



Rubric for evaluators

P- CACEI-DAC-03-DI04Review: 6
Effective July 10, 2020



Rubric for evaluators

June 2020, Mexico City

Content

Introduction.....	1
Criterion 1. Faculty	4
Criterion 2. Students	13
Criterion 3. Curriculum.....	18
Criterion 4. Assessment and continuous improvement	26
Criterion 5. Infrastructure and Equipment	34
Criterion 6. Institutional Support	41
Annex 1: Checklist for question 4.2. 1 - <i>Cédulas</i> 4.2.1, 4.2.1 a and 4.2.1 b.....	46
Annex 2: Checklist for question 4.2.2	47

This rubric includes contributions from the evaluators, the Accreditation Committee, the Discipline Technical Commissions of CACEI, and recommendations from the Washington Accord, external advisors, and educational institutions. It was coordinated by María Elena Barrera Bustillos, General Director of CACEI.

Specifically for the first version, CACEI thanks Dr. Miguel Ángel Romero Ogawa, Mtra. Bárbara Valle Torres and Dr. José Humberto Loría Arcila, academics who assisted in the final revision of the document. In the sixth version, we also thank Mtra. Luz María Nieto Caraveo for her advice.

This document has been registered at the Intellectual Property Registry on behalf of CACEI, A.C.

Introduction

What is it?

A rubric or evaluation matrix is a form of recording that selects those aspects to be assessed by performance levels or quality through precise descriptors. This rubric consists of four elements:

- A definition of each indicator considering the standard defined in the CACEI Framework of Reference.
- The program's aspects are described in each indicator, which in this document are posed as questions.
- A scale of values by which each question or indicator will be scored.
- The descriptors for each level of execution or performance.

What is it for?

The rubric developed has the objective of supporting CACEI evaluators in reviewing the self-assessment report and evidence and the visit to the PE, seeking to have information that allows the process to be valid and reliable.

The rubric allows:

- Identify strengths and weaknesses of an educational program according to the standards defined for a quality program. The detailed analysis of the evidence provides essential information on the assessed aspects, their level of compliance with the standards, and opportunities for improvement.
- Facilitate discussion and academic consensus among the assessment team. The evaluation process is an opportunity to reflect, share and contrast points of view, expectations and assessments among the members of the same evaluation team with standard references.
- To show diverse possibilities that facilitate the relevant assessment of an indicator. The result obtained with the rubric is a good starting point to establish recommendations to the programs that lead to realistic and contextualized improvement plans.

The rubric must not:

- Be considered only a checklist. Each result should be carefully analyzed and assigned the score regarding the evidence presented and the expected standard, no matter how discrete.
- Provide a quantitative score. The exciting thing is not to score but to discriminate what exists, development level, and what can be improved. The assigned score should emerge from a deep faculty academic reflection.
- Discourage reflection on the fulfillment of the indicator. The rubric is a first step, which facilitates joint and group work with solid arguments.
- Use it to establish rankings among different programs.
- Invite conformism and lack of reflection. The results presented should always be an invitation to improve the degree of compliance achieved. For this reason, an additional level to mere compliance is included.

How was it designed?

The rubric was developed considering the expected results identified in the educational programs assessed to be considered as of good quality, based on the six criteria defined in the 2018 Framework of Reference and the standards agreed by CACEI's Academic Committee. The expected results must be supported by the evidence delivered by the Committee responsible for assessing the educational program.

Its design used the scale defined in the Framework of Reference 2018 for an indicator's compliance levels. These were described considering the evidence expected to be found in the self-assessment report.

An indicator can be assessed with one or more questions. The rating assigned to the indicator must respond to the criterion for assigning the comprehensive rating defined by CACEI, considering the partial ratings to each question.

What scale is used?

This rubric uses two scales. The first is applied for the guiding questions and the second for the indicator. The first one helps to justify the second one. A description of the main concepts used is given below.

The scale of the **guiding questions** ranges from 1 to 4, and their descriptors depend on the issue they address. Their use and interpretation depend on the context and evidence for each indicator. However, it is possible to offer some general guidelines on the terminology used in these questions:

- **Adequate, sufficient, majority, or reasonable number** applies to cases where the information provided reflects an impact such that it does not affect the excellent quality of the program. It should not be interpreted as 50% plus one but in terms of how it affects the program's quality. This impact is not necessarily linear. What is important is that, even if 100% is not reached, the missing margin does not significantly affect the program's quality. When negative trends on the risk level of the indicator are identified, this should be noted in the assessment report and the recommendations issued by the evaluators.
- **Formal process** refers to an institutionally approved process through one of the program's unipersonal or collegiate bodies, or academic unit, or organization. It is essential because when a process is not formalized, it risks disappearing when there is a change in the program's management or other contingencies.
- **Systematic process** refers to established procedures that function periodically, with clearly defined methods, stages, dates, and responsible parties, and documented results from at least the previous and current school cycle. When a process is not systematic, there is a risk that it will not be carried out in a thorough or timely manner in the future.
- **Current** refers to present (up to date) information.

The scale for assessing the indicators is based on the level of compliance, with the guiding questions and specifically those that are considered indispensable (shaded) as stated in the 2018 Framework:

- **Not achieved:** Applies when the program does not meet any of the established terms of the indicator.
- **Partially achieved:** Applies when the program does not meet some of the terms of the indicator.
- **Achieved:** Applies when the program meets all terms of the indicator.
- **Exceeds:** Applies when the program meets all terms of the indicator and, in addition, shows additional elements, such as innovations, relevant organizational learning, etc.

Criterion 1. Faculty

- **Indicator 1.1:** It is assessed whether the faculty involved in delivering the program is adequate and has the necessary competencies according to the characteristics and curricular areas of the PE.
- **Standard:** The faculty involved in delivering the program has the appropriate competencies and is committed to achieving the student's graduate attributes, considering the following factors:
 - The level of academic education (background) of its members.
 - Their institutional diversity of academic degrees, including the nature and scope of their professional experience.
 - Their ability to communicate effectively.
 - Their experience and competence in teaching, research and engineering design practice.
 - Their productivity level, supported with scientific, engineering and professional publications.
 - Their degree of participation in professional, scientific, engineering associations, and also programs to help society.
 - Their interest in supporting the curriculum and extracurricular activities related to the PE.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in question 1.1.1 (*Cédula 1.1.1 and Cédula 0*).

Indicator 1.1 Faculty profile	1	2	3	4
<p><i>1. Is the combination of factors of faculty in the program adequate for the achievement of the graduate attributes? The factors that are considered are:</i></p> <p><i>1) Academic education, 2) Diversity of academic education, 3) Effective communication, 4) Experience and competence in teaching, 5) Research, 6) Practice in engineering design, 7) Productivity in research, technological development, patent or similar, 8) Participation in engineering chapters, professional associations, etc., 9)</i></p>	Not adequate	It meets some of the characteristics, mainly academic education (1, 4 and 5).	Comply with 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 10.	Meets all 10 factors.

Indicator 1.1 Faculty profile	1	2	3	4
<i>Participation in extracurricular activities of the program, 10) Participation in the analysis and updating of the program.</i>				
<i>2. Is there a balance between faculty, regarding seniority and age?</i>	No	This qualification option is NOT valid for this question.	There is balance, however, there is a risk of non-compliance.	There is a balance among faculty regarding their seniority and age.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard:</i>	Rating of 3 or more in question 1.1.1 (<i>Cédula 1.1.1</i> and <i>Cédula 0</i>)			
<i>Assessment of indicator 1.1</i>	It is not reached.	It is partially reached.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 1.2:** It is assessed if the PE, according to its characteristics and enrollment, has enough faculty and they have the competencies to cover all the curricular areas of the curriculum. There should be a sufficient number of faculty to allow adequate levels of a) interaction between students and faculty, b) counseling and tutoring of students, c) service activities, d) professional development, e) interaction with representatives of industry and the profession, as well as with the students' employers.
- **Standard:** The PE has sufficient and pertinent faculty to attend all the curricular areas of the curriculum. The faculty has the academic, professional, and didactic competencies to allow adequate levels in the performance of the substantive activities inherent to their responsibilities.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 1.2.1.1 and 1.2.2.

Indicator 1.2 Sufficiency of faculty members	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Does the PE have enough faculty to cover all areas of the curriculum, according to their characteristics and enrollment?</i>	Three or more areas of the PE do not have enough faculty with the relevant profiles.	One or two areas of the PE do not have enough faculty with the relevant profiles.	It has enough faculty, with adequate profiles, covering all areas of the curriculum.	It has enough faculty, with adequate profiles, who cover all areas of the curriculum and has faculty to cover additional areas provided for by the PE.

Indicator 1.2 Sufficiency of faculty members	1	2	3	4
<i>2. Do the faculty attending the PE have the relevant competencies for their adequate academic performance?</i>	No	Most faculty, according to the evaluation of their performance, do not have the relevant competencies for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	All faculty, according to the evaluation of their performance, have the relevant competencies for the achievement of graduate attributes.	All faculty, according to the evaluation of their performance, have the relevant competencies for the achievement of the graduate attributes, and those of the senior semesters have a wide link with the productive sector.
<i>Minimum standard:</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 1.2.1 and 1.2.2			
<i>Assessment of indicator 1.2</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 1.3:** It is assessed if the full-time professors have an adequate distribution of substantive activities in the context of the PE.
- **Standard:** The tasks associated with academic activities are adequately distributed to full-time professors.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 1.3.1, 1.3.4, 1.3.5 and 1.3.7.

