

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Category: 1. Quality Assurance Agency

Subcategory: 1.1. Establishment of the Agency

Criteria

1.1.1 The Agency is legally established within its jurisdiction or country, enjoys formal recognition from competent authorities, and complies with the administrative or legal requirements in force within the jurisdiction in which it operates.

Scenario

Fully complies

1.1.2 The Agency is recognized within its jurisdiction as the responsible entity for the evaluation or accreditation of entities related to higher education.

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

Panama is a country with a population of nearly 4 million inhabitants and has 42 universities, of which 28 are institutionally accredited, including the 5 state universities. The country has a National System for the Evaluation and Accreditation for the Improvement of Higher Education Quality, directed and managed by the National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation of Panama (CONEAUPA). CONEAUPA is the only official accreditation agency in the country formally established by Law 30 of July 20, 2006, published in the Official Gazette No. 25595 on July 25, 2006. Its background is in Decree Law 16 of July 11, 1963, "Regulating the establishment and operation of private universities in the Republic of Panama".

Law 52 of June 26, 2015 "Which creates the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the Improvement of Higher University Education Quality in Panama and repeals Law 30 of 2006", published in the Official Gazette No. 27813-B of June 30, 2015, establishes, like the now-repealed Law 30, that the accreditation of both public and private universities in Panama is mandatory.

The National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation of Panama (CONEAUPA) was created as an evaluative and accrediting agency representative of the different actors linked to the

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

development of the country's university higher education and is formally recognized as the national agency.

Law 52 of 2015 was regulated by Executive Decree No. 539 of August 30, 2018, and subsequently, articles and numerals were added to it to improve the regulations. Due to the existing gap regarding universities that failed to achieve accreditation, as well as addressing other issues related to the accreditation process, Executive Decree No. 1295 of July 9, 2021, was approved. In order to have a single regulation, Executive Decrees 539 and 1295 were integrated and a new order was given to the articles through Resolved No. 723-AL of March 21, 2022, which approved the Single Text of Executive Decree No. 539 of August 30, 2018, which creates the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the improvement of the quality of Higher University Education in Panama.

The central government, through the Ministry of Education (MEDUCA), supports the processes of institutional accreditation and reaccreditation, of careers and programs of both public and private universities. An example of this is the Act of Commitment Signing to start the reaccreditation process of 23 universities in October 2021, an activity that was attended by the President of the Republic, S. E. Laurentino Cortizo Cohen.

Therefore, the criteria of the subcategory are fully met. The agency is legally established in Panama, has formal government recognition, and complies with the administrative and legal requirements in force in the jurisdiction in which it operates. Additionally, CONEAUPA is recognized within its jurisdiction as the agency responsible for the evaluation and accreditation of university higher education institutions. Therefore, it can be concluded that CONEAUPA is a legitimate and recognized accreditation agency in Panama.

Subcategory: 1.2. Mission and Purposes.

Criteria

Scenario

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

1.2.1 The Agency has an explicit mission statement and a set of purposes and objectives that consider the legal, historical, and cultural context in which it operates.	Fully complies
1.2.2 The Agency clearly states in its mission its responsibility for the evaluation and accreditation of entities related to higher education.	Fully complies
1.2.3 The Agency has policies and mechanisms in place to achieve its purposes and objectives and applies them systematically.	Fully complies
1.2.4 The Agency aims to enhance quality while simultaneously promoting the public accountability of higher education institutions.	Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

The mission of CONEAUPA, as stipulated in Resolution No. 04 of March 4, 2020, is "To advance academic excellence in the substantive functions of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) in Panama through the accreditation of quality, the formulation of Public Policy proposals, research, and innovation within an environment respecting principles of environmental care, integrity, transparency, equity, and accountability to aid in combating poverty and promoting national development." The vision is to be acknowledged as the benchmark for best practices in educational quality assurance both nationally and internationally. This vision has been historically shaped since the regulatory inception for private universities (1963), the enactment of Law 30 of 2006, and Law 52 of 2015, which is the prevailing legislation.

