

APPENDIX II ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR THE MPHEC MONITORING PROCESS

I INTRODUCTION

The specific objective of the monitoring function is to review the policy, processes and procedures used by institutions to assess the quality of existing programs and other functions as appropriate, to ensure they are performing adequately as quality control and quality improvement mechanisms.

The purpose of the Committee in carrying out the monitoring process is to provide answers to the following two questions: first, “Is the institution following its own quality assurance policy?”, and second, “Could the institution's quality assurance policy be modified to better ensure the quality of its academic programs and services or is it satisfactory as is?”. The Committee will be assessing the institution's quality assurance policy and related processes, but will not be assessing the quality of specific programs or units.

The process is intended to be formative; institutional policies and practices will be reviewed with a view to provide assistance and advice to institutions.

II ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

1. Institutional context of the policy
 - 1.1 The policy is consistent with the institution's mission and values.
2. General
 - 2.1 Scope of the policy is appropriate, i.e., the policy is comprehensive in terms of assessing all programs and units.
 - 2.2 The policy follows the Commission's guidelines. Any discrepancy is explained/justified.
 - 2.3 The policy promotes *continuous* quality improvement.
3. Policy objectives
 - 3.1 Scope of the objectives is appropriate.
 - 3.2 Objectives linked to program quality improvement.
 - 3.3 Objectives linked to decision-making process.
 - 3.4 Objectives linked to realization of stated student outcomes.
 - 3.5 Objectives linked to the economic, cultural and social development of the university's communities.
4. Policy components
 - 4.1 Assessment criteria are defined and are appropriate (to include the adequacy of financial, human and physical resources).
 - 4.2 General guidelines for the program/unit self-study are established and are appropriate.
 - 4.3 The external review process is objective including clearly defined generic terms of reference for, and selection process for, experts.
 - 4.4 Procedures allowing for the participation of students, faculty members, staff and the community-at-large are established.
 - 4.5 (If the policy focuses on units) Mechanism(s) to assess interdisciplinary programs, typically not examined when a policy focuses on units, exist and are appropriate.
 - 4.6 Linkages between program assessment and accreditation requirements are identified.

- 4.7 Schedule of program/unit assessment is appropriate.
 - 4.8 Procedures to review the policy itself are identified, including procedures to seek/include stakeholder input.
5. Policy implementation (assessment practices)
- 5.1 Program/unit self-studies address the institution's assessment criteria.
 - 5.2 Program/unit self-studies include a component that is student-centered, as they aim, among other things, to assess the quality of learning.
 - 5.3 Students, faculty members, staff and the community-at-large participate in the assessment process.
 - 5.4 External review process is objective; experts selected during the peer review process have the appropriate expertise.
 - 5.5 Policy and procedures monitor the continuing relevance of the program.
 - 5.6 Schedule of reviews is adhered to, or modifications to schedules can be reasonably explained or justified.
 - 5.7 Required follow-up action is undertaken.
 - 5.8 Policy is subject to regular review (and the review process includes procedures to seek stakeholder input).
6. Policy administration
- 6.1 Coordinating or administrative unit identified as the lead is appropriate.
 - 6.2 Effective support has been offered to programs and units under review.
 - 6.3 Appropriate follow-up mechanisms are in place and are functioning appropriately.
 - 6.4 Assessment results have been appropriately disseminated.
 - 6.5 The process informs decision-making.