented.	(1) The procedures presented are unclear and of poor sequence.	(2) The procedures are partly clear and of poor sequence, which affects understanding and application.	(3) The procedures are clear, of good sequence and easy to understand , but they are difficult to apply.	(4) The procedures are very clear, of excellent sequence and easy to understand and apply.
7.2.2.2. Do the cooperation procedures clearly reflect the policies on internal and external relations?	(0) This cannot be explained.	(1) This can be partly explained.	(2) It can be explained.	(3) It can be perfectly explained.	(4) It can be considered an optimal practice.
7.2.2.3. Does the institution have agreements with external institutions?	(0) It has no agreements with external institutions.	(1) Yes, but it is not activated in practice.	(2) Yes, and some of it is activated in practice.	(3) Yes, and most of it is activated in practice.	(4) Yes, and all of it is activated in practice.
7.2.2.4. Doe the institution review its agreements with other institutions?	(0) No, it did not make any review.	(1) Yes, but the procedures are partial.	(2) Yes, and the reviews are adequate, but they tackle progress only.	(3) Yes, and the reviews are adequate and they tackle progress and the necessary amendments.	(4) Yes, and the reviews are excellent and they tackle progress, amendments and effective application.

Total ratings given to the cooperation procedures on all levels indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the cooperation procedures on all levels indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.2. Sub-criterion Two: External Relations					
7.2.3. Grants and assistance provided by national and external organizations	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.2.3.1. How does the institution manage and invest the funds resulting from external relations activities?	(0) The institution did not get any funding.	(1) The funding obtained is little and it wasn't officially managed and registered.	(2) The funding obtained is average, and the institution keeps a special record to manage it in accordance with its plan.	(3) The funding obtained is good, and the institution keeps a special record to manage it in accordance with its plan.	(4) The funding obtained is excellent, and the institution keeps a special record to manage it in accordance with its plan.

Total ratings given to the grants and assistance provided by national and external organizations indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Grants and assistance provided by national and external organizations indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services

7.2. Sub-criterion Two: External Relations

7.2.4. Joint studies and projects	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.2.4.1. Does the institution conduct joint studies and projects, document them and measure their effectiveness?	(0) The institution did not conduct any joint studies or projects.	(1) The institution conducts joint studies and projects, but they are not documented and their effectiveness is not measured.	(2) The institution conducts joint studies and projects and they are documented and their effectiveness is measured in an acceptable manner.	(3) The institution conducts joint studies and projects, and they are documented and their effectiveness is measured in a good manner.	(4) The institution conducts joint studies and projects, and they are documented and their effectiveness is measured in an excellent manner.

Total ratings given to the joint studies and projects indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the joint studies and projects indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.2. Sub-criterion Two: External Relations					
7.2.5. Joint courses, conferences and workshops	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.2.5.1. Does the Foundation hold and run joint workshops and seminars?	(0) The institution did not hold any joint workshop and seminar.	(1) The institution held joint workshops and seminars, but they are not documented and were poorly run.	(2) The institution held joint workshops and seminars, with inaccurate documentation and poor management.	(3) The institution held joint workshops and seminars, with accurate documentation and good management.	(4) The institution held joint workshops and seminars, with very accurate documentation and excellent management that achieve all objectives. These are reviewed and improvement is applied.
7.2.5.2. Are the outcomes of joint workshops and seminars measured?	(0) No outcomes were presented.	(1) The outcomes presented are poor.	(2) The outcomes presented are average and reflect average performance.	(3) The outcomes presented are good and reflect good performance.	(4) The outcomes presented are excellent and reflect excellent performance.

