SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT INSTRUCTIONS
for
CEEMAN International Quality Accreditation (IQA)[1]

There is no prescribed format for the Self-Assessment Report, but it should nevertheless cover in detail the points referred to in the guidelines for CEEMAN International Quality Accreditation (IQA) policy and procedures.

These are:

1) **Mission; strategic focus**
2) **Legal status and governance**
3) **Main achievements to date**
4) **Program structure and participant processes**
5) **Program and curricula development; educational innovations**
6) **Learning outcomes; participant and program evaluation processes**
7) **Faculty**
8) **Research and contributions to management theory and practice**
9) **Resources and support processes**
10) **Applications of technology**
11) **Business / financial model and results; financial viability**
12) **How the institution meets the needs of its local environment and constituents; progress on internationalization.**

In particular, the Self-Assessment Report (hereinafter: SAR) should comment on:

- The mission and strategic focus given the demands and constraints of the available resources and the situation of the institution's local environment.
- Progress with respect to the implementation of the mission and strategy.
- Consistency of programs, research, faculty, and resources with the mission and strategic focus of the institution.
- How the programs and research meet the needs of students/participants in the programs, and other stakeholders.
- The adequacy of resources, processes, faculty, and facilities to provide high levels of satisfaction and service.
- Demonstrated concern for issues of corporate social responsibility / responsible leadership / values and ethics.
- How the institution provides leadership to the relevant business community.

To provide further guidelines under each of these headings, you can assume that the CEEMAN Accreditation Director, in making a recommendation for peer review, will want to satisfy herself/himself on the points listed under the 12 broad themes as outlined below.

[1] Revised January 11, 2015

Minimum information and data requirements are identified after questions related to each of the 12 SAR themes. **Typically, numerical data will cover the last 5 years.** Unless stated otherwise, program data can be grouped in the main body of the SAR (e.g. undergraduate programs, full-time MBA programs, EMBA programs, M.Sc. programs, Ph.D. programs, open enrolment non-degree programs, customized in-company programs). Some data should be organized in quintile format, including quintile averages as well as the overall data base average and standard deviation. The appendices can include additional data and information which the institution seeking accreditation thinks would be relevant and helpful to building a positive case for accreditation. To form quintile tables from a data base, first organize the data from highest to lowest data result. Organize the data into five quintiles (top 20% scores, next 20% etc.). Calculate averages for each of the five quintile groups. Add an overall data base average and standard deviation.

1) With respect to mission and strategic focus:

- Is there a written mission statement? If so, is it clear, concise, and realistic?
- Is there a clear process for making this mission known understood and accepted within the institution and among external stakeholders?
- Is the mission statement convincing and credible with respect to resources at hand and the nature of the institution's market environment?
- Is there demonstrable progress with respect to the accomplishment of the mission?
- Is the business strategy of the institution aligned with the mission?
- Is the strategy sufficiently focused to assure quality execution and effective differentiation?
- Has the institution made clear business strategy decisions with respect to (i) scope of revenue-generating programs and activities, (ii) student segmentation, and (iii) geographic scope.
- Is there consistency between the stated mission and strategy and actual faculty, program, research activities, and other resources and processes?
- Does the institution have overall and for its programs a clear "USP" (Unique Selling Proposition) and clear value-added to students and to corporate sponsors?
- Does the institution deliver what it promises in its promotional material?
- Has the institution identified any priorities for gaining additional strategic focus and/or achieving more fully its stated mission?

Information requirements: Commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above.

2) With respect to legal status and governance:

- What is the legal form of the institution?
- Is the legal form of the institution appropriate for its mission and appropriate to assure long-term viability?
- If there are substantial sources of public or other external support; does the institution's management work effectively with these constituencies to determine future direction and key investments?
- Is the institution effectively managed – and through which structures and leadership?
- Is the institution effectively governed – and through which board structures?
- Does the management work effectively with the governing boards?
- Does the faculty have a voice in key institutional decisions?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) organization charts related to governance of the institution, its employees, and other stakeholders.