Indicator 1.3 Distribution of substantive activities	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Do full-time teachers carry out a plan or program of their substantive activities for each school period or cycle?</i>	No	Most full-time faculty (PTC) do it, but not in all years.	All PTCs plan or program their substantive activities for each school year.	All PTCs carry out a plan or program of their substantive activities for each school year and are defined in the collegiate bodies.
<i>2. Is there a procedure that allows verifying the substantive activities performed by full-time professors and evaluating their results?</i>	No	Yes, but it only allows to verify compliance with the activities described in the plan, but there is no evidence of their results.	Yes, it allows to verify compliance with the activities described in the plan, with the evidence of its results.	Yes, the process is in the regulations and allows to verify compliance with the activities described in the plan, with evidence of compliance.

Indicator 1.3 Distribution of substantive activities	1	2	3	4
3. <i>How do you assess the distribution of substantive activities for full-time professors participating in the program?</i>	Inadequate	There is an imbalance in the distribution of activities, mainly teaching.	There is balance in the distribution of activities, considering their appointment (oriented to teaching or research).	All PTCs together contribute to substantive activities and are recognized by external bodies (e.g. PRODEP profile).
4. <i>How do you assess the degree (level) of interaction between students and faculty?</i>	Inadequate	It is incipient, only some PTCs interact with students in support activities (e.g. science summers, research projects, linkage, mobility, etc.).	Suitable, given that in addition to classes, a reasonable number of PTCs interact with students in support activities (e.g. science summers, research projects, linkage, mobility, etc.).	All PTCs interact with students and faculty in support activities.
5. <i>How do you assess the degree (level) of counseling and mentoring of students?</i>	Inadequate	Incipient, given that only some PTCs carry out these activities.	Adequate, given that all PTCs perform counseling and mentoring.	Adequate, given that all PTCs perform counseling and mentoring, which has a clear impact on improving student performance.
6. <i>How do you assess the degree (level) of faculty interaction with employers and practitioners in the profession?</i>	Inadequate	Incipient, since it is sporadic by decision of the faculty.	Appropriate, given that most PTCs engage in linkage activities.	Suitable, given that all PTCs engage in linkage activities.
7. <i>How do you assess, as a whole, the competence of the faculty to favor the achievement of the educational objectives of the PE?</i>	No	Most PTCs, according to the evaluation of their performance, do not have the relevant competencies for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	All PTCs, according to the evaluation of their performance, have the relevant competencies for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	All PTCs, according to the evaluation of their performance, have the relevant competencies for the achievement of the graduate attributes, and those of the senior semesters have a broad link with the productive sector.

Indicator 1.3 Distribution of substantive activities	1	2	3	4
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 1.3.1, 1.3.4, 1.3.5 and 1.3.7			
<i>Assessment of indicator 1.3</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 1.4:** It is assessed whether a comprehensive, continuous, relevant, and efficient system of evaluation of academics exists and is in operation and is linked to decision-making for the development of faculty.
- **Standard:** There is and operates a comprehensive, continuous, relevant, and efficient system of evaluation of faculty, and is linked to decision-making for their development, which includes the participation of students, academic peers, and authorities.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 1.4.1, 1.4.3 and 1.4.4.

Indicator 1.4 Evaluation and development of the faculty members	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Is there a comprehensive system for evaluating and updating faculty?</i>	No	There is and operates an evaluation system unrelated to the updating of faculty.	There is and operates a comprehensive evaluation system linked to the updating of faculty.	There is and operates a comprehensive evaluation system linked to the updating of faculty that explicitly promotes teaching innovation.
<i>2. Does the comprehensive evaluation system include the participation of: students, academic peers, and authorities?</i>	No	The system includes the participation only of students, academic peers, or authorities.	The comprehensive evaluation system includes the participation of students, academic peers, and authorities.	The comprehensive evaluation system includes the participation of students, academic peers, and authorities, as well as external experts in the disciplines and in education.
<i>3. How do you assess the degree (level) of professional development of the faculty assigned to the program?</i>	Inadequate	Incipient, only a minimum proportion of faculty participate in professional associations or collegiate activities of	Appropriate, most faculty participate in professional associations or collegiate activities of their profession (id 1.1.1).	Appropriate, all faculty participate in professional associations or collegiate activities of their profession (id 1.1.1).

Indicator 1.4 Evaluation and development of the faculty members	1	2	3	4
		their profession (cédula 1.1.1).		
4. How do you assess the degree (level) of pedagogical updating of the faculty participating in the program?	Inadequate	Incipient, only a small proportion of faculty have pedagogical updating in the last five years (cédula 0).	Adequate, given that faculty have pedagogical updating in the last five years (cédula 0).	Adequate, given that faculty have continuous pedagogical updating in each one the last five years (cédula 0).
5. How do you assess the degree (level) of disciplinary updating of the faculty participating in the program?	Inadequate	Incipient, only a minimum proportion of faculty have disciplinary updating in the last five years (cédula 0).	Adequate, given that faculty have disciplinary updating in the last five years (cédula 0).	Adequate, given that faculty have continuous disciplinary updating in each one the last five years (cédula 0).
6. Are the results obtained from the evaluation of the faculty included in the faculty development program?	No	Only a few results are included in the faculty's development program.	Most of the results are included in the faculty's development program.	The results obtained from the evaluation of academic staff are included in their entirety in the faculty's development program.
7. Is the faculty given feedback after the evaluation?	No	A reasonable number of faculty receive feedback based on the results of the assessment, but not on an ongoing basis.	All faculty receive feedback based on the results of the evaluation in a systematic manner.	All faculty receive feedback based on the results of the evaluation in a systematic way and, in addition, tangible improvements in the performance of the faculty are obtained.
8. Are there policies and mechanisms aimed to the faculty associated with the results of their evaluation?	No	There are some isolated and poorly systematized policies and mechanisms.	There are integrated and systematized policies and mechanisms aimed at academic staff, associated with the results of their evaluation.	It has integrated and systematized policies and mechanisms aimed at faculty, associated with the results of their evaluation and with evidence of their positive impact on the faculty.

Indicator 1.4 Evaluation and development of the faculty members	1	2	3	4
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 1.4.1, 1.4.3, 1.4.4			
<i>Assessment of indicator 1.4</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 1.5:** The role of the faculty is evaluated concerning: a) the creation, modification, and evaluation of courses, b) definition and revision of the educational objectives of the EP and the graduate attributes, and c) student outcomes.
- **Standard:** There are documented and appropriate processes of the body or bodies integrated by academic personnel of the PE (council, committee, academy, or similar), in which they continuously and routinely review, analyze and make decisions, jointly with the authority, related to a) the creation, modification, and evaluation of courses, b) definition and review of the educational objectives of the PE and the graduate attributes and c) student outcomes. The results of these processes should be used systematically to contribute to the continuous improvement of the curriculum.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 1.5.1 and 1.5.2.

Indicator 1.5 Responsibility of the faculty members with the curriculum	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Is there an instance or instances integrated by faculty members who participate in the decision-making process of all relevant academic aspects of the curriculum?</i>	No	There are some instances, but they do not participate in decision-making about the curriculum.	There are instances where academics participate in decision-making about the curriculum at all levels, from courses to structures and purposes or purposes, including educational objectives and graduate attributes.	There are instances where academics participate in decision-making on the curriculum at all levels, from the courses to the structures, and the purposes or purposes, the educational objectives and the graduate attributes, with systematic and transparent processes.
<i>2. Is there a record of the meetings held and the matters discussed in them, of the instance(s) integrated by faculty that participate in the decision-making of all relevant</i>	No	There are records of some instances or working meetings or of the issues dealt with in them.	Records are kept of most of the instances or working meetings and of the issues dealt with in them.	There are systematized records of all instances or work meetings and the issues dealt with in them, which are available to the entire academic community.

Indicator 1.5 Responsibility of the faculty members with the curriculum	1	2	3	4
<i>academic aspects of the curriculum?</i>				
<i>3. Is there evidentiary documentation of the impact of the decisions made by the body or bodies of faculty members who participate in the decision-making of all relevant academic aspects of the curriculum?</i>	No	There is not enough documentation or the impact of decisions on some academic aspects of the PE is not reflected.	Most of the evidentiary documents are available, which reflect the impact of the decisions on the academic aspects of the PE, including the educational objectives and the graduate attributes.	It has all the evidentiary documents, which reflect the impact of the decisions on the academic aspects of the PE, including the educational objectives and the graduate attributes.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in question 1.5.1 and 1.5.2			
<i>Assessment of indicator 1.5</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 1.6:** The existence and operation of processes for the selection and retention of faculty members are assessed, in which academic peers participate. Relevant work experience (professional, teaching, and research) and the evaluation results are considered to ensure that the faculty members respond to the profiles required by the PE.
- The existence and use of mechanisms and resources to retain professors with good performance and good results in their evaluations are assessed.
- **Standard:** The PE has a transparent institutional process for the selection and permanence of professors in which faculty members participate, and the candidates' academic background and relevant work experience are taken into consideration. The existence of mechanisms and resources for retaining professors with good performance and good results in their evaluations are also considered.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 1.6.1 and 1.6.2.

