



**CRITERIA AND GUIDELINE FOR ACCREDITATION  
OF DOCTORAL PROGRAM  
IN THE MONGOLIA**

**2019**



## Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	4
<b>Mongolian National Council for Education Accreditation</b> .....	5
<b>National Quality Assurance System</b> .....	6
<b>Doctoral Programme Accreditation Procedure</b> .....	7
<b>Criteria and essentials of doctoral program accreditation</b> .....	14
<b>APPENDIX 1 SELF-EVALUATION TEMPLATE</b> .....	19

## Introduction

The current document is produced in the framework of the Erasmus+ “Promoting internationalization of research through establishment and operationalization of Cycle 3 Quality Assurance System in line with the European Integration” (C3QA) project.

The document is developed by the Mongolian National Council for Education Accreditation (MNCEA). It gives a comprehensive description of quality assurance framework of doctoral education.

While developing the document, MNCEA has assumed as a basis the following factors:

1. Needs assessment and situational analysis of the Mongolian doctoral education;
2. Current trends in European Higher Education Area (EHEA) and the European Research Area (ERA);
3. Recommendations and observations provided by the C3QA project partners (local, international).

MNCEA would also like to express its deep gratitude to C3QA project partners for their helpful insights in document drafting and review processes.

Any feedback or suggestions regarding the document would be much appreciated. They can be addressed to MNCEA at the following:

E-mail: [accmon@mongolnet.mn](mailto:accmon@mongolnet.mn)

Phone: (+976) 70109391

Fax: (+976) 70104507



## ACRONYMS

<b>MNCEA</b>	Mongolian National Council for Education Accreditation
<b>HE</b>	Higher education
<b>HEI</b>	Higher education institution
<b>QA</b>	Quality assurance
<b>R&amp;D</b>	Research and development

## **Mongolian National Council for Education Accreditation**

According to the Education Law approved in 1995, "The accreditation body for educational institution shall have the right to make accreditation analysis on the educational work and training by the elementary, middle and tertiary educational institutions and to ensure that they meet the requirements of the accreditation and shall be a legal entity to be fully funded by their activities," The law provides the legal basis of accreditation process in the education sector. The government of Mongolia chartered the Mongolian National Council for Education Accreditation by Resolution No. 240 of 1997, and passed its rule. Though, MNCEA was chartered by the government its administration based co-governing structure by the government and public. For example, the Governing Council, the Accreditation Council and Specialized Councils are composed of government, non-governmental organizations, and other stakeholders, and its independent assessments are conducted by authorized experts.

In Article 26 of the Law on Education revised in 2016, the following four provisions of the "Accreditation" section have been added to the MNCEA status and legal status.

26.5. The accreditation body of the educational training organization is the National Council for Education Accreditation.

26.6. Mongolian national council for education accreditation is responsible for setting accreditation criteria and procedures and registering to institution of accreditation of training programs.

26.7. The government will assist Education Accreditation Council to provide the accreditation body guidance and coordination.

26.8. The foreign accreditation body will be registered and approved by the National Accreditation Council.

In addition, Article 39.14 attached that "MNCEA shall be financed from the state budget for a portion of the proceeds based on the performance and performance. Though, the amount of service fees shall be set by the Governing Board of the MNCEA."

According to the Government of Mongolia in 288 on 2018, the regulation of the Education Accreditation Organization approved MNCEA became the National Center for Accreditation and implemented the organizational and program accreditation and expanded its role to grant program accreditation bodies.

Under this regulation, MNCEA is implementing the following functions: These include:

1. Define the accreditation procedures, procedures and accreditation requirements of the organization and program;
2. Submit proposals and conclusions to revoke the license of training institution that has been expired and accredited for training to the state central administrative body in charge of education;
3. Approve and select requirements for educational accreditation experts;
4. To register and approve a contract with the international institutional and training accreditation body in Mongolia;
5. Maintain integrated records of accredited training institutions and programs, create a nationwide database, report the information, provide information to the state central

administrative organization in charge of education and labor issues, and conclude performance agreements and deliver products;

6. Other rights and duties provided by law;

### National Quality Assurance System

The amendments to the Law on Education in 2016 result in a legal environment for accreditation.

Completion of a national quality assurance system is in line with international trends. Quality assurance based on learning outcomes based learning was based on the national, higher education and program level to improve the skills and capabilities of graduates in the labor market.

Figure 1. National Quality Assurance System

Stages	Goal	Criteria	Regulation	Criteria	Responsible	Outcome
<b>Start</b>	Initial accreditation	Compulsory	Standard of programme quality	Compulsory	MNCEA	Education degree, recognize documents
	Licensing	Compulsory	Common criteria for activities	Compulsory	MECS	Education degree, recognize documents
<b>Implementation</b>	Accreditation	Voluntary	Quality standard of programme	Voluntary	MNCEA	Education degree, recognize documents
			Professional standard		Professional associations	Education degree, recognize documents
			Professional standard		International accrediting organizations	Education degree, recognize documents

It is our future goal to work with a mutually beneficial and effective national system of quality assurance. In order to do this, we implemented the "Partnership Partnership" program with the German Federal Republic of ASIIN in 2016-2018. Under this program, MNCEA plans to revise the entire internal operations, accreditation, preliminary accreditation and international accreditation activities up to 2018. This program is being implemented with the involvement of representatives of the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports and representatives from MNCEA to teachers, who are not limited to the strengthening of the Higher education institutions' structural units and staff.