3) With respect to achievements to date:

- Is there a required level of experience and participant throughput (five years of existence and at least 60 graduates from degree programs)?
- Does the institution have a significant share of its target market?
- Is the institution seen to be legitimate and well-reputed by key stakeholders and by the general public?
- Has the institution obtained other local or international accreditation consistent with its development?
- Is the institution ranked in regional, national and/or international rankings of business schools?
- Does the institution have and promote an important alumni activity?
- Have the programs scored well in the eyes of participants?
- Has the institution successfully dealt with its financial realities, and does it have a sound platform for the future?
- Has the institution identified goals or targets for new achievements over the next few years and are these goals or targets realistic?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) market share data related to target markets (rough estimates if this data is not easily accessible); (iii) ranking data (if available); (iv) data on the size of alumni groups; commentary on scheduled alumni activities and services provided to alumni; (v) quintile data, by program type, on overall participant evaluations of the institution's major programs. If the institution has specialized programs within broad program groupings, average participant evaluations for each specialized program can be added as an appendix to the SAR.

4) With respect to program structure and participant processes (for first degree programs, MBA/EMBA and M.Sc. Programs, Ph.D. programs, and/or management development programs):

- Do programs and curricula provide a clear value-added for the participants?
- Are admissions criteria rigorous and strictly applied?
- Are there clear milestones and checkpoints for successful progression through the programs?
- Are there sufficient applications and enrollment in the programs to assure both financial viability and quality education?
- Is information about the programs and program execution readily available to potential and actual participants?
- Does the content of the programs meet required standards as well as reflect the particular needs of the target market – both the core subjects and electives?
- Is there regular monitoring of program and service delivery quality?
- Does the institution have any specific plans on how to improve its quality assurance processes in the future?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) enrolment data by program type, including specializations (i.e. applications, offers made to participants, participants enrolled, participants graduation over the last 5 years); (iii) participant evaluations of overall faculty and administrative support, in quintile format, by major program types. Descriptions of representative programs' content (curriculum) can be added as an appendix. If there are documents for participants that outline policies and procedures related to academic standards and quality control processes, these could be added as an appendix to the SAR.

5) With respect to program and curricula development; educational innovations (for first degree programs, MBA/EMBA programs, M.Sc. programs, Ph.D. programs and/or other management development programs):

- Is there a process for regular program and course review and design updates?
- Do programs and individual courses include content related to issues of corporate social responsibility / responsible leadership / values and business ethics?
- Is there a satisfactory awareness and understanding by the faculty of new teaching materials available through various case clearing houses and other faculties? Are these resources integrated into the programs?
- Do the programs remains “fresh” with respect to the challenges facing practicing managers, and with respect to the challenges awaiting students as they return to their careers?
- Does the research and teaching material development of the institution’s own faculty contribute to the regular development of the institution’s programs and curricula?
- Is there a track record of innovation in the design and delivery of the institution’s offerings – and specifically which form have these taken in the past?

Information requirements: Commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above.

6) With respect to learning outcomes; participant and program evaluation processes (for first degree programs, MBA/EMBA programs, M.Sc. programs, Ph.D. program, sand/or other management development programs):

- Are all students properly evaluated?
- Are there appropriate examination procedures?
- Do quality standards exist and are these rigorously adhered to?
- Are students given the opportunity to effectively evaluate the school’s programs and faculty, and are these evaluations properly reviewed and taken into account?
- What institution decisions are affected by student evaluations and with what processes and consequences?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) % of graduating participants by degree program type who find employment by graduation date and by three months after graduation date.

7) With respect to faculty:

- Is the faculty properly qualified?
- Does the faculty exhibit the right degree of diversity for the tasks expected of it? Is there an appropriate faculty “mix”?
- Is there a well-defined and rigorous process for appointing new faculty and for promotion of existing faculty?
- Does the faculty work together as a team – in program design, delivery, and in research?
- Is the faculty providing appropriate leadership inside and outside the institution?
- Does the institution have an explicit program and set of processes for developing its own faculty and for hiring new appointees?
- Are faculty compensation principles appropriate in the context of the institution’s mission and general business model?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) annual breakdowns of faculty size by academic qualifications (e.g. PhD, Master's degree, other qualifications), full-time vs. part-time faculty, % of teaching classes delivered by full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and visiting faculty, % composition of faculty (full-time equivalents) by gender and academic disciplines, faculty age mix by quintiles, annual new faculty hires, retirements, contract terminations (by full-time equivalents); (iii) number of nationalities included in the full-time faculty group; (iv) average normal contractual full-time faculty teaching load per year counted in classroom teaching hours per year; (v) overall faculty compensation percentages (e.g. base salary, bonuses, "over-time" compensation, other forms of compensation) at institution level.