Indicator 1.6 Selection, tenure and retention of faculty members	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Is there a transparent institutional process for faculty selection?</i>	No	It does exist, it applies, but it is not transparent.	There is and operates a transparent and well-known institutional process for the selection of faculty.	A transparent and well-known institutional process for the selection of faculty exists and operates and the results are widely published.
<i>2. Does the faculty member selection process consider the candidate's academic background and work experience?</i>	No	It only considers academic background or work experience.	Yes, both requirements and the relevance of the training to the needs of the curriculum are considered.	Yes, both requirements and the relevance of the training to the needs of the curriculum, as well as demonstrated teaching capabilities, are considered.
<i>3. Does the faculty selection process consider the performance of a competitive examination, sample class, or others with faculty members' peers?</i>	No	The selection process does not consider criteria of quality of teaching or does not have the participation of academic peers.	The selection process considers quality criteria of teaching and has the participation of academic peers.	The selection process considers quality criteria of teaching and has the participation of academic peers and includes a sample class.
<i>4. Is there an institutional program for retaining professors with good performance and good results in their evaluations?</i>	No	It does exist, but it is not transparent.	There is and operates a transparent institutional process for the retention of faculty with good performance and good results in their evaluations.	There is and operates a transparent institutional process for the retention of faculty with good performance and good results in their evaluations, including specific stimuli or recognitions.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 1.6.1 and 1.6.2			
<i>Assessment of indicator 1.6</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

Criterion 2. Students

- **Indicator 2.1:** It is assessed the existence of an institutional process for the attraction, selection, admission, and induction of students to the PE is assessed considering the entrance profile.
- **Standard:** The PE has a transparent process for the attraction, selection, admission, and induction of students to the PE considering the entrance profile.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Rating of 3 or more in questions 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4.

Indicator 2.1 Admission	1	2	3	4
1. <i>Is there a promotional program of the PE that attracts students with the required entrance profile?</i>	No	The program has some sporadic activities of limited coverage, but it is not periodic.	The program is periodic, though limited in coverage.	The program is periodic and with sufficient coverage.
2. <i>Is there a standardized process for selecting candidates considering the entrance requirements established by the PE regulations?</i>	No	The process is institutional, meets the requirements established in the regulations, but is not standardized.	The process is standardized, meets the requirements established in the regulations, but its results are not analyzed.	The process is standardized, meets the requirements established in the regulations and its results are analyzed systematically.
3. <i>Is there a transparent, standardized, and disseminated process for the admission of students to the PE?</i>	No	The admission process only meets one of the three required characteristics (transparent, standardized or disseminated), but its impact is not analyzed.	The admission process is transparent, standardized and disseminated, but its impact is not analyzed.	The admission process is transparent, standardized and disseminated and its impact analysis is carried out.
4. <i>Does an induction program for students accepted into the PE exist and operate?</i>	No	The induction program exists but operates	The induction program exists and operates	The induction program exists, operates for all accepted students, the degree of

Indicator 2.1 Admission	1	2	3	4
		occasionally or is not known to admitted students.	systematically for all admitted students.	satisfaction of the participants is known and incorporates the results of the analysis of the admission process.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3 and 2.1.4			
<i>Assessment of indicator 2.1</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 2.2:** The processes corresponding to the institutional regulations to recognize credits obtained in other institutions, programs, or levels, credit transfer, or exchange studies are assessed.
- **Standard:** A process exists and operates to revalidate, establish equivalency, and recognition credits obtained in other institutions, programs, or levels, transfer of credits, or exchange studies.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 2.2.1 and 2.2.2.

Indicator 2.2 Revalidation, equivalency, and recognition of other studies	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Does a process for revalidation, equivalency, and recognition of credits earned at other institutions, programs, or levels, transfer of credits, or exchange studies exist, and is it operational?</i>	No	There is a defined and documented process, but it is not in the normativity.	There is a defined, documented process and it is in the normativity.	There is a defined, documented process and it is in the normativity. In addition, the process has an external certification or has a high degree of systematization that is reflected in manuals and operational provisions.
<i>2. Is the information of this process available to the stakeholders of the PE?</i>	No	Information is available, but only when requested.	The information is available.	The information is available. In addition, an analysis of the efficiency of the process is made.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 2.2.1 and 2.2.2			

Indicator 2.2 Revalidation, equivalency, and recognition of other studies	1	2	3	4
<i>Assessment of indicator 2.2</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 2.3:** Statistics and trends of the PE cohorts are assessed to detect areas of opportunity that may impact the establishment of improvement strategies for student performance.
- **Standard:** The PE operates a process of monitoring progress of the cohorts that allows detecting areas of opportunity that influence the establishment of improvement strategies for the performance of students in their curriculum, as well as monitoring statistics and trends under the regulations of the PE considering indexes such as failure, lag, retention, dropout, graduation efficiency, results of comprehensive exams (EGEL or similar).
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.

Indicator 2.3 School trajectory (academic progress)	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Is there a follow-up and analysis of statistics and trends by cohorts under the regulations of the PE that considers indexes such as failure, lag, retention, dropout, and desertion?</i>	No	There are statistics and trends of the indicators, but they are not carried out systematically and only some indicators are analyzed.	There is the monitoring and analysis of statistics and trends by cohort, and they are carried out systematically.	There is the monitoring and analysis of statistics and trends by cohort, they are carried out systematically and strategies are in place to improve their results.
<i>2. Are there strategies oriented to address the problems of efficiency and graduation?</i>	No	There are some strategies or actions, but they are not articulated; or they are not carried out systematically.	There are defined strategies, and a brief analysis of their efficiency is carried out.	There are defined strategies and a detailed analysis of the efficiency of these is carried out and used to improve results.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.			
<i>Assessment of indicator 2.3</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 2.4:** Institutional programs, services, counseling, and tutoring activities that support students in their progress in the curriculum are assessed.
- **Standard:** The PE has institutional programs, services, counseling, and tutoring activities that support students in their progress in the curriculum to improve the retention and terminal efficiency of the PE.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.

Indicator 2.4 Counseling and tutoring	1	2	3	4
1. Does a tutoring program exist and operate to support students in their progress through the curriculum to improve the program's retention and efficiency rates?	No	There is a tutoring program, but it is not registered systematically; or it does exist, but its results are not used to improve retention rates and terminal efficiency.	There is a tutoring program, it is systematically registered, and its results are used to improve retention rates and terminal efficiency.	There is a tutoring program, it is systematically registered, and its results are used to improve retention rates and terminal efficiency. In addition, the process has an ISO certification.
2. Does an academic advising program exist and operate that supports students in their progress in the curriculum to decrease the failure rates of the PE courses?	No	There is an academic advising program, but it is not systematically registered; or it does exist, but its results are not used to improve pass rates.	There is an academic advising program, it is systematically registered, and its results are used to improve pass rates.	There is an academic advising program, it is systematically registered, and its results are used to improve pass rates. In addition, the process has an ISO certification.
3. Does a medical and psychological services program exist and operate to support students in their advancement in the curriculum to improve the retention rate?	No	There is a program of medical and psychological services, but it is not recorded systematically; or it does exist, but its results are not used to improve the retention rate.	There is a program of medical and psychological services, it is registered systematically, and its results are used to improve the retention rate.	There is a program of medical and psychological services, it is registered systematically, and its results are used to improve the retention rate. In addition, the process has an ISO certification.

Indicator 2.4 Counseling and tutoring	1	2	3	4
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 2.4.1, 2.4.2 and 2.4.3			
<i>Assessment of indicator 2.4</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 2.5:** The processes and policies for the graduation of students are assessed.
- **Standard:** The PE has and operates a transparent, documented, and disseminated process of the policies established by the institution for the graduation of its students. The institution must verify that graduates have complied with the established graduation requirements.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 2.5.1 and 2.5.2.

Indicator 2.5 Graduation	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Is there a transparent and disseminated process that publicizes the requirements and procedure for graduation?</i>	No	There is a formal process, but it is not widespread among students.	There is a formal and widespread process among students.	There is a formal and disseminated process among students and its results are monitored.
<i>2. Is there an analysis of the effectiveness of the different degree options?</i>	No	There is an analysis of the efficacy of graduation options for some cohorts, but it is not formal or systematic.	There is an analysis of the efficacy of graduation options for all cohorts, it is formal but not systematic.	There is an analysis of the effectiveness of graduation options for all cohorts, it is formal and systematic.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in question 2.5.1 and 2.5.2			
<i>Assessment of indicator 2.5</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

Criterion 3. Curriculum

- **Indicator 3.1:** It is assessed that the PE has identified and defined the specific sectors of society (stakeholders) to which it is directed and the needs that its graduates can meet.
- **Standard:** The PE has institutionally defined the interest groups (stakeholders) and the institution's mechanisms and strategies.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3.