Article 5 of Law 52 establishes the principles of the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the Enhancement of Higher University Education in Panama, including the continuous improvement of quality, respect for university autonomy, recognition of the diversity of university institutions, their various programs and teaching modalities, equitable and just treatment of higher education institutions, transparency in adherence to all ethical, moral, and legal norms governing higher education, and confidentiality in the management of information.

According to Article 6 of Law 52, CONEAUPA's objectives are to promote and develop a culture of evaluation that ensures the quality of university higher education, to strengthen the National System

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

of Evaluation and Accreditation, to encourage continuous improvement in the performance and quality of university institutions, and to certify the quality of institutions and programs through the accreditation process. Moreover, CONEAUPA aims to enhance the quality of university higher education and to facilitate articulation and mobility among different levels and modalities of the University Higher Education System.

As for the agency's policies and mechanisms, it is important to note that the Accreditation and Reaccreditation processes are mandatory and are supported by Resolutions, Agreements, and legal provisions of the Council, which must be rigorously adhered to once published in the official State publication, the Official Gazette.

Thanks to the implementation of established policies and mechanisms by CONEAUPA, a total of twenty-three (23) universities have been reaccredited, and six (6) universities have undergone Institutional Accreditation processes for the first time, with five achieving certification (Record I-2023 of March 29, 2023). The Resolutions for all accredited universities are published in the Official Gazette and on the CONEAUPA website.

The agency has educated both CONEAUPA staff and universities through workshops, diploma programs, and technical support visits.

CONEAUPA's actions are planned and executed under the leadership of the Executive Secretary based on compliance with the Annual Operational Plan (AOP), which is approved by the CONEAUPA Plenary and submitted to the Ministry of Education (Law 52 of June 26, 2015, Article 23, clauses 4 and 5). The AOP reflects the distribution of the budget and the significance of the actions related to the accreditation processes of the HEIs, as well as the training of peers, technicians, and the development and validation of matrices. The agency is governed by governmental provisions for the execution of the budget assigned through the Ministry of Education.

One of the agency's particularly significant initiatives is the Strategic Plan 2023-2030, which, with a long-term prospective vision, identified through participatory workshops, the demands and needs of the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the Enhancement of Higher University Education Quality, defining strategic axes and subsequent effects: 1. The norms and procedures of

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

the evaluation and accreditation processes are updated and implemented in a coordinated, coherent, timely, and transparent manner; 2. CONEAUPA promotes and facilitates higher education quality through collaborative work of HEIs and their greater engagement with national and international organizations; and 3. CONEAUPA, accredited and strengthened, autonomously, coordinatedly, effectively, and efficiently leads the National Evaluation System for the Enhancement of University Higher Education Quality in Panama. The Plan establishes strategic guidelines and priority products to achieve a strengthened and consolidated System that promotes continuous improvement in the performance and quality of HEIs in a relevant, articulated, and timely manner.

The agency relies on Resolutions to ensure quality in its processes and to comply with the guidelines for Higher Education in Panama. Its goal is to guide, accompany, and promote the educational institutionalization of universities, including specialized areas such as careers and programs.

Overall, CONEAUPA fulfills its objectives and upholds transparency in the application and adherence to the laws that govern the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the Enhancement of Higher University Education Quality; it has implemented effective policies and mechanisms for the accreditation and reaccreditation of universities, careers, and programs, as well as for organizing its activities. The university community's needs and requirements have been duly considered.

Subcategory: 1.3 Ethical Commitment of the Agency.

Criteria

Scenario

1.3.1 In its role of evaluation or accreditation, the Agency has a code of ethics that is systematically applied.

Fully complies

1.3.2 If the Agency offers technical assistance related to the evaluation and accreditation processes for applicants, these activities are clearly separated from the evaluation and accreditation activities and do not directly influence an improved rating of the process.