Total ratings given to the joint courses, conferences and workshops indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the joint courses, conferences and workshops indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services

7.2. Sub-criterion Two: External Relations

7.2.6. Marketing of graduates	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.2.6.1. Does the institution implement and manage activities for the recruitment activities?	(0) The institution did not implement any activities for the recruitment of graduates.	(1) The institution implemented activities for the recruitment of graduates, but with inaccurate documentation and poor management.	(2) The institution implemented activities for the recruitment of graduates, but with inaccurate documentation and average management.	(3) The institution implemented activities for the recruitment of graduates, with accurate documentation and good management that achieves most objectives.	(4) The institution implemented activities for the recruitment of graduates, with very accurate documentation and excellent management that achieves all objectives.
7.2.6.2. What is the efficiency of graduate recruitment activities?	(0) No outcomes have been presented.	(1) The outcomes presented are poor and very few graduates have been employed on jobs that are not commensurate with their specializations.	(2) The outcomes presented are average and few graduates have been employed on jobs commensurate with their specializations.	(3) The outcomes presented are good and a reasonable percentage of graduates have been employed on jobs commensurate with their specializations.	(4) The outcomes presented are excellent and a high percentage of graduates have been employed on jobs within their exact specializations.

Total ratings given to the marketing of graduates indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the marketing of graduates indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

7. Criterion Seven: Student Services					
7.2. Sub-criterion Two: External Relations					
7.2.7. Mechanisms and activities for attracting students	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
7.2.7.1. Does the institution implement and run activities for attracting students?	(0) The institution did not implement any activity to attract students.	(1) The institution implemented activities to attract students, but they are undocumented and were poorly managed.	(2) The institution implemented activities to attract students, but with inaccurate documentation and average management.	(3) The institution implemented activities to attract students, with accurate documentation and good management that achieves most objectives.	(4) The institution implemented activities to attract students, with very accurate documentation and excellent management that achieves all objectives.
7.2.7.2. What is the efficiency of the student attracting activities?	(0) No outcomes were presented.	(1) The outcomes presented are poor, and a very small percentage of Jordanian and non-Jordanian graduates was attracted.	(2) The outcomes presented are average, and an average percentage of Jordanian graduates and a very small percentage of non-Jordanian graduates were attracted.	(3) The outcomes presented are average, and a high percentage of Jordanian graduates and an average percentage of non-Jordanian graduates were attracted.	(4) The outcomes presented are excellent, and a very high percentage of Jordanian graduates and a high percentage of non-Jordanian graduates were attracted.

Total ratings given to the mechanisms and activities for attracting students indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the mechanisms and activities for attracting students indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion Seven: Community Service and External Relations		
7.1.1.	Policies and Plans:	Rating () X Number of items (5) =
7.1.2.	Sustainable Development:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.1.3.	Training Courses:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.1.4.	Participatory Skills:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.1.5.	Health Services :	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.1.6.	Support:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.1.7.	Community Representation:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.1.8.	Contributions:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.1.9.	Preservation of the Environment:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.2.1.	Policies:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
7.2.2.	Cooperation:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
7.2.3.	Grants and Assistance:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
7.2.4.	Studies and Projects:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
7.2.5.	Conferences:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.2.6.	Marketing of Graduates:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
7.2.7.	Attraction of Students:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
General Rating:	Total number of points $\frac{\text{Total number of points}}{\text{Total number of items}} = \frac{\quad}{36} =$ Total number of items	
The level achieved:		
<u>Improvement Priorities:</u>		

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance

8.1. Sub-criterion One: Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement

Educational institutions are expected to be committed to maintaining and improving quality. The plans for on-going improvement and development should be a fundamental pillar of the management processes. This requires an effective leadership that supports the quality assurance and improvement processes, significant participation by all institution staff in the evaluation and improvement processes, each in his field of specialization, and reliance on objective evidence and proofs and specific performance indicators.