In the framework of the European Union Erasmus project, the joint projects of the Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sports, MNCEA, the National University of Mongolia, and Otgontenger University jointly participated in the joint project on "Improving quality assurance of doctoral level training". As a result of these projects, MNCEA will become an acceptable international organization.

## Doctoral Programme Accreditation Procedure

*Approved by the 08 Resolution of the Board  
of Mongolian National Council for Education  
Accreditation, dated June 26, 2018*

Programme accreditation has the following steps and procedures.

### *Step of preparing the process and conducting the self-evaluation:*

1. **Submission of Applications:** An HEI's Board of Trustees or another relevant body of the institution submits a predefined request /application form/ to the NCEA Secretariat Office for programme accreditation. Either an individual programme or a cluster of programmes can be accredited. A cluster should not contain more than 6 programmes and the programmes within a cluster should fall into a similar field of qualification. NCEA shall define similar fields of qualification like e.g.

- Social Sciences
- Education Sciences
- Engineering
- Natural sciences, etc.

Where applicable, these fields shall take into account existing professional standards, in particular in the case of regulated professions.

The NCEA Secretariat Office accepts only requests when the data on the application form is complete.

2. **Contract and Obligations of Contracting Parties:** The Secretariat Office scrutinizes accurately the institution's request within 10 days after receiving the request and if it is acceptable, it appoints a coordinator, invoices costs related to the accreditation and conclude a contract with the institution. The office stipulates the responsibilities and obligations of the contracting parties and conditions of payment and attaches the timelines with all phases, timings and responsible bodies until a decision is made.

3. **Expert Panel Formation:** To conduct an external institutional accreditation of an educational institution, NCEA sets up an expert panel of 4 experts chosen from NCEA's expert pool, or from the pool of professional associations, and matching the specific profile of the programmes that are to be accredited. If the programmes that are to be accredited are interdisciplinary, additional experts may be included to make sure that the complete profile of

the degree programmes is covered by the expert panel. The expert panel should ideally consist of

- 2 Representatives from higher education institutions (professors) academia in the areas of programme/s to be accredited (in case of interdisciplinary programmes or in order to cover all subject areas of the programmes under review, more than 2 professors can be nominated); one of the academic peers should have international experiences in the academic field of the programme;
- One representative from employers;
- One student familiar with student organisation work.

NCEA selects the chairperson from among the members of the peer panel. The chairperson ideally has previous experience in this role. The task of the chairperson is to collaborate with the NCEA Coordinator (see step 4 below) and to represent the peer group in front of the HEI and chair the meetings. The chairperson also scrutinizes the draft report and agrees on the agenda for the onsite visit with the institution (see steps 5 and 6 below).

The expert panel is presented to the institution that is to be accredited and each member has to confirm that there is no conflict of interest. In case of objections these need to be justified in a plausible manner to NCEA; the composition of the peer group may be changed if this is properly justified.

Then, the evaluation experts are appointed by the decree of the NCEA Secretariat Office's Director.

4. **Tasks of the Coordinator:** The coordinator appointed by NCEA coordinates and assists all parties involved in the accreditation process. The coordinator supports the applying institution with regard to technical and organizational matters and provides all relevant stakeholders with methodological guidelines and advice for the implementation of the accreditation procedure.
5. **Drafting of Self-Evaluation Report:** A template for the self-evaluation report for programme accreditation is provided to the HEI by NCEA. Based on this template, the responsible persons for the programmes under accreditation draw up a self-evaluation report, outlining the features of the programmes. The institution submits the self-evaluation report in accordance with the coordinator's guidelines within 3 months after the contract is concluded. The chairperson scrutinizes the self-evaluation report and supplementary data for completeness within 10 days after receiving the report and provides the findings to the coordinator. If the self-evaluation report is incomplete, the coordinator returns the report to



the institution for revision. The institution resubmits the completed report to the coordinator within 7 days.

**6. Submission of Self-Evaluation Report to Expert Panel:** If the self-evaluation report and supplementary data are complete, the coordinator forwards the complete set of documents to the expert panel.

### *Step of conducting a reviewing process*

**7 Arrangements of on-site visit:** As early as possible the exact dates of the onsite visit is agreed on between the chairperson and the HEI with the organisational support of the coordinator. Once the self-evaluation report is ready and submitted to the expert panel, the preparation of the on-site visit (agenda, participants, transfer organization, hotel rooms) is finalized. The coordinator and the chair visit the institution and ensure that everything is ready before the site visit.

**8 Expert Preparation of On-Site Visit:** The experts carefully scrutinize the self-evaluation report and supplementary materials. Based on the accreditation criteria, the experts provide feedback on each criterion to the coordinator within 20 days using a template provided by NCEA; the feedback is sent to the coordinator only to receive unbiased feedback from all experts. Once all feedback has been submitted to the coordinator, the coordinator compiles a summary of the different experts' feedback and sends it back to the experts. Additional questions are sent to the HEI to take this into consideration for the on-site visit, where appropriate.