Fully complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

1.3.3 The Agency promotes transparency in all its evaluative processes and has mechanisms to control the presence of conflicts of interest at all stages of the evaluation process, which are systematically applied. Fully complies

1.3.4 The Agency is independent in its accreditation decisions, autonomously responsible for its operations, and ensures that third parties, such as higher education institutions, public bodies, or other stakeholders, cannot influence the conclusions and recommendations made in its reports. Fully complies

1.3.5 The Agency has a clear and objective definition of the characteristics and conditions that institutions, programs, or entities seeking external evaluation must meet, which is applied without discrimination. Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

1.3.1 Law 52 emphasizes the importance of transparency in complying with ethical, moral, and legal norms regulating higher education. In this regard, the National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation of Panama (CONEAUPA) has established a Code of Ethics, Conduct, and Corporate Responsibility, which is supported by Resolution No. 04 of March 4, 2020 (Evid. 1.3.1.). Furthermore, public servants at CONEAUPA, as officials of the Ministry of Education, must comply with the Code of Ethics for Public Servants of the Republic of Panama as per Executive Decree 246 of December 15, 2004 (Evid. 1.3.2.). To ensure compliance with these norms, CONEAUPA officials have attended the Ethics Course for Public Servants (Evid.1.3.3.). Additionally, prior to the start of the institutional reaccreditation processes in 2022, the technical staff signed a Confidentiality Agreement preventing the disclosure of information about the assigned processes.

Regarding technical assistance, the agency conducts orientation visits (art. 23.2 of Law 52 of June 26, 2015) and workshops (art. 23 pt. 6 of Law 52 of June 26, 2015) on evaluation and accreditation at universities, directed at those responsible for educational quality at all Higher Education Institutions (Evid. 1.3.4. and 1.3.5.). These workshops focus on the preparation of the Self-Study, the supporting evidence, and the institutional improvement plans.

As part of the support to universities, guidance is provided, and specific aspects of the documents are reviewed to ensure compliance with the standards approved by the Plenum of CONEAUPA.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Technical assistance is also provided for cases initiating their respective institutional processes related to Academic Quality (Evid. 1.3.6.).

For members of the CONEAUPA Plenum, an Internal Regulation anticipates conflicts of interest and establishes the procedure to follow (Resolution 3 of January 29, 2020, and Resolution 14 of September 14, 2020). For instance, if an issue specifically concerning the universities that represent the private or public sector is to be presented, the member withdraws from the session until the point is concluded. In these cases, the representative of that university is replaced by another representative.

CONEAUPA is composed of 11 ad-honorem members, all closely linked to the development and transformation of university education in the Republic of Panama, and according to Article 20 of Law 52, they are: the Minister of Education or their representative (who presides and has the right to voice and vote only to break ties), the Minister of Economy and Finance or their representative, the National Secretary of Science, Technology and Innovation or their representative, the President of the Commission of Education, Culture and Sports of the National Assembly or their representative, the President of the Technical Commission of Academic Development or their representative, the Executive Secretary of the National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation of Panama (only with the right to speak), two members from the public universities or their representatives, two members from the private universities or their representatives, a member of the National Council of Private Enterprise for a period not exceeding two years among them and on a rotating basis, a member from the Organizations of Professionals of Panama elected among them for a period not exceeding two years and on a rotating basis, and a member of the National Council of Education (Evid. 1.3.10).

The decisions of accreditation and institutional reaccreditation are based on the Decision-Making Guide which includes a table that allows for the determination of the validity of the accreditation according to the scores obtained in the basic and secondary indicators and the total sum of both (Resolution No. 7 of August 3, 2021). The same occurs with the accreditation of careers and programs (Resolution No. 3 of September 28, 2021).