Institutional commitment to quality improvement shall be judged through indicators relating to:

- 8.1.1. Support and Follow-up by Leadership**
- 8.1.2. Availability of physical, financial and human resources**
- 8.1.3. Dissemination of the quality assurance**
- 8.1.4. Getting all institution staff involved in the improvement processes**
- 8.1.5. Commitment to Areas of Improvement**
- 8.1.6. Benefiting from the feedback in the improvement processes**

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

Descriptive Assessment of Performance					
8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.1. Sub-criterion One: Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement					
8.1.1. Support and Follow-up by Leadership	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.1.1.1. What is the level of participation of the senior management of the institution in the review and follow-up of the quality system?	(0) Never. It does not participates.	(1) The review records indicate poor participation and poor effectiveness.	(2) The review records indicate average participation and average effectiveness.	(3) The review records indicate good participation and high effectiveness that reflect in the improvement plans.	(4) The review records indicate excellent participation and very high effectiveness that reflect in the improvement plans and the reviews of the effectiveness of those plans.
8.1.1.2. Does the senior management of the institution have sufficient awareness of quality assurance standards to ensure their application?	(0) Yes, it has awareness of some quality standards.	(1) Yes, it has average awareness of all quality standards, and it directs staff to some of their guides.	(2) Yes, it has average awareness of all quality standards, and it directs staff to some of their guides.	(3) Yes, it has good awareness of all quality standards, directs staff to some of their guides and monitors the level of application of the quality assurance system in some units of the institution..	(4) Yes, it has full awareness of all quality standards, directs staff to some of their guides, and monitors the level of application of the quality assurance system in all units of the institution.
8.1.1.3. Does the senior management of the institution participate in the design of the quality assurance system and approve its policies and procedures?	(0) Yes, to a very weak degree and has a very weak practice in supporting and enforcing its application.	(1) Yes, to a weak degree and has a weak practice in supporting and enforcing its application.	(2) Yes, to an acceptable degree and has an acceptable practice in supporting and enforcing its application.	(3) Yes, to a great extent and has a good practice in supporting and enforcing its application and reviewing its objectives so that they remain consistent with the institution's mission and objectives.	(4) Yes, to a very great extent and has an excellent practice in supporting and enforcing its application and reviewing its objectives so that they remain consistent with the institution's mission and objectives.
8.1.1.4. Has the senior management of the institution established a unit attached to it to manage quality assurance?	(0) No.	(1) Yes, it established the unit and provided it with little support.	(2) Yes, it established the unit, provided it with some support and supplied it with some of the resources it needs to ensure quality.	(3) Yes, it established the unit, provided it with some support and supplied it with most of the resources it needs to ensure quality.	(4) Yes, it established the unit, provided it with full support and supplied it with all the resources it needs to ensure and improve quality.

Total ratings given to the Support and Follow-up by Leadership indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Support and Follow-up by Leadership indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.1. Sub-criterion One: Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement					
8.1.2. Availability of physical, financial and human resources	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.1.2.1. Does the institution provide the human resources needed by the quality assurance processes management?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it provides a person to manage the quality assurance processes.	(2) Yes, it provides half of its needs.	(3) Yes, it provides 75% of its needs.	(4) Yes, it provides all its needs.
8.1.2.2. Does the institution provide the physical and financial resources needed by the quality assurance processes management?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it provided 25% of what is required.	(2) Yes, it provided 50% of what is required.	(3) Yes, it provided 75% of what is required.	(4) Yes, it provided all what is required.

Total ratings given to the availability of physical, financial and human resources indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the availability of physical, financial and human resources indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.1. Sub-criterion One: Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement					
8.1.3. Dissemination of the quality assurance	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.1.3.1. Has the institution acted to disseminate the quality culture among its staff?	(0) No.	(1) Yes, through meetings on quality assurance	(2) Yes, through meetings on quality assurance and notice boards	(3) Yes, through meetings, notice boards and electronic media	(4) Yes, through meetings, notice boards, electronic media, awareness programs for new staff and printed materials
8.1.3.2. Has the institution worked to disseminate the quality culture among its staff?	(0) There are no procedures for measuring awareness level at the institution	(1) The measurement procedures followed at the institution show that the general level of awareness is poor.	(2) The measurement procedures followed at the institution show that the general level of awareness is average.	(3) The measurement procedures followed at the institution show that the general level of awareness is good.	(4) The measurement procedures followed at the institution show that the general level of awareness is excellent.