**9 On site-visit:** At the beginning, the peers conduct an internal preparatory meeting to go through all the interview sessions along the list of accreditation criteria and collect systematically open questions. The following interview rounds/activities should be foreseen:

- Meeting with Management of Institution / Quality Assurance Unit
- Meeting with Students / Alumni
- Meeting with Business Partners of HEI
- Meeting with Deans / Lecturers from different programmes
- Visit of premises / laboratories / venues of learning and teaching.

The evaluation panel works at the institution for 2-4 days and collect all necessary information required for a full assessment. At the end of the on-site visit, the expert panel provides preliminary feedback to the institution without foretelling the final accreditation decision.

During the last internal meeting of the site visit, the evaluation experts should agree on their conclusions by selecting the best of three variable choices: The evaluation criteria are

- “fully met”,

- “provisionally met” and
- “not met” the criteria.

They also agree if requirements or recommendations are necessary to bring the degree programmes up to the expected standard. The assessment of the experts must be evidence based and plausibly justified. The coordinator of NCEA attends all meetings and takes proper notes of the interview rounds and the final conclusions of the peers to be able to write a draft accreditation report.

**10 Draft Evaluation Report:** The Chair drafts the evaluation report based on the notes taken during the audit visit within 15 days after the site visit. The draft report is sent to all peers and they are requested to carefully read the report, make comments if they agree and make amendments where suitable.

**11 Feedback from HEI:** The draft report written by the expert team is submitted to the HEI to provide feedback. The HEI shall be given the opportunity to correct factual errors, to clarify issues or to indicate how the HEI may take up issues for its further development. The HEI has a maximum of 14 days to prepare its feedback and send its comments to the coordinator who forwards it to the experts.

Taking this feedback into consideration the final version of the peer report is finalized.

The proposal of the expert panel contains one of the following three final judgments:

- Accreditation criteria are fully met
- Accreditation criteria are partly/provisionally met
- Accreditation criteria are met unsatisfactorily

The different decision proposals must be evidence based and plausibly explained and requirements and recommendations must be spelled out clearly. The draft final report is sent to the Accreditation Commission for Programme Accreditation.

### *Step of the accreditation decision-making and follow-up*

**12. Accreditation Commission for Programme Accreditation takes Decision:** The Accreditation Commission for Programme Accreditation (HEI and TVET programmes) analyzes the proposed accreditation report. At the next meeting of the Commission, the members of the commission discuss the report and verify if all criteria have been presented properly in the report and if the conclusions are evidence based and plausible. The chairperson of each procedure also presents an oral summary of the report findings and conclusions. Based on their analysis of the report, the Accreditation Commission makes amendments and finally takes the accreditation decision as follows:

- Accreditation criteria are fully met: full accreditation is granted for 5 years

- Accreditation criteria are partly/provisionally met: limited accreditation with requirements is granted for 1 year. Requirements need to be fulfilled within one year (compare the section “Follow-up of the Accreditation Procedure”). After fulfilment of the requirements, the accreditation is extended to its maximum duration.
- Accreditation criteria are met unsatisfactorily: Suspension of accreditation: either the HEI gets the opportunity to significantly improve the main points of criticism and to seek accreditation again or the situation at the HEI is in a situation that it is unlikely that the HEI will be able to meet the standards at all. Then accreditation may be refused entirely.
- Accreditation refused: when there is no likelihood that the institution can improve so as to meet the minimum requirements.

A majority of votes from among the Commission members suffices to take a decision

The HEI is informed about the decision right after. The final report and the certificates are sent to the HEI within 15 days after the decision was taken. The reviewing process is finalized now. The HEI has the right to **appeal** against the decision.

13. **Registration of HEI:** In case of a positive decision, the programmes are listed in the official register and respective documents of accreditation are registered at and archived in the NCEA Archive within 10 days after the accreditation decision is made.
14. **Follow up of the Accreditation:** If only limited accreditation was granted to the HEI and requirements need to be fulfilled, the HEI is requested to submit respective evidence after 9 months that proves that the requirement has been fulfilled. These documents are sent to the coordinator of NCEA who forwards the information to the peers. The peers assess if the information provided gives proof that the requirement was fulfilled or not and sent their feedback to the coordinator of NCEA. The judgment of the peers and the documents are sent to the Accreditation Commission for Institutional Accreditation which is evaluates the assessment of the peers and the documents provided by the HEI at the next meeting. If all requirements are fulfilled, the HEI receives accreditation for the full duration. If the requirements are not satisfactorily fulfilled, the HEI gets another 6 months to make respective amendments and send new evidences after 4 months. Peers and Accreditation Commission repeat the procedure of assessment. If the HEI fails again to satisfy the peers and Accreditation Commission, accreditation is not be prolonged and expires after 6 months. The HEI has the right to appeal against the decisions in the first and second round of checking the fulfilment of requirements.