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

As already noted, the agency guarantees transparency in evaluative processes and has tools to prevent potential conflicts of interest. Among these, the Code of Ethics, Conduct and Corporate Responsibility of CONEAUPA, the agendas (Evid. 1.3.7.) and agreements (1.3.8.) of the Council sessions, as well as the incident reports to resolve any incidents presented during the processes (Evid. 1.3.9.).

According to the resolutions approved by the Council, the requirements for requesting external evaluation are duly published in the Official Gazette and contemplate each phase of the process (Law 52 of 2015, art. 8). At each stage of the process, the Agency interacts closely with each IES through the conduct of workshops, seminars, diploma courses, or even university visits to ensure timely support in each situation, thus complying with the estimated times for each process. With this in mind, CONEAUPA operates in an environment of complete independence regarding each process, without any external pressure. Law 52 of June 26, 2015 establishes the legal guidelines of the agency for decision-making regarding accreditation processes, which are mandatory in the Republic of Panama (Evid. 1.3.11).

The existence of a systematically applied code of ethics and the clear separation of evaluation and technical assistance activities are indicators of a rigorous observance of ethical principles and impartiality in the process. Additionally, the promotion of transparency and the systematic application of mechanisms to avoid conflicts of interest are important measures to ensure the integrity of the evaluative process.

Finally, the independence of CONEAUPA in its decisions and its commitment to a clear and objective definition of the characteristics that institutions, programs, or entities requesting external evaluation must meet, are indicators of high quality in the evaluation and accreditation work.

Subcategory: 1.4 Governance, Organization, and Resources

Criteria

Scenario

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

- | | |
|--|----------------|
| 1.4.1 The governance structure of the agency is consistent with its mission and objectives, includes mechanisms to incorporate the viewpoints of relevant stakeholders, and uses this information to review its criteria and procedures. | Fully complies |
| 1.4.2 The composition of the committee responsible for accreditation decisions ensures its independence and impartiality. | Fully complies |
| 1.4.3 The Agency has a management plan that allows it to evaluate its performance and plan its future development; additionally, it has evidence of its progress and compliance. | Fully complies |
| 1.4.4 The Agency has the necessary human, financial, and infrastructural resources to effectively and efficiently conduct external evaluation processes, ensuring the requisite conditions for their development. | Fully complies |
| 1.4.5 The functions and authorities of internal units, evaluation frameworks, and administrative procedures are clearly defined. | Fully complies |
| 1.4.6 The agency has effective mechanisms to ensure timely communication with Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and evaluators, and it adheres to established deadlines. | Fully complies |
| 1.4.7 Should the Agency delegate evaluation or accreditation processes to other bodies, it has clear, public, and effective criteria and procedures to ensure the quality of services provided by these bodies and applies them effectively. | Fully complies |

Self-Assessment:

The National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation of Panama (CONEAUPA) maintains an organic structure consistent with its mission and objectives, in which the Agency Council consists of eleven highly trained professionals committed to improving the quality of higher education in the country. The Council considers the actions and opinions of educational experts, legal advisors, and users to make decisions objectively and effectively.

CONEAUPA demonstrates its impartiality and independence in decision-making, as evidenced during the 2022 Reaccreditation process. The experiences shared by the rectors of reaccredited

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

universities allowed for an appreciation of the maturity of the process and the agency. Moreover, Council members have diverse and independent profiles that enable them to make impartial decisions.

The selection process for the Executive Secretary and Deputy Secretary is conducted through a Public Call, where the most suitable professionals with extensive experience in higher education in Panama are chosen. The Organizational Chart of the National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation of Panama is tailored to its functions and supports the implementation of state policies that lead to the sustainable and systematic development of higher education.

CONEAUPA ensures efficient development through its Annual Management Plan, which is adapted to current and projected needs in university higher education.

The agency evaluates its management and plans its development according to the previously mentioned Annual Operational Plan (AOP). The outcomes of workshops for the development of the Strategic Plan support the effectiveness of the agency's planning and management.