Total ratings given to the dissemination of the quality assurance indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the dissemination of the quality assurance indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.1. Sub-criterion One: Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement					
8.1.4. Getting all institution staff involved	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.1.4.1. Were all units made involved in the design and implementation of quality assurance processes and building improvement plans?	(0) Never, No. No unit was made involved in the design and implementation of quality assurance processes and building improvement plans	(1) Yes, few units and faculties were made involved.	(2) Yes, about half of the units and faculties were made involved.	(3) Yes, most of the units and faculties were made involved.	(4) Yes, all units and faculties were made involved

Total ratings given to the getting all institution staff involved indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the getting all institution staff involved indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.1. Sub-criterion One: Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement					
8.1.5. Commitment to Areas of Improvement	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.1.5.1. Does the institution have appropriate procedures and tools to ensure the implementation of improvement plans in different areas and measure their effectiveness?	(0) Never, No. It has no procedures.	(1) Yes, it has procedures and tools of relevance to the improvement plans and measuring their effectiveness in one area.	(2) Yes, it has procedures and tools of relevance to the improvement plans and measuring their effectiveness in two areas.	(3) Yes, it has procedures and tools of relevance to the improvement plans and measuring their effectiveness in several areas.	(4) Yes, it has procedures and tools of relevance to the improvement plans and measuring their effectiveness in all areas.
8.1.5.2. Do improvement plans cover all areas, processes and units at the institution?	(0) Never, No. There are no improvement plans.	(1) Yes, they cover some processes and areas in some academic and administrative units.	(2) Yes, they cover most of the processes and areas in most of the academic and administrative units.	(3) Yes, they cover most of the processes and areas in all the academic and administrative units.	(4) Yes, they cover all the processes and areas in all the academic and administrative units.

Total ratings given to the Commitment to Areas of Improvement indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Commitment to Areas of Improvement indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.1. Sub-criterion One: Institutional Commitment to Quality Improvement					
8.1.6. Benefiting from the feedback in the improvement processes	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.1.6.1. Does the institution have clear procedures to benefit from feedback in the on-going improvement?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there are unclear and unapplied procedures.	(2) Yes, there are clear procedures applied on a small scale.	(3) Yes, there are clear procedures applied on a ,large scale.	(4) Yes, there are clear procedures applied on a ,large scale, with training programs related to quality improvement.
8.1.6.2. Are the periodic reports of faculties, units and programs utilized for their improvement?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, few reports are benefited from in few units.	(2) Yes, few reports are benefited from in most of the units.	(3) Yes, a large number of reports are benefited from in most of the units.	(4) Yes, all reports are benefited from in all units.
8.1.6.3. Is the institution committed to evaluating and reviewing the quality assurance management system?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there are proofs of one unofficial review.	(2) Yes, there are proofs of one official review not followed with an amendment of the quality assurance management system.	(3) Yes, there are proofs of one official review followed with an amendment of the quality assurance management system.	(4) Yes, there are proofs of frequent reviews followed with an amendment of the quality assurance management system.

Total ratings given to the benefiting from the feedback in the improvement processes indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the benefiting from the feedback in the improvement processes indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

8.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scope of Work of Quality Assurance

Institutions should develop a total quality management system that governs all processes related to quality standards. This system should be managed by a unit with broad powers to ensure a high level of quality in all tasks and functions carried out by the institution in the fields of education, scientific research and community service. The quality assurance processes should be broad enough to cover the processes of planning, implementation and evaluation of the desired performance and providing the necessary feedback to improve it. They should also cover the inputs, processes and outputs.