**12. Suspension of Accreditation:** If the peers concluded that accreditation cannot be granted due to severe shortcomings with regard to the expected quality standards, the Accreditation Commission examines the exact reasoning given by the peers and the evidences provided. The commission confirms the suspension of accreditation and accepts the conditions formulated to resume the accreditation procedure again or changes the conditions if this seems necessary. Alternatively, the commission concludes that the shortcomings can be improved and the minimum standards could be met if certain requirements are fulfilled. In that case the commission changes the proposal of the peers to a provisional accreditation with requirements as outlined under the section “Follow up of the Accreditation”. If the accreditation is suspended, the HEI is given the opportunity to implement respective amendments and provide evidence that the conditions for resuming the accreditation procedure have been met. The evidence of fulfilment of the conditions is sent by the HEI to the coordinator of NCEA within 18 months after the decision was taken. The coordinator of NCEA forwards the documents provided by the HEI to the peers who assess if the documents prove that the conditions have been fulfilled. If the peers conclude that the conditions have been fulfilled they have to verify if additional requirements or recommendations need to be formulated. The assessment of peers and the documents of the HEI are forwarded to the Accreditation Commission and are discussed at the next meeting of the commission. The Accreditation Commission verifies if the reasoning of the peers and the documents provided are acceptable to confirm that the conditions are fulfilled. The commission then decides to resume the accreditation procedure and might add requirements and recommendations that need to be fulfilled by the HEI (compare section on “Follow up of Accreditation”). If the HEI does not succeed in providing evidence to fulfil the conditions as formulated by the Accreditation Commission, no accreditation is granted to that HEI.

**13. Changes during the accreditation period:** In the letter with the accreditation decision that is sent to the HEI it is also indicated that significant changes in the programmes relevant to any of the accreditation criteria need to be indicated to NCEA. If an HEI intends to introduce significant changes or has implemented these changes, the HEI needs to send a respective explanation in writing to the coordinator of NCEA. The coordinator forwards this information to the Accreditation Commission requesting them to assess whether the changes are in line with the accreditation criteria and accreditation can be granted with the procedural changes. If the Accreditation Commission verifies that the changes are in line with the accreditation criteria, the commission decides that accreditation can continue with the changes. If the Accreditation Commission comes to the conclusion that the changes are not in line with the

accreditation criteria and alter the quality management system at the HEI in a way that quality standards are not met anymore, the commission can suspend accreditation or demand that the HEI refrains from the intended changes. If accreditation is suspended please refer to the section “Suspension of Accreditation”. The Accreditation Commission can also decide that a new procedure has to be implemented. In any case, the HEI is informed about the results in writing.

**14. Reaccreditation after maximum duration of accreditation:** Before the maximum duration of accreditation comes to an end, the HEI is obliged to apply for reaccreditation. The procedure of reaccreditation is exactly the same like for a first accreditation. The reaccreditation procedure needs to be organized in a way that accreditation is granted without gaps.

**15. Appeals Procedure:** The HEI has the right to appeal against the decisions made by the Accreditation Commission within one month of receiving the decision. The HEI has to submit this appeal in writing and its justification why it appeals against the decisions to the coordinator of NCEA. If additional evidence is required to underpin the reasoning of the HEI this needs to be submitted as well. The coordinator forwards this appeal to the accreditation commission which takes appeals as a constant point on its agenda. The Accreditation Commission examines the justification and the additional evidences. If the commission accepts the argumentation of the HEI, the decision made by the Accreditation Commission is either taken back or changed if this seems necessary. If the accreditation commission does not follow the reasoning of the HEI and concludes that the appeal is not justified, the procedure is forwarded to the *appeals committee*.

The appeals committee consists of a representative of NCEA, two professors of HEIs of Mongolia, a business representative and a student.

The HEI is informed about the decision in writing. The appeals committee analyses the case and gets in contact with the HEI to discuss the issue with representatives from the HEI and takes additional information into consideration. The appeals committee tries to resolve the issue with the HEI and formulates a compromise that is acceptable to all parties. The possible compromise is presented to the Accreditation Commission. The commission confirms if it accepts the compromise of the appeals committee. If the compromise is accepted, a respective decision is taken and the HEI is informed about it. If the accreditation commission does not accept the proposed solution, the appeals committee makes one more attempt to find a solution. If no mutual compromise can be found, the appeal is rejected.

## Criteria and essentials of doctoral program accreditation

The following criteria are for use during the self-assessment process of a degree programme (or a group of degree programmes in related subject areas) as well as the external assessment process by MNCEA external expert panels.

Self and external assessment should provide evidence of the sustainable management and continuous enhancement of higher education degree programme in accordance with social demands and requirements.

The main functions of criteria for programme accreditation are:

- to provide guidance for the responsible units within a higher education institution in developing and updating its educational offer in line with the overarching goals of the institution.
- to support the institution in carrying out a self-reflective internal assessment process of its degree programmes and their respective objectives as well as the processes for their achievement
- to provide an assessment scheme for the external evaluators during the programme accreditation procedure

The criteria set below acknowledges the fact that programme accreditation is voluntary and is carried out for programmes offered by higher education institutions that have passed institutional accreditation.