CONEAUPA has professional staff, financial resources, and infrastructure that effectively ensure the various external evaluation processes. These processes are clearly established in the CONEAUPA's Organization and Job Description Manual (Resolution No.13 of August 14, 2020) and are updated to the organizational chart according to the agency's functions to meet the needs of HEIs.

CONEAUPA has communication and dissemination mechanisms to ensure timely issuance of information through its website, social networks (Instagram and Facebook), institutional email, and Public Inquiries email. In addition, virtual meetings and orientation or support visits to universities are conducted.

To ensure the quality of accreditation with other organizations, CONEAUPA establishes regulations with parameters and standards on which agreements for the recognition of accreditation certifications and the conduct of joint accreditations are developed (Resolution No.8 of June 12, 2020), as well as the recognition of accreditations granted by other recognized organizations (Resolution No.8 of November 18, 2011). This has resulted in CONEAUPA's recognition of the accreditation of six

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

engineering programs at the Technological University of Panama and one at the Interamerican University of Panama awarded by the Central American Agency for Accreditation of Architecture and Engineering Programs (ACAAI), and by the Mexican Committee for the Accreditation of Agricultural Education (COMEAA), which accredited four agronomic science programs at the University of Panama.

Thus, CONEAUPA meets the standards and requirements to perform external accreditation effectively and efficiently. Its governance structure is coherent with its mission and objectives, utilizing mechanisms to incorporate diverse perspectives. The decision-making entity is independent and impartial, and CONEAUPA has a management plan to evaluate and enhance its performance. It has the necessary resources and has clearly established the functions and authorities of its internal units and administrative procedures. Additionally, it has effective mechanisms for communication with HEIs and evaluators and ensures the quality of services provided by other organizations in case they are entrusted with evaluation or accreditation processes.

Subcategory: 1.5 Self-regulation and Continuous Improvement

Criteria	Scenario
1.5.1 The Agency employs mechanisms to continuously evaluate the quality of its own activities, aiming to align with international trends, changes in the social environment, and the higher education system in which it operates.	Fully complies
1.5.2 The Agency conducts self-assessment processes of its own activities, based on the collection and analysis of information, which enable it to clearly identify its strengths and weaknesses and design a verifiable improvement plan.	Fully complies
1.5.3 The Agency regularly reviews and updates its regulations based on the needs of the higher education system.	Fully complies
1.5.4 The Agency regularly undergoes external evaluations and uses the outcomes of these assessments for its continuous improvement	Fully complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

1.5.5 The Agency ensures the ongoing enhancement and updating of its staff. Fully complies

1.5.6 The Agency develops criteria and procedures to assess the impact of its actions on the quality of higher education, verifying at least the changes that occur in institutions or programs as a result of the accreditation processes. Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

CONEAUPA employs mechanisms to self-assess and adapt to international demands and environmental changes, such as surveys and the updating of regulations, as well as the review of matrices validated by experts and both public and private universities. To gather and analyze information, CONEAUPA conducts surveys of participants in workshops and training seminars for accreditation or reaccreditation processes. This allows for the identification of the current situation, causes, consequences, and actions to be taken, and aims to capture the opinions of local experts and users of the services provided by the agency.

The preliminary actions to institutional accreditation or reaccreditation processes, as well as for programs and courses, are based on requirements, steps, and guidelines established by the agency. These include the Principles of the Institutional Accreditation Evaluation Model (Resolution No. 5 of March 5, 2020), the Decision-Making Guide (Resolution No. 7 of August 3, 2021), principles of evaluation models, process procedures, matrices, and calls for participation in evaluation processes, developed by the Executive Secretariat, Deputy Secretariat, and the Technical Commission for Evaluation and Accreditation of CONEAUPA, and approved by the Plenary Council.