The scope of work of quality assurance shall be judged through indicators relating to the following:

8.2.1. Application and monitoring of quality assurance management at the various administrative and technical faculties, centres and units

8.2.2. Regular evaluation of inputs, processes and outputs

8.2.3. Quality control and improvement and dissemination of the related results

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scope of Work of Quality Assurance					
8.2.1. Application and monitoring of quality assurance management at the various faculties and units	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.2.1.1. Is the quality assurance management system applied and monitored at the various faculties and units?	(0) It is not applied and monitored at all units.	(1) Yes, to a low degree in some units	(2) Yes, to an average degree in most of the units	(3) Yes, to a good degree in most of the units	(4) Yes, to a good degree in all units

Total ratings given to the application of and monitoring quality assurance management at the various faculties and units indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the application of and monitoring quality assurance management at the various faculties and units indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scope of Work of Quality Assurance					
8.2.2. Evaluation of inputs, processes and outputs	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.2.2.1. Does evaluation address inputs, processes and outputs at the institution?	(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)

Total ratings given to the evaluation of inputs, processes and outputs indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the evaluation of inputs, processes and outputs indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.2. Sub-criterion Two: Scope of Work of Quality Assurance					
8.2.3. Quality control and improvement and dissemination of related results	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.2.3.1. Does the institution control its quality system?	(0) The institution does not control its quality system.	(1) There are procedures for control, but they are not applied.	(2) There are procedures for control, but they are partly applied.	(3) There are procedures for control, but they are averagely applied.	(4) There are procedures for control, they are fully applied and they give precise results.
8.2.3.2. Does the institution act to improve its quality system?	(0) The institution does not improve its quality system.	(1) There are procedures, but they are not applied.	(2) There are procedures for improvement, but they are partly applied.	(3) There are procedures for control, but they are averagely applied.	(4) There are procedures for control, and they are fully applied.
8.2.3.3. Are the results related to the level of the institution performance quality published and publicized?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, the results are raised to the senior management.	(2) Yes, results are presented through workshops and seminars.	(3) Yes, results are published in the annual reports.	(4) Yes, results are published and publicized in all possible media.

Total ratings given to the quality control and improvement and dissemination of related results indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the quality control and improvement and dissemination of related results indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

8.3. Sub-criterion Three: Indicators, Criteria and Benchmarks:

The institution should identify key performance indicators to help it in monitoring performance, measuring its progress in achieving its goals and objectives and comparing the present performance to a previous performance or to the performance of similar institutions on local regional and global levels. Also, the additional indicators for some units and programs should be identified. The learning outcomes should be measured and the extent of their meeting of the labour market needs and requirements should be verified.

The indicators, criteria and benchmarks shall be judged through indicators relating to the following:

8.3.1. Inclusiveness, complementarity and measurability of key performance indicators in an objective manner in all educational sectors of the institution

8.3.2. Appropriateness of the secondary performance indicators to the special natures of the academic and administrative units

8.3.3. Identification of benchmarks for the institution's performance quality

8.3.4. The extent to which learning outcomes meet the labour market needs and requirements

8.3.5. Diversity of sources of evidence and proofs, including feedback received through opinion polls on performance quality evaluation

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.3. Sub-criterion Three: Indicators, Criteria and Benchmarks					
8.3.1. Inclusiveness, complementarity and measurability of key performance indicators	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.3.1.1. Has the institution identified key performance indicators inclusive of all quality criteria?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, key performance indicators have been identified for one criterion.	(2) Yes, key performance indicators have been identified for some criteria	(3) Yes, key performance indicators have been identified for most of the criteria	(4) Yes, key performance indicators have been identified for all criteria
8.3.1.2. Are the key performance indicators measurable and achievable?	(0) The institution has not identified indicators, or all of them are immeasurable.	(1) Yes, few of them are measurable and achievable.	(2) Yes, an average number of them are measurable and achievable.	(3) Yes, most of them are measurable and achievable.	(4) Yes, all of them are measurable and achievable.

Total ratings given to the inclusiveness, complementarity and measurability of key performance indicators indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the inclusiveness, complementarity and measurability of key performance indicators indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.3. Sub-criterion Three: Indicators, Criteria and Benchmarks					
8.3.2. Appropriateness of the secondary performance indicators to the special natures of the academic and administrative units	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.3.2.1. Has the institution identified special criteria for its academic and administrative units?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there is one unit which has special criteria.	(2) Yes, some units have special criteria.	(3) Yes, most units have special criteria.	(4) Yes, all units have special criteria.