### Criterion 1. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT

**The doctoral programme objectives are aligned with the institutional research policy and objectives, taking into account stakeholder expectations.**

#### 1.1 Programme design

Doctoral program is developed by meeting the common requirements of doctoral programs, and other special requirements by relevant stakeholders. Documentation of a doctoral program clearly states the procedures of plan, implementation and quality assurance of research projects completed during the program.

#### 1.2 Programme objectives

The programme has defined objectives in the form of intended learning outcomes covering knowledge, skills and competences to be acquired by students by the end of the studies. The objectives reflect the national qualifications framework, the institutional research policy and objectives and mission, expectations of the relevant subject community and the relevant stakeholders.

#### 1.3 Programme content

The curricular contents allow scientific scope and students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The curriculum does have a logical sequence, avoids overlaps and contains a balance between theory and

practice in line with the programme objectives. Where appropriate, the curriculum contains elective elements for students.

#### **1.4 Syllabus**

The programme documentation, including in particular course descriptions, contains relevant information about learning outcomes, pre-requisites, curriculum structure, teaching and learning method, expected student workload, credit award, assessment methods and criteria, recommended literature. It is regularly updated.

#### **1.5 Special requirements for the programme**

Intended learning outcomes and content of doctoral programs reflects the special requirements of doctoral programs by professional associations of a particular field.

### **Criterion 2. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION**

**The institution have a structure, organization and legal environment to effectively implement the doctoral programme, aligned with the programme objectives and supports students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes and research activities.**

#### **2.1 Admission**

Admission criteria enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. They are fairly and consistently applied. The procedures adopted (choice of thesis topics and supervisors, type and amount of funding, etc.) are explicitly stated and fair.

#### **2.2 Doctoral student workload**

Workload of independent and desk research is balanced, preventing from overload or shortcomings.

#### **2.3 Teaching and learning methodology**

The instructional methodology is student centered, aligned with the programme objectives and supports students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

#### **2.4 Supervision**

The doctorate includes individual and regular follow-up of doctoral students, with clearly defined, coherent and transparent procedures for doctoral students and thesis supervisors.

#### **2.5 Research link, cooperation**

Provisions are made at the level of the programme to increase the collaboration with national and international public and private organizations and higher education institutions. The doctoral programme have established links and partnerships with internal or external research departments and/or organizations. Teachers and doctoral students are involved in research teams.



## **2.6 Thesis defence**

Explicit criteria for authorizing thesis defense (producing new knowledge, exploitation of results, validating teaching, mobility, etc.) are communicated to doctoral students and thesis supervisors. Organization rules for thesis defense (composition of the examination board and role of its members, convening notice, manuscript submission, etc.) are communicated to doctoral students and supervisors. These rules are defined in a fair and transparent manner.

## **2.7 Graduation documents**

Students are provided with a qualification certificate as well as a programme-specific Diploma Supplement in English. These documents provide information on the student's qualifications profile and individual performance as well as the programme learning outcomes, context, level and status of the degree programme with regard to its applicable education system.

## **Criterion 3. DOCTORAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND ACHIEVED PROGRAMME OUTCOMES**

**The programme demonstrates the achievement of the intended outcomes. Assessment is fairly and consistently implemented in line with the relevant institutional policies.**

### **3.1 Assessment of doctoral students**

Student learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and competency) are systematically assessed with various approaches and methods. Assessment procedure and criteria is directed towards assessing in a fair and transparent manner. Assessment resources including test banks in every course is developed and updated to assess students' knowledge, skills and competency.

### **3.2 Doctoral student progress and recognition of achievements**

Criteria for credit award and student progression are transparent for all relevant stakeholders and are consistently applied at programme level.

Rules for the recognition of externally acquired competences and qualifications are applied at programme level.

### **3.3 Doctoral student support and advice**

The doctorate invites doctoral students to take part in supplementary scientific and/or professional events or actions, such as scientific events, conferences or panel discussions, etc. For each type of action, the methods for access, validation and evaluation, particularly by doctoral students, are defined and communicated.

### **3.4 Research funding**



The doctorate is based on a transparent thesis funding policy, which is consistent with its objectives and the institution's scientific policy. The policy involves controlled management of this funding.

### **3.5 Scholarship**

Specific rules and regulation to specify the financial resource to fund doctoral students' studies and provide scholarships to them.

## **Criterion 4. TEACHING STAFF**

**Teaching staff are both sufficient and suitable in accordance with the characteristics of the doctoral programme, the scientific field and the number of students.**

### **4.1 Teaching staff**

The teaching staff members involved in the programme have the adequate qualifications with regard to the programme content and didactical competences to enable students to achieve the intended programme outcomes.

### **4.2 Teaching staff development**

Systematic professional development mechanism is in place to improve faculty's teaching and research skills and supervision skills of doctoral students.

### **4.3 Links with research**

Teaching staff members are involved in research relevant to the programme subject area. Results from research are fed into teaching and learning. Where appropriate, students are involved in research activities in the programme subject area.