8) With respect to research and contributions to management theory and practice:

- Does the faculty demonstrate clear thought leadership?
- Does the faculty publish in refereed, non-refereed journals, and other appropriate media?
- Is the faculty present and visible at major academic conferences, management meetings, and in the press?
- Does the faculty write case studies for classroom use?
- Does the institution, through its faculty, contribute to the development of new teaching material and new courses?
- Are faculty contributions in research and teaching material development consistent with the stated mission and strategic focus of the institution?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) for full-time faculty only, in quintile format, the average number of annual publications per faculty member in book form, referred journals, non-referred journals, conference proceedings, case studies, and other publication forms including other media outlets which are valued by the institution; (iii) % of full-time faculty who have participated annually in local, national, and international conferences, (iv) amount of annual funding (and sources) for faculty research activities. As an appendix, include individual citations annually for all faculty publications. If your institution has a Ph.D. program, include current approved dissertation topics for all current Ph.D. candidates a separate appendix.

9) With respect to resources and support processes:

- Are the institutions physical facilities adequate to provide top quality education – in particular with reference to classrooms, study rooms, and other support facilities?
- Is there an appropriate level of computer and database access?
- Are there adequate library and research infrastructure facilities available to students and staff?
- Are there streamlined processes in place to support student work and student life at the institution?
- Does the institution attract high quality employees who care about participants, have diverse backgrounds, have a clear notion of what quality means the institution, and who possess the skills, attitudes and opportunities needed to make their own personal contributions to improving institutional quality standards?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) data on the number of classrooms by participant seating capacity; (iii) number of study group rooms; (iv) description of computer and related IT resources and capabilities; (v) size and composition of library holdings; (vi) annual library budget; (vii) percent of library budget allocated to printed copy vs. data bases. An appendix should include a list of data bases which the library subscribes to.

10) With respect to applications of technology:

- Is there sufficient technological/ IT support to key administrative functions?
- Is there sufficient technological/IT support for key promotion and information activities for students?
- Does the institution have a well-developed and well-organized website?
- Is there appropriate use of technology/IT in the education process itself?

Information requirements: Commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above.

11) With respect to business / financial model and results; financial viability:

- Does the institution have a credible and viable business/financial model to assure long-term balance of costs and revenues?
- Is the institution, given its current direction, financial viable?
- Are the institutional activities well-managed and properly controlled from the financial viewpoint?
- Does the institution have an appropriate management accounting and financial reporting system?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) annual institutional income statements and balance sheets; (iii) a statement of contribution margins for all major program or other revenue-generating activities (contribution margin equals direct revenues minus direct costs.

12) With respect to meeting the needs of the local environment, and with respect to internationalization and social responsibility:

- Are local needs properly served?
- Are the programs and research consistent with the realities and challenges of the institution's target market?
- Is there a well-developed network of contacts with the local and international business community?
- Does the school conduct research and develop teaching materials about the challenges of managers and leaders in its local environment?
- Is there progress in internationalizing the student body?
- Is there progress in internationalizing curricula, programs, and teaching materials?
- Is there progress in internationalizing the faculty and in achieving appropriate cultural diversity and experience?
- Is the institution committed to creating a cleaner and more sustainable environment and, if so, with which operational environmental protection initiatives?

Information requirements: (i) commentary from the institution which can help the peer review team to form assessments related to the questions above; (ii) evolution of % of international students; (iii) description of international alliances, exchange programs, and other international agreements that your institution participates; (iv) annual number of international exchange students (inflows and outflows) if applicable.

Documentation room:

It is expected that the institution will prepare a documentation room on site where members of the peer review team can view examples of course outlines and examinations, examples of student theses (if applicable), program brochures and other institutional promotional material, examples of faculty books and other faculty research publications.

Good SAR’s are typically self-critical:

Every first-class institution has aspirations on how to improve further its performance. The most credible IQA SAR’s are perceptive in identifying reasonable aspirations and clear priorities for self-improvement.