Total ratings given to the appropriateness of the secondary performance indicators with the special natures of the academic and administrative units indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the appropriateness of the secondary performance indicators with the special natures of the academic and administrative units indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.3. Sub-criterion Three: Indicators, Criteria and Benchmarks					
8.3.3. Identification of benchmarks for the institution's performance quality	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.3.3.1. Does the institution identify benchmarks for its performance quality?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it identifies the minimum level of performance acceptable in accordance with one quality criterion.	(2) Yes, it identifies the minimum level of performance acceptable in accordance with some quality criterion.	(3) Yes, it identifies the minimum level of performance acceptable in accordance with most of the quality criteria.	(4) Yes, it identifies the minimum level of performance acceptable in accordance with all quality criteria.

Total ratings given to the identification of benchmarks for the institution's performance quality indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the identification of benchmarks for the institution's performance quality indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.3. Sub-criterion Three: Indicators, Criteria and Benchmarks					
8.3.4. The extent to which learning outcomes meet the labour market needs and requirements	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.3.4.1. Does the institution apply clear procedures in evaluating the extent to which learning outcomes meet the needs and requirements of the labour market extent to which learning outcomes meet the needs and requirements of the labour market?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, there are ambiguous procedures, and they are unapplied.	(2) Yes, there are clear procedures, and they are unapplied.	(3) Yes, there are procedures that are applied but surrounded with some ambiguity.	(4) Yes, there are procedures that are applied and clear.
8.3.4.2. To what extent do the learning outcomes meet the needs and requirements of the labour market?	(0) Very poor. Satisfaction is less than 20% in all programs.	(1) Poor. Satisfaction ranges between 20 and 40% in all programs.	(2) Average. Satisfaction ranges between 20 and 60% in all programs.	(3) High. Satisfaction ranges between 60 and 80% in all programs.	(4) Very high. Satisfaction is higher than 80% in all programs.
8.3.4.3. To what extent do the learning outcomes meet the needs and requirements of the labour market from graduates' perspective?	(0) Very poor. Satisfaction is less than 20% in all programs.	(1) Poor. Satisfaction ranges between 20 and 40% in all programs.	(2) Average. Satisfaction ranges between 20 and 60% in all programs.	(3) High. Satisfaction ranges between 60 and 80% in all programs.	(4) Very high. Satisfaction is higher than 80% in all programs.
8.3.4.4. To what extent do the learning outcomes meet the needs and requirements of the labour market from teaching staff members' perspective?	(0) Very poor. Satisfaction is less than 20% in all programs.	(1) Poor. Satisfaction ranges between 20 and 40% in all programs.	(2) Average. Satisfaction ranges between 20 and 60% in all programs.	(3) High. Satisfaction ranges between 60 and 80% in all programs.	(4) Very high. Satisfaction is higher than 80% in all programs.

Total ratings given to the extent to which learning outcomes meet the needs and requirements of the labour market indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the extent to which learning outcomes meet the needs and requirements of the labour market indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.3. Sub-criterion Three: Indicators, Criteria and Benchmarks					
8.3.5. Diversity of sources of evidence and proofs, including feedback received through opinion polls on performance quality evaluation	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.3.5.1. Does the institution adopt diverse sources of evidence and proofs in evaluating performance quality?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it adopts one source.	(2) Yes, it adopts two sources.	(3) Yes, it adopts three sources.	(4) Yes, it adopts all possible sources.

Total ratings given to the diversity of sources of evidence and proofs, including feedback received through opinion polls on performance evaluation indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the diversity of sources of evidence and proofs, including feedback received through opinion polls on performance evaluation indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

8.4. Sub-Criterion Four: Independent Verification of Evaluation

In performance evaluation processes, educational institutions should rely on evidence and proofs that include previously identified performance indicators and benchmarks. The results based on those evidence and proofs should be independently verified by competent individuals or parties. This requires reliance on multiple sources of data and multiple measuring instruments with good features> It also requires measuring learning outcomes and comparing them to the desired objectives.