## **Criterion 5. RESOURCES AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

**Management information system to collect necessary resources, check resource allocations, and performance and make decisions of doctoral programs in order to achieve the learning outcomes and do research.**

### **5.1 learning and research facilities**

Laboratories and their equipments and library resources are suited to the subject area of the programme. Students have access to facilities and software necessary for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, also during self-study periods.

### **5.2 Teaching and learning resource materials**

Learning environment has necessary facilities and resources including textbooks for all courses, and teaching and learning materials. Hard and soft copies of necessary resource materials for research work are available for immediate accessibility.

### **5.3 Information management system**

The institution has in place an information management system for the collection and analysis of data. Data is collected, analyzed and used for quality improvement of the doctoral programmes

### **5.4 Transparent programme information**

Information about the doctoral programme, including objectives intended learning outcomes, qualification awarded, duration, level, requirements, as well as information about the achieved programme outcomes, including graduates' career paths, are made transparent for all relevant stakeholders. It is regularly updated.

### **5.5 Financial resources**

The doctoral programme possess and maintain reliable financial resources from multiple sources to support the implementation, monitoring and improvement of the programmes.

## **Criterion 6. QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**The doctoral programme is subject to regular internal and external quality assurance mechanisms directed at continuous development with the involvement of stakeholders.**

### **6.1 Internal quality assurance and enhancement**

The programme and its components (including teaching material and facilities) as well as the quality of the involved staff members are regularly evaluated. The programme demonstrates that evaluation results are used for continuous improvements. All relevant stakeholders are involved in evaluation mechanisms.

### **6.2 External recognition at national and at international level**

Where appropriate, the programme is externally evaluated by relevant national or international organization with a view to facilitating the academic or professional recognition of the qualification awarded.



## APPENDIX 1 SELF-EVALUATION TEMPLATE

*I hereby endorse*

Rector/Director \_\_\_\_\_

“ \_\_\_\_ ” \_\_\_\_\_ 2019

### DOCTORAL PROGRAM SELF-EVALUATION

---

(Name of the Institution)

---

(Name and code of the specialty)

---

(Address of the Institution)

**ULAANBAATAR 2019**

**Composition of the self-evaluation working group**

Name, Surname	Position	Responsibility in the group
<i>Please insert rows, if necessary</i>		

## CONTENT

**Criterion 1. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT**

**Criterion 2. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION**

**Criterion 3. DOCTORAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND ACHIEVED PROGRAMME OUTCOMES**

**Criterion 4. TEACHING STAFF**

**Criterion 5. RESOURCES AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

**Criterion 6. QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**Note:** *each criterion should be assessed separately the criteria themselves (e.g. 1.1; 1.2; 1.3...). The criteria are statements of quality expectations in the form of minimum standards that an institution is expected to fulfil to receive full accreditation. For the self-evaluation should answer the the analytic questions. The questions are intended to help institutions and external evaluators interpret the criteria, and to help institutions reflect about areas and thematic issues supporting the fulfilment of the criteria. The analytic questions are not intended as a checklist or tick box.*

## **Criterion 1. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND CONTENT**

**The doctoral programme objectives are aligned with the institutional research policy and objectives, taking into account stakeholder expectations.**

### **1.6 Programme design**

Doctoral program is developed by meeting the common requirements of doctoral programs, and other special requirements by relevant stakeholders. Documentation of a doctoral program clearly states the procedures of plan, implementation and quality assurance of research projects completed during the program.

- *How has the evaluation been made in evidences and documentations of the program during last 5 years?*
- *Who initiated and implemented this process and what assessments made resulting in it?*
- *What kind of follow – up and corrective activities made according to the evaluation and assessments?*

### **1.7 Programme objectives**

The programme has defined objectives in the form of intended learning outcomes covering knowledge, skills and competences to be acquired by students by the end of the studies. The objectives reflect the national qualifications framework, the institutional research policy and objectives and mission, expectations of the relevant subject community and the relevant stakeholders.

- *How have the program objectives been upgraded by comparing with similar international and national programs during last 5 years?*
- *What are your program's or institution's uniqueness and features?*
- *How are the program objectives being aligned with a mission of school (such as contribution to betterment of society and development of professional field)?*
- *How do you evaluate to what extent the program objectives meet demands of individuals and expectations of employers in delivering high competencies?*

### **1.8 Programme content**

The curricular contents allow scientific scope and students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The curriculum does have a logical sequence, avoids overlaps and contains a balance between theory and practice in line with the programme objectives. Where appropriate, the curriculum contains elective elements for students.

- *How have you evaluated and assured during last 5 years if the curriculum and syllabuses are linked with the learning outcomes and implemented coherently? It may include below;*

- *Actual harmonization of theory and practice*
- *Logical order*
- *Overlap and gap*
- *Possibility of elective learning*
- *Learning mode and load*

### 1.9 Syllabus

The programme documentation, including in particular course descriptions, contains relevant information about learning outcomes, pre-requisites, curriculum structure, teaching and learning method, expected student workload, credit award, assessment methods and criteria, recommended literature. It is regularly updated.