Indicator 3.1 Stakeholders of the program	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Have the different stakeholders, whose information is relevant, been institutionally identified and documented for the continuous improvement of the PE?</i>	No	Some stakeholders and some needs that graduates can meet have been identified and documented; but relevant sectors are needed.	All stakeholders and needs that graduates can meet have been identified and documented.	All stakeholders and needs that graduates can meet have been identified and documented and incorporated into continuous improvement mechanisms and strategies.
<i>2. Of the identified stakeholders, which ones have participated?</i>	None	Stakeholders have sporadic participation through various means (face-to-face or virtual meetings, concrete proposals, etc.).	Stakeholders participate formally and constantly through various means (face-to-face or virtual meetings, concrete proposals, etc.).	Stakeholders participate formally and constantly through various means (face-to-face or virtual meetings, concrete proposals, etc.) and their proposals are followed up.
<i>3. Do the educational objectives of the PE reflect the needs of the stakeholders?</i>	No	Some educational objectives reflect the needs of stakeholders.	Most educational objectives reflect the needs of stakeholders.	All educational objectives reflect the needs of stakeholders.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 3.1.1, 3.1.2 and 3.1.3			
<i>Assessment of indicator 3.1</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 3.2:** It is assessed whether the program currently responds to regional, state, or national needs, considering the analysis of the labor field, the follow-up of graduates, the opinions of employers and interest groups, professional trends, and disciplinary and technological progress. Moreover, whether it has a systematic review process in which

interest groups participate to ensure its relevance and consistency with the needs, the institution's mission, and the academic unit where it operates.

- **Standard:** The program must have a systematic review of the information from stakeholders, responding to the current training needs of the graduate, based on different studies, for example, graduate follow-up and employers' opinions, as well as its congruence with the mission of the institution and the academic unit where it operates.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Rating of 3 or more in questions 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4 and 3.2.5.

Indicator 3.2 Relevance of the program	1	2	3	4
1. <i>Is there a systematic review process that incorporates relevant stakeholder feedback into the PE?</i>	No	The review process incorporates information from some stakeholders.	The review process incorporates relevant stakeholder information in a systematic manner.	The review process incorporates relevant stakeholder information in a systematic manner and is periodically analyzed in the academic community.
2. <i>Are the educational objectives of the PE clearly defined?</i>	No.	Most educational objectives are not clearly expressed.	Educational objectives are clearly expressed and most respond to the needs of stakeholders.	Educational objectives are clearly expressed and most respond to the needs of stakeholders and are periodically analyzed by the academic community.
3. <i>Are the educational objectives of the PE disseminated to the public?</i>	No	The dissemination of EOs is limited; for example, only within the program or the institution.	The dissemination of EOs is wide and uses various means, but it is not on the website of the institution.	The objectives are widely disseminated inside and outside the institution, including the institution's website.
4. <i>Does the PE operate a formal and systematic process that allows obtaining and periodically analyzing the opinion of graduates?</i>	No	There is a formal process of monitoring graduates that allows obtaining their opinion, but this is not systematic, opinions are not always analyzed and documented or there	It operates a formal and systematic process that allows to obtain and analyze the opinion of the graduates of all the cohorts.	It operates a formal and systematic process that allows to obtain and analyze the opinion of the graduates of all the cohorts, with the participation of the academic community.

Indicator 3.2 Relevance of the program	1	2	3	4
		is no analysis of all cohorts.		
<i>5. Does the PE operate a formal and systematic process that allows obtaining and periodically analyzing the opinion of employers?</i>	No	There is a formal process for obtaining information from employers, but this is not systematic, and opinions are not always analyzed and documented.	It operates a formal and systematic process to obtain information from employers and their input is analyzed.	It operates a formal and systematic process to obtain information from employers and their contributions are analyzed with the participation of the academic community.
<i>6. Does the PE operate a formal and systematic process that includes studies of labor field needs to support its curricular modifications?</i>	No	It operates a formal process that includes studies of the labor field, but this is not systematic and does not support the curricular modifications.	It operates a formal and systematic process that includes studies of the labor field and supports curricular modifications.	It operates a formal and systematic process that includes studies of the labor field and supports curricular modifications with the participation of the academic community.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4 and 3.2.5			
<i>Assessment of indicator 3.2</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 3.3:** It is assessed whether the EP satisfies the specific requirements considering the following areas: Basic Sciences, Engineering Sciences, Applied Engineering and Design in Engineering, Social Sciences and Humanities, Economic and Administrative Sciences and Complementary Courses. The characteristics of these areas are described at the end of the rubric.
- **Standard:** The PE considers in its curricular structure the areas and characteristics defined by CACEI.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 3.3.1, 3.3.2 and 3.3.3.

Indicator 3.3 Curricular organization	1	2	3	4
1. Does the PE Curriculum comply with the areas, and their characteristics, defined by CACEI?	No	The PE Curriculum does not meet the minimum number of hours defined in one or two of the established areas or does not culminate with one or more significant design experiences in the courses (<i>capstone courses</i>) that include comprehensive projects.	The PE Curriculum meets the minimum number of hours defined by CACEI in all established areas and culminates with one or more significant design experiences in the courses (<i>capstone courses</i>) that include comprehensive projects.	The PE Curriculum exceeds the number of hours in all the areas defined by CACEI and culminates with one or more significant design experiences in the courses (<i>capstone courses</i>) that include comprehensive projects.
2. Is there a description of the programs of the different learning units, courses, or subjects?	No	Partial information on the programs of the courses is provided in <i>cédula</i> 3.3.2.	Complete information on all course programmes is provided in <i>cédula</i> 3.3.2.	There is an analyzed and complete information of all the programs of the courses in the <i>cédula</i> 3.3.2.
3. Is there a defined curricular structure establishing the path students can follow in their training?	No	The curricular structure is defined, but it is not clear the path that students must follow in their training in terms of explicit progressions (<i>cédula</i> 3.3.2) that contribute in a congruent way to achieve the attributes of egress. It is not known to EP faculty and students.	The curricular structure is defined and clear, as well as the path that students must follow in their training in terms of explicit progressions (<i>cédula</i> 3.3.2) that contribute to achieving the attributes of egress, but there are some gaps and inconsistencies.	The curricular structure is defined and clear, as well as the path that students must follow in their training in terms of explicit progressions (<i>cédula</i> 3.3.2) that contribute in a congruent way to achieve the attributes of egress.

Indicator 3.3 Curricular organization	1	2	3	4
<i>4. Is there an institutional process that periodically reviews the achievement of the objectives of the courses, subjects, or learning units?</i>	No	The review of the achievement of the objectives of the courses is carried out periodically and rests only on the responsible faculty.	The review of the achievement of the objectives of the courses is carried out periodically and rests mainly on the responsible professors and some collegiate bodies.	The review of the achievement of the objectives of the courses is carried out periodically and involves the responsible professors, the collegiate bodies, and the institution.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 3.3.1, 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4			
<i>Assessment of indicator 3.3</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 3.4:** It is assessed whether the educational objectives of the PE are congruent with the mission of the institution.
- **Standard:** The program's educational objectives are defined, published, assessed, and congruent with the institutional mission and the mission of the faculty member's academic unit where the program is located.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 3.4.1 and 3.4.2.

Indicator 3.4 Congruence between the educational objectives of the PE and the mission of the institution	1	2	3	4
<i>1. The educational objectives are defined and published?</i>	No	Educational objectives are defined, but they are not published or are not known to faculty and students.	Educational objectives are defined and published, but faculty or students do not know them.	Educational objectives are defined, published, and known to faculty and students.
<i>2. Are the educational objectives congruent with the institutional and academic unit's mission?</i>	No	Educational objectives are consistent with the institutional mission or with the mission of the academic unit.	The educational objectives are consistent with the institutional and academic unit missions.	The educational objectives are consistent with the institutional and academic unit missions and are periodically analyzed.

Indicator 3.4 Congruence between the educational objectives of the PE and the mission of the institution	1	2	3	4
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 3.4.1 and 3.4.2. Question 3.4.1 is not qualified because it is repeated with questions 3.2.2 and 3.2.3.			
<i>Assessment of indicator 3.4</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 3.5:** It is assessed whether the graduate attributes of the PE are defined, disseminated, evaluated and if they are congruent with the educational objectives. The attributes to be developed in the graduate must include or be equivalent to those of CACEI. These graduate attributes are described at the end of the rubric.
- **Standard:** T The graduate attributes of the PE are defined, published, and their achievement is evidenced, which must be congruent with the educational objectives and include or be equivalent to the graduate attributes established by CACEI.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 3.5.1, 3.5.2 and 3.5.3.