Independent verification of the evaluation shall be judged by indicators relating to:

8.4.1. Validation of conclusions and interpretations

8.4.2. Verification of the learning outcomes achieved by students in comparison with the requirements of national qualifications or similar institutions.

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.4. Sub-criterion Four: Independent Verification of Evaluation					
8.4.1. Validation of conclusions and interpretations	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.4.1.1. Does the institution validate the conclusions of performance quality by relying on independent consultations from experienced and specialized people?	(0) Never, No.	(1) Yes, it relies on independent consultations from specialized people with little experience within the institution.	(2) Yes, it relies on independent consultations from specialized people with extensive experience within the institution.	(3) Yes, it relies on independent consultations from specialized people with extensive experience on national level.	(4) Yes, it relies on independent consultations from specialized people with extensive experience on global level.

Total ratings given to the Validation of conclusions and interpretations indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the Validation of conclusions and interpretations indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

8. Criterion Eight: Management of Quality Assurance					
8.4. Sub-criterion Four: Independent Verification of Evaluation					
8.4.2. Verification of the learning outcomes achieved by students in comparison with the requirements of national qualifications or similar institutions	Quality Levels				
	Level (0)	Level (1)	Level (2)	Level (3)	Level (4)
8.4.2.1. Did the institution compare the outputs of the learning outcomes of its students with other references?	(0) The institution did not make any comparison.	(1) The institution made one comparison, without making use of its results.	(2) The institution made one comparison, and made use of its results.	(3) The institution made several comparisons, and made use of the results of some of them.	(4) The institution made several comparisons, and made use of their results.

Total ratings given to the verification of the learning outcomes achieved by students in comparison with the requirements of national qualifications or similar institutions indicator=

The arithmetic average of the ratings given to the verification of the learning outcomes achieved by students in comparison with the requirements of national qualifications or similar institutions indicator =

The quality level achieved is:

Improvement priorities:

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The General Rating of Criterion Six: Student Services		
8.1.1.	Support and Follow-up by Leadership:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
8.1.2.	Availability of Resources:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
8.1.3.	Dissemination of Quality Culture:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
8.1.4.	Getting Staff Involved:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
8.1.5.	Commitment to Areas of Improvement:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
8.1.6.	Making Use of Feedback:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
8.2.1.	Application of Quality Assurance Management:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
8.2.2.	Comprehensive Evaluation:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
8.2.3.	Quality Control and Improvement:	Rating () X Number of items (3) =
8.3.1.	Inclusiveness of Indicators:	Rating () X Number of items (2) =
8.3.2.	Respect of Specificity:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
8.3.3.	Benchmarks:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
8.3.4.	Achievement of Requirements:	Rating () X Number of items (4) =
8.3.5.	Diversity of Resources:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
8.4.1.	Validation:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
8.4.2.	Achievement of Objectives:	Rating () X Number of items (1) =
General Rating:	Total number of points _____ = $\frac{\quad}{30}$ = Total number of items	
The level achieved:		
<u>Improvement Priorities:</u>		

Guide for Measuring Quality Assurance Criteria for Higher Education Institutions

The Overall Rating of the Institution		
1.	Strategic Planning:	Rating () X Number of items (10) =
2.	Governance:	Rating () X Number of items (20) =
3.	Academic Programs:	Rating () X Number of items (20) =
4.	Scientific Research, Scholarships and Innovations:	Rating () X Number of items (20) =
5.	Financial, Physical and Human Resources:	Rating () X Number of items (20) =
6.	Student Services:	Rating () X Number of items (10) =
7.	Community Service and External Relations:	Rating () X Number of items (10) =
8.	Management of Quality Assurance:	Rating () X Number of items (10) =
General Rating:	<p>Overall Total</p> <p>_____ = _____ =</p> <p>Total of Weights 120</p>	
The level achieved:		
Recommendation:		
<u>Improvement Priorities:</u>		