- *How have you done analysis in the program content and accordingly, made modification activities during last 5 years?*
- *Due to the content modification, what efficient results have you had?*
- *Have made any changes in credit hours and syllabus mode in regard of the content modification?*
- *How are assessment tools for students' learning improved or upgraded?*

### 1.10 Special requirements for the programme

Intended learning outcomes and content of doctoral programs reflects the special requirements of doctoral programs by professional associations of a particular field.

## Criterion 2. DOCTORAL PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

**The institution have a structure, organization and legal environment to effectively implement the doctoral programme, aligned with the programme objectives and supports students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes and research activities.**

### 2.1 Admission

Admission criteria enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. They are fairly and consistently applied. The procedures adopted (choice of thesis topics and supervisors, type and amount of funding, etc.) are explicitly stated and fair.

- *How do you assess to what extent admission process is transparently and fairly organized?*
- *How do you deliver the information of admission for target individuals?*
- *What are your lessons and experiences from admission processes of last 5 years and how have you made necessary follow-up activities?*

### 2.2 Doctoral student workload

Workload of independent and desk research is balanced, preventing from overload or shortcomings.

- *How do you assess and assure to what extent credit hours is smoothly distributed for each of week and quarter?*
- *What kind of coordination activities do you have to prevent from too low or over loads?*

### 2.3 Teaching and learning methodology

The instructional methodology is student centered, aligned with the programme objectives and supports students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes.

- *What policy or coordination activities have you implemented in order to foster research and learning methodology during last 5 years?*
- *What research methodology do doctoral students handle and use mainly?*
- *What independent and active learning methods do doctoral students handle and use?*

#### **2.4 Supervision**

The doctorate includes individual and regular follow-up of doctoral students, with clearly defined, coherent and transparent procedures for doctoral students and thesis supervisors.

- *How do you assess and assure to what extent policies and regulations to recruit, appoint and assess the academic supervisor are efficiently implemented?*
- *What kind of improvements do you have in organizing flexibly procedures and necessary follow-up activities to assess and motivate achievements of research and learning process?*

#### **2.5 Research link, cooperation**

Provisions are made at the level of the programme to increase the collaboration with national and international public and private organizations and higher education institutions. The doctoral programme have established links and partnerships with internal or external research departments and/or organizations. Teachers and doctoral students are involved in research teams.

- *How have cooperation activities, which focused on supporting program objectives and doctoral research, been efficiently implemented?*
- *How are involvement of faculty members and students in joint projects and programs?*

#### **2.6 Thesis defence**

Explicit criteria for authorizing thesis defense (producing new knowledge, exploitation of results, validating teaching, mobility, etc.) are communicated to doctoral students and thesis supervisors. Organization rules for thesis defence (composition of the examination board and role of its members, convening notice, manuscript submission, etc.) are communicated to doctoral students and supervisors. These rules are defined in a fair and transparent manner.

- *How do you assess and assure to what extent respective procedures and criteria are explicitly and fairly implemented?*
- *How are satisfactions of academic supervisor and doctoral students in regard of it?*
- *How do you do follow-up activities if there is any complain?*

#### **2.7 Graduation documents**

Students are provided with a qualification certificate as well as a programme-specific Diploma Supplement in English. These documents provide information on the student's qualifications profile and individual performance as well as the programme learning outcomes, context, level and status of the degree programme with regard to its applicable education system.

- *Who is responsible for preparing and issuing the graduation documents?*
- *Who manages that templates and up-to-date information of individual students?*

### **Criterion 3. DOCTORAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT AND ACHIEVED PROGRAMME OUTCOMES**



**The programme demonstrates the achievement of the intended outcomes. Assessment is fairly and consistently implemented in line with the relevant institutional policies.**

### **3.1 Assessment of doctoral students**

Student learning outcomes (knowledge, skills and competency) are systematically assessed with various approaches and methods. Assessment procedure and criteria is directed towards assessing in a fair and transparent manner. Assessment resources including test banks in every course is developed and updated to assess students' knowledge, skills and competency.

- *How is your school improving and making excellence in the fair and explicit assessment system of learning outcome?*
- *How to you solve complains and feedbacks of students in regard of their assessment?*
- *Do you make respective analysis and follow-ups in the achievements of students learning and learning outcomes?*

### **3.2 Doctoral student progress and recognition of achievements**

Criteria for credit award and student progression are transparent for all relevant stakeholders and are consistently applied at programme level. Rules for the recognition of externally acquired competences and qualifications are applied at programme level.

- *How do you assess and assure to what extent the procedure to accept and recognize credits are explicitly, fairly and efficiently being implemented?*

### **3.3 Doctoral student support and advice**

The doctorate invites doctoral students to take part in supplementary scientific and/or professional events or actions, such as scientific events, conferences or panel discussions, etc. For each type of action, the methods for access, validation and evaluation, particularly by doctoral students, are defined and communicated.

- *What additional support activities did you organize and what results did you achieve?*
- *In doing so, how do you ensure participations of doctoral students?*
- *Except major activities, how do you analyse demanded supports for doctoral students and take respective follow-ups?*

### **3.4 Research funding**

The doctorate is based on a transparent thesis funding policy, which is consistent with its objectives and the institution's scientific policy. The policy involves controlled management of this funding.