Indicator 3.5 Graduate attributes	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Are the graduate attributes defined and published, and known to students and faculty?</i>	No	Attributes are defined and published, but students or faculty do not know them.	Attributes are defined; faculty and students know them and are available to the public on the program's website.	Attributes are defined; faculty and students know them and are available to the public on the program's website in multiple languages.
<i>2. Are the PE graduate attributes congruent with the educational objectives of the PE?</i>	No	Some of the graduate attributes of the EP are consistent with the educational objectives of the PE.	The graduate attributes of the PE are consistent with the educational objectives of the PE.	The graduate attributes of the PE are consistent with the educational objectives of the same and this is periodically analyzed
<i>3. Do the graduate attributes of the PE include or are equivalent to the seven desirable attributes of the engineer, indicated in Indicator 3.5 of the 2018 Framework?</i>	No	Some of the graduate attributes of the PE are equivalent to those indicated in indicator 3.5 of the MR 2018 (<i>cédula</i> 3.5.3).	The attributes of the PE are equivalent to the seven attributes indicated in indicator 3.5 of the MR 2018 (<i>cédula</i> 3.5.3).	The attributes of the PE are equivalent to the seven attributes indicated in indicator 3.5 of the MR 2018 (<i>cédula</i> 3.5.3) and its equivalence is periodically analyzed or it has additional graduate attributes.

Indicator 3.5 Graduate attributes	1	2	3	4
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 3.5.1, 3.5.2 and 3.5.3			
<i>Assessment of indicator 3.5</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 3.6:** It is assessed that the PE incorporates and recognizes using non-conventional teaching-learning modalities. Furthermore, the PE contains elective courses, professional practice, social service, and company visits. The includes activities derived from student mobility, approved in other national and foreign institutions, as long as these contribute to the achievement of the graduate attributes of the PE.
- **Standard:** The PE incorporates at least three strategies that make it flexible and responsive to the training needs of students considering the graduate attributes.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 3.6.1, 3.6.2 and 3.6.3.

Indicator 3.6 Curricular Flexibility	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Does the PE integrate strategies or schemes that facilitate the incorporation of scientific and technological progress in its curricular design?</i>	No	The design of the PE only provides for the scientific and technological updating that faculty carry out individually.	The design of the PE foresees the scientific and technological updating through the professors and the work of the collegiate bodies.	The design of the PE foresees the scientific and technological updating through the professors and the work of the collegiate bodies and its results are incorporated into the redesign of the curriculum.
<i>2. Does the PE allow non-conventional modalities to develop the different courses, subjects, or learning units?</i>	No	The program incorporates one or two unconventional modalities to make the curriculum more flexible.	The program incorporates three unconventional modalities to make the curriculum more flexible.	The program incorporates more than three unconventional modalities to make the curriculum more flexible.
<i>3. In its design, does the PE incorporate the professional practices in a curricular or co-curricular manner or stays in the productive sector of incidence?</i>	No	Internships or short stays in the productive sector are optional or have no curricular value or do not	Internships and stays in the productive sector have curricular value and students develop a comprehensive project.	Internships and stays in the productive sector have curricular value, students develop a comprehensive project and their results are

Indicator 3.6 Curricular Flexibility	1	2	3	4
		develop a comprehensive project.		incorporated for curricular evaluation.
<i>4. Does the PE have institutional policies that facilitate its flexibility?</i>	No	Policies are nascent and limited.	The institutional policies defined promote the flexibility of the PE.	The institution has regulations that promote flexibility.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 3.6.1, 3.6.2 and 3.6.3			
<i>Assessment of indicator 3.6</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.
<p>Note: The principle of curricular flexibility includes the unconventional educational modalities that engineering programs have put in place, reducing excessive loads, minimizing "bottlenecks," multidisciplinary projects, diversification of forms of learning evaluation, summer courses, courses in companies, dual model, etc.</p> <p>It is assessed that the PE incorporates and recognizes using non-conventional teaching-learning modalities. Furthermore, the PE contains elective courses, professional practice, social service, and company visits. The PE includes activities derived from student mobility, approved in other national and foreign institutions, as long as these contribute to the achievement of the graduate attributes of the PE.</p>				

Criterion 4. Assessment and continuous improvement

- **Indicator 4.1:** It is assessed that the PE has a documented and systematic process that involves collegial groups and representatives of the PE stakeholders to periodically review the achievement of the educational objectives and ensure its relevance.
- **Standard:** The PE operates a documented and systematic process that involves collegial groups and representatives of the PE stakeholders to periodically review the achievement of the educational objectives and ensure its relevance.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Rating of 3 or more in question 4.1.1 and 4.1.2

Indicator 4.1 Assessment of the educational objectives of the program	1	2	3	4
<p><i>1. Is there a formal process for periodic assessment of the program's educational objectives with collegial groups and stakeholder representatives?</i></p>	No	<p>Yes, there is a periodic evaluation process, but only collegiate groups participate, or Yes, there is a periodic evaluation process, but only representatives of stakeholders participate, or There is an evaluation process in which collegiate groups and representatives of stakeholders participate, but this is not formal or periodic.</p>	There is a formal and periodic evaluation process in which collegiate groups and representatives of stakeholders participate.	There is a formal and periodic evaluation process involving collegiate groups and stakeholder representatives, which is documented and widely disseminated through publications.
<p><i>2. Are the conclusions or observations from the analysis of the periodic evaluation result used to make recommendations to improve</i></p>	No	The conclusions or observations of the analysis of the result of	The conclusions of the analysis of the result of the periodic evaluation are used to improve the	The conclusions of the analysis of the result of the periodic evaluation are used to improve the evaluation process, the

Indicator 4.1 Assessment of the educational objectives of the program	1	2	3	4
<i>the evaluation process, educational objectives, and compliance with established goals?</i>		the periodic evaluation are used to improve: Only the evaluation process or Only the educational objectives or Only the fulfillment of the established goals.	evaluation process, the educational objectives, and the fulfillment of the established goals.	educational objectives, and the fulfillment of the established goals. Decisions to improve are made through deliberative processes involving faculty and students.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in question 4.1.1 and 4.1.2			
<i>Assessment of indicator 4.1</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 4.2:** It is assessed that the PE has adequate and documented processes to determine the degree of development of students' graduate attributes throughout the PE.
- **Standard:** The PE has defined a systematic process to evaluate the development and achievement of the graduate attributes throughout the curriculum, with adequate evaluation mechanisms, indicators, and goals. The PE periodically analyzes the assessment results together with representatives of the program's stakeholders to make recommendations to be taken into account in the continuous improvement process.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in question 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 in all its subparagraphs and in 4.2.3.

Indicator 4.2 Assessment and achievement of the graduate attributes	1	2	3	4	
<i>1. For each graduate attribute of the program, is it defined...</i>					
<i>Before assessing this section, the</i>	<i>The mapping in the curriculum?</i>	No	Mapping is insufficient, confusing, or inaccurate (ID 4.2.1a)	The mapping is sufficient, clear, and accurate.	The mapping is sufficient, clear, and precise and is carried out in a broadly participatory manner with faculty and students.

Indicator 4.2 Assessment and achievement of the graduate attributes		1	2	3	4
<i>checklist in Annex 1 must be answered</i>	<i>The assessment tools?</i>	No	The valuation tools are not congruent with the attribute or are insufficient or not well designed (<i>cédula</i> 4.2.1b).	The valuation tools are well designed, sufficient, and consistent with the attribute they evaluate (<i>cédula</i> 4.2.1b).	The assessment tools are well designed, sufficient, and consistent with the attribute they evaluate (<i>cédula</i> 4.2.1b) and are the result of the collegiate work of the faculty.
	<i>The performance indicators?</i>	No	The indicators are unclear, not congruent with the attribute or insufficient (id 4.2.1b).	The indicators are sufficient, consistent, and clear with respect to the attribute (<i>cédula</i> 4.2.1b).	The indicators are sufficient, consistent, and clear with respect to the attribute (<i>cédula</i> 4.2.1b) and it is shown that faculty are clear about their importance in their own course.
	<i>The results collection process?</i>	No	Data collection is unreliable (ID 4.2.1b).	The collection is reliable and systematic provides data that are analyzed to evaluate their results (<i>cédula</i> 4.2.1b).	The collection is reliable and systematic and provides data that are analyzed to evaluate their results (<i>cédula</i> 4.2.1b) in widely participatory collegiate processes.
2. For each graduate attribute of the program, ...					
<i>Before assessing this section, the checklist in Annex 2</i>	<i>Is there a systematized process to ensure the graduate attribute's continuous development, measurement, and achievement?</i>	No	Yes, there is a process to ensure the continuous development, measurement and achievement of attributes, but it is not systematized, and the participation of	There is a systematized, documented process with the participation of authorities and faculty to ensure the continuous development, measurement, and achievement of the graduate attributes.	There is a systematized, documented process with the participation of authorities and faculty to ensure the continuous development, measurement, and achievement of the graduate attributes, which

Indicator 4.2 Assessment and achievement of the graduate attributes		1	2	3	4
<i>must be answered.</i>			authorities and faculty is not documented.		generates reports and guiding publications of wide dissemination.
	<i>Is there evidence of the assessment of the graduate attributes?</i>	No	The evidence is insufficient because the learning products do not include comprehensive projects, or the evaluation criteria are not clear, or the previous ones do not correspond to the graduation attributes.	Sufficient evidence is presented, i.e., learning products (papers, reports, etc.) that include integrative projects. Evaluation procedures and instruments are consistent with the description of attributes. If rubrics are used, full and qualified rubrics (examples of a good, a medium, and a bad) are included.	Sufficient evidence is presented, i.e., learning products (papers, reports, etc.) that include integrative projects. Evaluation procedures and instruments are consistent with the description of attributes. If rubrics are used, full and qualified rubrics (examples of a good, a medium, and a bad) are included. Evidence of innovative instruments designed under appropriate technical criteria is included.
	<i>Can it be concluded that graduates achieve the attribute? Review the Annex (tabular or graphic) requesting the cédula 4.2.1 b.</i>	No, the attached report (tabular or graphic) requesting the cédula is not reached or not	The attached report (tabular or graphic) that the cédula 4.2.1b requests shows that the students who complete the program do not reach the attribute.	The attached report (tabular or graphic) that the cédula 4.2.1b requests shows that the students who complete the program reach the attribute satisfactorily.	The attached report (tabular or graphic) that the cédula 4.2.1b requests shows that the students who complete the program achieve the attribute satisfactorily and, additionally, the achievement of other attributes derived from the institutional educational model is demonstrated.