- *How does your funding procedure for doctoral research implement?*
- *Is there any possibility to get funding from other sources or in range of your collaboration?*

### **3.5 Scholarship**

Specific rules and regulation to specify the financial resource to fund doctoral students' studies and provide scholarships to them.

- *How is your procedure to alleviate and waive tuition fees and issue the scholarship being implemented?*
- *How do you assess and assure to what extent such supports promote achievements of student's learning and learning outcomes?*

## **Criterion 4. TEACHING STAFF**

**Teaching staff are both sufficient and suitable in accordance with the characteristics of the doctoral programme, the scientific field and the number of students.**

#### **4.1 Teaching staff**

The teaching staff members involved in the programme have the adequate qualifications with regard to the programme content and didactical competences to enable students to achieve the intended programme outcomes.

- *How have you implemented a policy or strategic planning in creating pool of qualified faculty members and researchers?*
- *How did you create adequate source of faculty members?*
- *What activities do you implement for creating convenient and stable environment for qualified faculty members and researchers?*

#### **4.2 Teaching staff development**

Systematic professional development mechanism is in place to improve faculty's teaching and research skills and supervision skills of doctoral students.

- *How are your procedure and support activities to promote scientific works of faculty members implemented?*
- *What kind of activities and supports have you implemented and organized for making progress in numbers and quality of their scientific works?*
- *How do you support initiatives of academic supervisors to advance their research capability?*

#### **4.3 Links with research**

Teaching staff members are involved in research relevant to the programme subject area. Results from research are fed into teaching and learning. Where appropriate, students are involved in research activities in the programme subject area.

- *How do you use research results of doctoral students for improving the program?*
- *How do you support recommendations and initiatives for making pilots in order to improve the program?*
- *In doing so, how do you motivate the doctoral students?*

### **Criterion 5. RESOURCES AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

**Management information system to collect necessary resources, check resource allocations, and performance and make decisions of doctoral programs in order to achieve the learning outcomes and do research.**

#### **5.1 learning and research facilities**

Laboratories and their equipments and library resources are suited to the subject area of the programme. Students have access to facilities and software necessary for the achievement of the intended learning outcomes, also during self-study periods.

- *How satisfied are the participants of the programme with its equipment and facilities?*
- *How does the programme react to bottlenecks in equipment and facilities?*
- *How is it ensured that the books and electronic resources provided by the library are adequate and sufficient for the programme under review?*

#### **5.2 Teaching and learning resource materials**

Learning environment has necessary facilities and resources including textbooks for all courses, and teaching and learning materials. Hard and soft copies of necessary resource materials for research work are available for immediate accessibility.

- *How is the concept of student-centered learning applied during the delivery of the programs?*
- *How is it ensured that didactical instruments and methods support the achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the programme?*
- *How is it ensured that all teaching staff members apply the didactical instruments and methods most suitable for the achievement of the intended competences?*

### **5.3 Information management system**

The institution has in place an information management system for the collection and analysis of data. Data is collected, analysed and used for quality improvement of the doctoral programmes

- *How is it ensured that necessary and meaningful data is produced?*
- *How is the data analysed? How are key performance indicators developed and their achievement monitored?*
- *How is data drawn from statistical analysis and achievement of KPIs used to improve programmes and programme delivery?*

### **5.4 Transparent programme information**

Information about the doctoral programme, including objectives intended learning outcomes, qualification awarded, duration, level, requirements, as well as information about the achieved programme outcomes, including graduates' career paths, are made transparent for all relevant stakeholders. It is regularly updated.

- *How is it ensured that up-to-date information is made available to students and other stakeholders?*
- *What means of communication are used?*
- *How is it ensured that course descriptions are up-to-date and contain all relevant information for students?*

### **5.5 Financial resources**

The doctoral programme possess and maintain reliable financial resources from multiple sources to support the implementation, monitoring and improvement of the programmes.

- *What provisions are made to generate income from diverse sources where appropriate?*
- *How are stakeholders' needs taken into account?*
- *How does the financial management ensure transparent provision of financial transactions?*
- *How is compliance with national financial regulations ensured?*

## **Criterion 6. QUALITY ASSURANCE**

**The doctoral programme is subject to regular internal and external quality assurance mechanisms directed at continuous development with the involvement of stakeholders.**

### **6.1 Internal quality assurance and enhancement**

The programme and its components (including teaching material and facilities) as well as the quality of the involved staff members are regularly evaluated. The programme demonstrates that evaluation results are used for continuous improvements. All relevant stakeholders are involved in evaluation mechanisms.

- *How is ensured that results of quality assurance mechanisms are actually implemented for programme improvement? Who is involved in taking and implementing decisions?*
- *What measures for the improvement of the quality of the programme have been taken within the last few years?*
- *Which elements of the internal quality assessment are considered to be especially useful for the continuous improvement of the programme?*

## **6.2 External recognition at national and at international level**

Where appropriate, the programme is externally evaluated by relevant national or international organization with a view to facilitating the academic or professional recognition of the qualification awarded

- *How are institutional guidelines for international programme accreditation implemented?*
- *What measures are taken to facilitate professional recognition by the relevant professional bodies, where applicable?*