Indicator 4.2 Assessment and achievement of the graduate attributes	1	2	3	4
	presented 4.2.1b.			
3. Are the conclusions or observations of the analysis of the result of the periodic evaluation used to make recommendations to improve the evaluation process, the graduate attributes, and the fulfillment of the established goals?	No	The results are used only in some cases.	The conclusions or observations of the analysis of the result of the periodic evaluation are used to improve the evaluation process and the graduate attributes, as well as the fulfillment of the established goals.	The conclusions or observations of the analysis of the result of the periodic evaluation are used to improve the evaluation process and the graduate attributes, as well as the fulfillment of the established goals. In addition, widely disseminated publications are generated.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in question 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 in all its subparagraphs and in 4.2.3.			
<i>For the evaluation of this indicator, it shall use the checklists in Annex 1 and 2.</i>				
<i>Assessment of indicator 4.2</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 4.3:** It is assessed that the PE has adequate and documented processes to measure and analyze school performance indexes such as failure, lag, retention, dropout, efficiency rate, graduation rate, results of integrative exams, etc., to establish intervention actions to improve the improvement PE.
- **Standard:** The PE has defined and in operation adequate processes to measure and analyze school performance indexes such as failure, lag, retention, dropout, efficiency rate, graduation rate, etc., to establish intervention actions for the improvement of the PE. Efficiency should be calculated based on 1.5 times the duration of the study plan.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Grade of 3 or more in questions 4.3.1 and 4.3.4.

Indicator 4.3 Assessment of the school performance indexes	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Are the school performance indices mentioned in this criterion adequately and systematically measured and analyzed?</i>	No	Only school performance indices or another component are measured, but not analyzed.	All school performance indices are systematically measured and analyzed.	All school performance indices are systematically measured and analysed. In addition, publications are generated with guidelines and recommendations for faculty, students, and managers.
<i>2. Are there results of comprehensive exams (national standardized tests similar to EGELs)?</i>	No	There are sporadic results or only from some students who do not constitute a representative sample.	The results of integrative examinations are taken, and their results are analyzed.	The results of integrative examinations are taken, and their results are analyzed in a collegial and transparent way for the community.
<i>3. Are the results used to follow up on the program?</i>	No	Only some results of integrative reviews are used to follow up on the program.	The results of integrative reviews are used for the improvement of the program.	The results of integrative reviews are used for program improvement and their trends and projections are positive.
<i>4. Are the conclusions or observations of the analysis of the school performance indexes used to implement intervention actions to improve the PE?</i>	No	Only a few conclusions from the analysis of school performance indices are used.	The conclusions of the analysis of school performance indices are used to implement intervention actions.	The conclusions of the analysis of school performance indices are used to implement intervention actions and the impact of these indices is reviewed periodically.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 4.3.1 and 4.3.4			
<i>Assessment of indicator 4.3</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 4.4:** It is assessed that the PE has defined a systematic evaluation process with the participation of collegiate groups and stakeholders' representatives, supported by the results obtained in the assessment of educational objectives, graduate attributes, school performance indexes, and additional information.
- It is assessed that the PE uses the evaluation process results to define strategies, plans, and specific actions that contribute to its continuous improvement in the achievement of its educational objectives, the achievement of the graduate attributes, the school performance indexes, and other defined indicators.
- **Standard:** The PE has defined and operating a formal and systematic process for the periodic review of its results, considering the assessment of its educational objectives, graduate attributes, school performance indexes, and other indicators; in addition to involving collegiate groups related to the program, as well as representatives of the PE's stakeholders.
- The EP has one or more clearly defined and documented improvement cycles due to the periodic assessment.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Rating of 3 or more in questions 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and classification of 4 in question 4.4.4.

Indicator 4.4 Continuous improvement	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Is there a formal process defined for periodic assessment and continuous improvement of the PE?</i>	No	The process has been defined, but the <i>cédula</i> 4.4.1 does not was filled correctly or completely.	Yes. In addition, the process is linked to addressing the areas of opportunity for improvement.	Yes. In addition, the process is linked to addressing the areas of opportunity for improvement and its advances are documented and disseminated.
<i>2. Are the assessment results of the educational objectives and graduate attributes of the program used in this process?</i>	No	Only some results of the assessment of OEs and AEs are used for the improvement of the program.	The results of the assessment of OEs and AEs are reflected transversally throughout the continuous improvement program.	The results of the valuation of OEs and AEs are reflected transversally throughout the continuous improvement program, including innovation strategies.
<i>3. Does the process involve collegial groups related to the program and representatives of the program's stakeholders?</i>	No	Some collegiate groups and representatives of stakeholders participate,	The process involves collegiate groups and stakeholders related to the PE.	The process has the participation of collegiate groups and stakeholders related to the PE, as well as experts from different

Indicator 4.4 Continuous improvement	1	2	3	4
		or Only most stakeholders participate, or Only most stakeholder representatives participate.		scientific-technological and educational fields.
<i>4. Are the evaluation and continuous improvement process in operation?</i>	No	It is in operation, but it is not formal, or it is not systematic.	The process of evaluation and continuous improvement operates systematically and is formalized.	The process of evaluation and continuous improvement operates systematically and is formalized. In addition, it allows to recognize a culture of self-evaluation widely distributed in the institution.
<i>5. Is there at least one closed improvement cycle to visualize the complete implementation of the continuous improvement process?</i>	No	NA	Yes	NA
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.4.4 and 4.4.5			
<i>Assessment of indicator 4.4</i>	It is not reached.	It is partially reached.	Achieved.	It is overcome.

Criterion 5. Infrastructure and Equipment

- **Indicator 5.1:** The sufficiency and state of use of the facilities are assessed, considering: a) Classrooms, laboratories, and workshops under school enrollment, area of knowledge, didactic modality, and type of subject; b) Cubicles for faculty members to work and live together; c) Spaces for support offices and the development of cultural and sports events and activities; d) Accessibility to the infrastructure for people with different abilities.
- **Standard:** See at the end of the rubric the specific standards for: Classrooms, Laboratories, Cubicles and other spaces for workers, sports, cultural and academic facilities and other spaces of support and service to the educational community.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.5 and 5.1.7.

Indicator 5.1 Classrooms, laboratories, cubicles and support offices	1	2	3	4
1. Do the classrooms have the necessary conditions in terms of: sufficiency, lighting, ventilation, noise insulation, audiovisual equipment, furniture, accessibility, and hygiene?	No	Classrooms are sufficient, but most of them do not meet the conditions required for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	The classrooms are sufficient and meet the characteristics required for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	The classrooms are sufficient and meet the conditions required for the achievement of the graduate attributes. In addition, they have the flexibility to adapt to new teaching-learning models.
2. Do the laboratories and workshops that serve the PE comply with the standards established by CACEI?	No	There are some laboratories and workshops; but they are not those required or lack the minimum equipment necessary for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	It has the required laboratories and workshops, and these have the minimum equipment necessary for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	It has the required laboratories and workshops, and these have the necessary equipment to achieve the graduate attributes. In addition, they are ISO certified.

Indicator 5.1 Classrooms, laboratories, cubicles and support offices	1	2	3	4
3. Do the laboratories and workshops have the necessary conditions of: sufficiency, functionality, safety, noise insulation, furniture, accessibility, connectivity, hygiene, and audiovisual equipment?	No	The number of laboratories and workshops is sufficient, but most do not comply with security, connectivity, and civil protection measures.	Laboratories and workshops are sufficient, comply with security and accessibility measures; but, in the short term, they will require adaptations to guarantee their functionality and connectivity.	The laboratories fully comply with the requested characteristics.
4. Are the cubicles and workspaces for faculty members sufficient and functional?	No	There are spaces for academic work, but there is a lack of conditioning to meet the needs aimed at achieving the graduate attributes.	It has spaces for academic work and are conditioned to meet the needs oriented to the achievement of the graduate attributes.	It has spaces for academic work and are conditioned to meet the needs oriented to the achievement of the graduate attributes. In addition, they have the flexibility to adapt to new teaching-learning models.
5. Are there relevant spaces to carry out activities that support the integral development of students?	No	There are spaces that are conditioned for the activities of comprehensive development of the student.	There are spaces for comprehensive development activities.	There are spaces for comprehensive development activities. In addition, they have the flexibility to adapt to new teaching-learning models.
6. Are the support and service spaces for the educational community sufficient and functional?	No	There are spaces for support and service to the community that are conditioned for this purpose.	There are spaces for support and service to the community designed for this purpose.	There are spaces for support and service to the community designed for this purpose. In addition, they have the flexibility to adapt to new teaching-learning models.
7. Are there actions for quality assurance and continuous improvement of classrooms,	No	Yes, but there are only remedial maintenance actions.	There is a program of quality assurance and continuous improvement of the facilities.	There is a certified program of quality assurance and continuous

Indicator 5.1 Classrooms, laboratories, cubicles and support offices	1	2	3	4
<i>laboratories, cubicles, and support offices?</i>				improvement of classrooms, laboratories, cubicles and support offices.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 5.1.1, 5.1.2, 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.1.5 and 5.1.7			
<i>Assessment of indicator 5.1</i>	It is not reached.	It is partially reached.	Achieved.	It is overcome.

- **Indicator 5.2:** The existence and sufficiency of computer resources are assessed, including computer equipment, simultaneous access capacity, connectivity, and essential and specialized software, whether free or licensed, its updating and technical support, considering the characteristics and enrollment of the PE.
- **Standard:** The PE has sufficient and adequate computer resources considering its characteristics and enrollment. The efficiency and contribution of these resources in achieving the graduate attributes is also evaluated.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5 and 5.2.6.

Indicator 5.2 Computer resources	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Are the IT resources sufficient and adequate to meet the characteristics and enrollment of the PE?</i>	No	They are insufficient, or inadequate.	They are sufficient and adequate, although in the short term they must be updated.	They are sufficient, adequate and up to date.
<i>2. Is the computer equipment sufficient, and does it meet the needs of its users?</i>	No	They are insufficient, or inadequate.	They are sufficient and adequate, although in the short term they must be updated.	They are sufficient, adequate and up to date.
<i>3. Is connectivity sufficient, and does it meet the needs of its users?</i>	No	It is limited.	It is sufficient and satisfactory, although it must be reinforced or improved.	It is sufficient and broadly meets the needs of the program.
<i>4. Is the essential and specialized software sufficient, up-to-date, and meets the needs of its users?</i>	No	It is limited, incomplete, and some programs are not licensed for use.	It is up to date, it is sufficient, but the number of licenses is limited to meet the needs of the students.	It is up-to-date and meets the needs required by the PE.

Indicator 5.2 Computer resources	1	2	3	4
5. Is the technical support required by the IT resources timely, sufficient and adequate?	No	It exists, but it is not sufficient and timely	It exists, it is functional, but sometimes it is slow to respond.	It is timely enough and adequate.
6. Are there actions in place for quality assurance and continuous improvement of IT resources?	No	They are sporadic.	There are actions in the annual plans for continuous improvement.	It has a program for quality assurance and continuous improvement of computer resources.
Minimum compliance with the standard	Rating of 3 or more in questions 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3, 5.2.4, 5.2.5 and 5.2.6.			
Assessment of indicator 5.2	It is not reached.	It is partially reached.	Achieved.	It is overcome.

- **Indicator 5.3:** The existence of sufficient, adequate, and effective services of an Information Center in support of the objectives of the EP is assessed, particularly its capacity to serve users, as well as the currency and availability of information resources is assessed.
- **Standard:** The PE has sufficient, adequate, and effective services of an Information Center to meet the needs and achieve the educational objectives of the PE. It has updated personnel and infrastructure considering technological advances to provide proper attention to the PE's faculty members.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Rating of 3 or more in questions 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3 and 5.3.4.

Indicator 5.3 Information center	1	2	3	4
1. Are the Information Center services, physical and remote, sufficient, adequate, and practical to meet the needs of the PE?	No	They are sufficient, but inadequate or ineffective.	They are sufficient and adequate but ineffective.	They are sufficient, adequate, and effective.
2. Are there quality assurance actions and a continuous improvement plan for these services?	No	They are sporadic.	There are actions in the annual plans for continuous improvement.	It has a program for quality assurance and continuous improvement.

Indicator 5.3 Information center	1	2	3	4
3. <i>Is there use, conformity, and acceptance of library services by the students of the PE?</i>	No	There is no process, only sporadic surveys are carried out.	There is a defined and formalized process of satisfaction with services.	There is a formalized and certified process to evaluate the use, conformity, and acceptance of library services; and its results are satisfactory.
4. <i>Is there currency and scientific-technological currency of the information resources pertinent to the PE?</i>	No	The acquis is limited to meet the PE's needs for the achievement of graduate attributes.	The collection is current and updated, but needs are identified to be met in the short term for the achievement of the graduate attributes.	The acquis is current and up-to-date and covers the needs of the EP for the achievement of the graduate attributes.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 5.3.1, 5.3.2, 5.3.3 and 5.3.4			
<i>Assessment of indicator 5.3</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 5.4:** The existence, validity, and availability of guides and manuals for proper tools, equipment, computer resources, and available laboratories are assessed. These documents should emphasize the safety aspects of users, equipment, spaces, and contingency plans.
- **Standard:** There are guides and manuals for the appropriate and safe use of the different tools, equipment, computer resources, and laboratories available, strategies or methods followed to provide adequate guidance to users, and contingency plans for the various facilities and equipment.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4 and 5.4.6.

Indicator 5.4 User and safety manuals	1	2	3	4
1. <i>Do the guides and manuals for the use of tools, equipment, computer resources, and laboratories exist to meet the needs of the PE?</i>	No	There are some guides and manuals, or those are not available to users.	There are guides and manuals, they are available to users, but their consultation is not systematized.	It has guides and manuals, they are available to users and their consultation is systematized.

Indicator 5.4 User and safety manuals	1	2	3	4
<i>2. Do the guides and manuals include the safety aspects of users, equipment, and spaces?</i>	No	They include general safety standards, but not specific to the use of equipment and spaces.	They include general and specific safety standards for the use of equipment and spaces.	They include general and specific safety standards for the use of equipment and spaces and their compliance is monitored.
<i>3. Do the guides and manuals include the safety aspects of users, equipment, and spaces?</i>	No	The strategy for training users is limited.	The strategy for training users is sufficient and the latter is implemented during the traineeship.	The strategy for training users is sufficient and the latter is implemented efficiently during the traineeship.
<i>4. Are there contingency plans in case of accidents or claims in facilities or equipment related to the program?</i>	No	Yes, but they are partial.	Yes, but the drills established in the corresponding regulations are not done.	Yes, and the drills established in the corresponding regulations are made.
<i>5. Are contingency plans periodically made known and implemented to the faculty members?</i>	No	The dissemination of contingency plans is limited.	The dissemination of contingency plans is formal and mandatory.	The dissemination of contingency plans is broad, formal, and documented in the certified processes.
<i>6. Are there actions in place for quality assurance and continuous improvement of contingency plans?</i>	No	Actions are limited and sporadic.	Actions are included in the annual planning.	There is a Quality Assurance Program that includes this aspect, and its process is certified.
Minimum compliance with the standard	Score of 3 or more in questions 5.4.1, 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4 and 5.4.6			
Assessment of indicator 5.4	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 5.5:** The existence of and compliance with a preventive and corrective maintenance program for equipment and facilities, as well as a program for updating or modernizing them, is assessed.
- **Standard:** Existence of and compliance with a preventive and corrective maintenance program for equipment and facilities and a program to update or modernize them.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 5.5.1 and 5.5.2.

Indicator 5.5 Maintenance, modernization and upgrading	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Does the EP have maintenance programs?</i>	No	The program is only of corrective maintenance.	The program includes corrective and preventive maintenance, but compliance is not always monitored.	The program has preventive, corrective, and predictive maintenance programs, with timely monitoring of compliance.
<i>2. Does the PE have programs for updating or modernization of equipment and facilities?</i>	No	The program is limited, it only includes the update of some equipment or installations.	The program is annual and includes the updating of equipment or facilities.	The program is multi-year and includes the updating of current and future equipment or installations.
<i>3. Do the maintenance, updating, or modernization programs for equipment and facilities have scheduled dates and compliance dates?</i>	No	The program includes scheduled dates only a few times.	The program includes in its planning compliance dates for preventive maintenance.	The program includes in its planning compliance dates for preventive and corrective maintenance.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 5.5.1 and 5.5. 2			
<i>Assessment of indicator 5.5</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

Criterion 6. Institutional Support

- **Indicator 6.1:** It is assessed that the PE has an organizational structure, rules, and institutional leadership, proving certainty to the entire administrative, faculty, and student community about the policies and regulations in operation. The PE has planning documents that allow decision-making, evaluation, and monitoring of the development and improvement of the PE.
- In addition, it is assessed that the person in charge of the PE must have a profile related to it. He or she must demonstrate the ability to take the initiative, manage, convene, promote, and evaluate the PE effectively and efficiently.
- **Standard:** The PE has an organizational structure, current regulations, and institutional leadership, which provide certainty to the entire administrative, faculty, and student community about the policies and rules in operation, as well as the planning documents that allow making decisions, assessing, and following up on the development and improvement of the PE.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3 and 6.1.4.

Indicator 6.1 Institutional leadership	1	2	3	4
1. <i>Is there a clearly defined organizational structure that supports the effective operation of the PE?</i>	No	Yes, but the structure is general, so it is not clearly identified how it supports the PE.	The structure is clearly defined and guarantees the functionality of the PE.	The structure is clearly defined and guarantees the functionality of the PE and incorporates innovative elements to adapt to the required changes.
2. <i>Is there a regulation defining the functions for each position described in the organizational structure and the rights and obligations of the community members?</i>	No	Yes, but it is a regulation that only partially covers these aspects.	The regulations define the functions of each position described in the organizational structure, as well as the rights and obligations in force.	The regulations define the functions of each position described in the organizational structure, as well as the rights and obligations in force. In addition, there are transparent organisation and procedure manuals for the PE community.

Indicator 6.1 Institutional leadership	1	2	3	4
<i>3. Do the PE, the faculty member, and the institution have articulated and coherent development plans?</i>	No	Yes, but there is only the development plan of the HEI, or only of the Department.	The plans are available at the three levels properly articulated.	The plans are properly articulated at the three levels, and these have effective follow-up mechanisms.
<i>4. Does the coordinator or person in charge of the PE have an academic background or experience related to the program and have the competencies for educational management?</i>	No	The manager has experience in management but does not have training related to the PE.	The person in charge has an academic background and experience related to the program and has the skills for academic management.	The manager has an academic background and experience related to the program, has the competencies for academic management and demonstrates skills to coordinate teams, inspire visions of the future and commitment to the PE.
<i>5. Is there any systematized mechanism to know the level or degree of acceptance that the PE and its graduates have in the different sectors of the environment?</i>	No	There is a mechanism, but it is not systematized.	There is a systematized and periodic mechanism to know the degree of acceptance of the PE and its graduates.	There is a systematized and periodic mechanism to know the degree of acceptance of the PE and its graduates and its results are incorporated into the continuous improvement of the program.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Score of 3 or more in questions 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3 and 6.1.4			
<i>Assessment of indicator 6.1</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 6.2:** It is assessed whether the PE has sufficient, timely, and effective institutional, faculty member, and administrative support services to achieve its educational objectives.
- **Standard:** There are sufficient, timely, and effective institutional, faculty member, and administrative support services for the achievement of the educational objectives of the PE.

- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Qualification of 3 or more in questions 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4 and 6.2.5.

Indicator 6.2 Institutional services	1	2	3	4
1. Does the PE offer the student the faculty member supports such as tutoring, academic advising, guidance, and counseling?	No	Yes, but only one of the three services or all three services, but with limited coverage or hours.	All three services are offered and are accessible to all students at appropriate times.	All three services are offered and are accessible to all students at the appropriate times and there are satisfaction studies with favorable results.
2. Does the PE offer the student the administrative supports that facilitate their entrance, permanence, and graduation?	No	Yes, but with limited coverage or service hours.	Accessible administrative supports are offered to all students at appropriate times.	Accessible administrative supports are offered to all students at the appropriate times and satisfaction studies are available with favorable results.
3. Does the PE offer the student the following services: medical, integral health, and wellness?	No	Yes, but only one of the three services or all three services, but with limited coverage or service hours.	All three services are offered and are accessible to all students at appropriate times.	All three services are offered and are accessible to all students at the appropriate times and there are satisfaction studies with favorable results.
4. Does the PE link with the different sectors using diverse strategies to strengthen the student's education?	No	Yes, but they are sporadic actions, which arise from the interest of some faculty.	There is a formalized program of residences or stays.	There is a formalized program of residences or stays, with innovative models such as the dual model.
5. Does the PE have a mechanism that favors decision-making considering relevant information obtained from the various institutional support services?	No	Yes, but it is rarely applied.	Each of the institutional support services has mechanisms to promote informed decision-making.	Each of the institutional support services has mechanisms to promote information-based decision-making, which in turn is disseminated in the PE community.

Indicator 6.2 Institutional services	1	2	3	4
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in questions 6.2.1, 6.2.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4 and 6.2.5.			
<i>Assessment of indicator 6.2</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 6.3:** It is assessed whether the financial resources of the PE are sufficient to achieve its objectives.
- **Standard:** The PE has sufficient financial resources to achieve its objectives.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Rating of 3 or more in question 6.3.1.

Indicator 6.3 Financial resources	1	2	3	4
<i>1. Are the available financial resources sufficient for the operation and improvement of the PE?</i>	No	Yes, but only partially.	Sufficient financial resources are available for the operation and improvement of the PE.	There are sufficient financial resources for the operation and improvement of the PE and additional resources to meet new needs.
<i>2. Are resources additional to the regular budget obtained and applied to the PE?</i>	No	Yes, but it is sporadically.	Additional resources are obtained and applied to the PE budget.	Additional resources are obtained periodically and applied to the PE budget and a flexible budget is available, which can be increased depending on specific efforts.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in question 6.3.1			
<i>Assessment of indicator 6.3</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

- **Indicator 6.4:** It is assessed whether there is sufficient and trained support personnel to develop support activities that ensure, within the scope of their competence, the fulfillment of the objectives and goals of the PE..

- **Standard:** The support personnel is sufficient and trained to develop support activities that ensure, within the scope of its competence, the fulfillment of the objectives and goals of the PE.
- **Minimum compliance with the standard:** Score of 3 or more in questions 6.4.1 and 6.4.2.

Indicator 6.4 Support personnel	1	2	3	4
1. Is the PE supported by a good and skilled set of people who facilitate the achievement of the <i>graduate attributes</i> ?	No	Yes, the set of support staff is sufficient, but few are trained.	The staff meets the profiles and are trained in their tasks.	The staff meets the profiles and are trained in their tasks; in addition, they have appropriate certifications for the tasks they perform.
2. Are there mechanisms in place to know the degree of satisfaction of the faculty members of the PE with the support services?	No	Yes, but the mechanisms are used sporadically.	There is a systematized mechanism that allows us to know the degree of satisfaction.	There is a systematized mechanism that allows to know the degree of satisfaction and the results are very favorable.
<i>Minimum compliance with the standard</i>	Rating of 3 or more in question 6.4.1 and 6.4.2			
<i>Assessment of indicator 6.4</i>	Not achieved.	Partially achieved.	Achieved.	Exceeds.

Annex 1: Checklist for question 4.2. 1 - Cédulas 4.2.1, 4.2.1 a and 4.2.1 b

Note that:

- The mapping of CACEI graduate attributes can be found in cédula 4.2.1.
- The mapping of the graduate attributes of the PE is found in cédula 4.2.1a.
- The assessment tools and indicators are described in cédula 4.2.1 b.
- Data collection refers to the existence of clear and transparent mechanisms and procedures to collect evidence and information on assessing graduate attributes.

Graduate Attributes of the Program	Is it defined?	1	2	3	4
<i>Enter here graduate attribute 1</i>	Curriculum mapping				
	Assessment tools				
	Indicators				
	Data collection process				
<i>Enter here graduate attribute 2</i>	Curriculum mapping				
	Assessment tools				
	Indicators				
	Data collection process				
<i>Enter here graduate attribute (...)</i>	Curriculum mapping				
	Assessment tools				
	Indicators				
	Data collection process				
<i>Enter here graduate attribute N</i>	Curriculum mapping				
	Assessment tools				
	Indicators				
	Data collection process				

Annex 2: Checklist for question 4.2.2

- a) Is there a systematized process to ensure graduate attributes' continuous development, measurement, and achievement? This refers to the existence of a formalized process in a document that includes stages, mechanisms, responsible parties, platforms, etc., and that is operated periodically with the collegial participation of faculty and authorities.
- b) Is evidence of the assessment of the graduate attributes presented? It refers to the evidence (works, projects, rubrics, etc.) of the students' learning, the way of evaluation by faculty, and its congruence and sufficiency to assess the achievement of the graduate attributes. The evidence should be reviewed by sampling and answered based on the following scale:
- c) Can it be concluded that graduates achieve the attribute? This refers to whether students who complete the curriculum and graduate demonstrate that they have achieved the graduate attributes. Institutions must submit an attached report (tabular or graphic) requested in question 4.2.1b. Based on this, the following scale is used.

Program Egress Attribute	Questions	1	2	3	4
<i>Enter here graduate attribute 1</i>	a) Systematic and continuous process?				
	b) Is evidence presented?				
	c) Is the attribute achieved?				
<i>Enter here graduate attribute 2</i>	a) Systematic and continuous process?				
	b) Is evidence presented?				
	c) Is the attribute achieved?				
<i>Enter here graduate attribute (...)</i>	a) Systematic and continuous process?				
	b) Is evidence presented?				
	c) Is the attribute achieved?				
<i>Enter here graduate attribute N</i>	a) Systematic and continuous process?				
	b) Is evidence presented?				
	c) Is the attribute achieved?				