Periodic self-assessment, involving key stakeholders in the presentation of the Strategic Plan, allows the agency to establish plans and goals to enhance its performance. In the case of CONEAUPA, Executive Decree No. 511 of July 5, 2010, which regulates Law 30, stipulates in Article 41 that the agency must submit the necessary documentation to apply for accreditation to the Central American Accreditation Council (CCA) and any other international body of the same nature within a period of 10 years. Although this law has been repealed and the current law does not contemplate the agency's accreditation, CONEAUPA commits to quality and excellence by seeking certification of Good

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Practices with the Ibero-American Network for the Accreditation of Quality in Higher Education (RIACES).

The Agency ensures the continuous improvement and updating of its staff, whereby the Executive Secretary proposes training plans in evaluation and accreditation of higher university education quality for the staff engaged in this process. In this regard, CONEAUPA personnel participate in workshops and diploma courses to stay updated on institutional Accreditation or Reaccreditation processes, for courses and programs, and meetings are held with universities to clarify points or review applicable standards, ensuring the continuous training of technical staff and thereby, their commitment to quality.

CONEAUPA is an organization committed to the continuous improvement of higher university education in the country. To achieve this objective, it develops rigorous criteria and procedures to evaluate the impact of its actions on the quality of higher education. One of the most important tools used by CONEAUPA to measure its impact is the application of surveys to external peers, as well as guiding universities on the development of instruments for institutional accreditation purposes. This information is used to feed the knowledge processes and make informed decisions about the quality of higher education in Panama. The experience gained from previous processes demonstrates CONEAUPA's exceptional performance in certifying participating universities with excellence, thanks to the guidance and orientation visits of its technical team. In this context, CONEAUPA has met each of its objectives to improve the quality of higher university education in Panama through formal and transparent processes.

Identified as an area for improvement is the need to integrate the vast amount of existing regulations into a thematic manual that facilitates the understanding and application of institutional, course, and program processes, both for agency staff and for universities. This initiative would allow for active ownership of the contents and greater effectiveness in the implementation of processes, which in turn would contribute to strengthening the quality of higher university education in Panama.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Category 2: The Agency's Relationship with Higher Education Institutions

Subcategory: 2.1. Promotion of Responsible Autonomy in Higher Education

Criteria

2.1.1 The Agency recognizes that higher education institutions are primarily responsible for ensuring their own quality and respects their autonomy, identity, and integrity.

Scenario

Fully complies

2.1.2 The Agency fosters a culture of evaluation within Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and the development of policies and mechanisms for continuous improvement.

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

The National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the Improvement of Higher University Education Quality in Panama establishes principles of respect for university autonomy, recognition of the diversity of university institutions and their various programs and teaching modalities; fair and equitable treatment of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), transparency in complying with all ethical, moral, and legal norms regulating higher education, and confidentiality in information management, among others (Law 52 of June 26, 2015, Article 5). CONEAUPA, as the administrator of this system, embodies these principles in its interactions with HEIs and acknowledges their primary responsibility for quality assurance while respecting their autonomy, identity, and integrity, taking into account institutional diversity and treating each fairly and equitably.

Through transparent, ethical work in accordance with the legal norms that regulate Higher Education in Panama, CONEAUPA has promoted compliance with the responsibility that universities have to maintain quality assurance. As a regulatory agency, it promotes continuous improvement in the performance and quality of HEIs, as evidenced in the document "Foundations of the Model for Evaluation with Purposes of Institutional Accreditation in Panama" (Resolution 5 of March 5, 2020), as well as in the "Matrix for Institutional Evaluation and Accreditation in Panama" (Resolution 6 of March 5, 2020), and the "Matrix for Institutional Reaccreditation in Panama" (Resolution 17 of

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

December 28, 2020), based on the agency's quality standards and as mechanisms for continuous improvement, allowing for their constant programming and development.

Both the accreditation and reaccreditation matrices, as well as the program matrices, establish mechanisms to demonstrate quality assurance by HEIs. The institutional evaluation and accreditation matrix, under Factor 1. Institutional Project, component Institutional Philosophy; subcomponent Quality Assurance, with 6 indicators (6 to 11) proposes strategic actions aimed at internal quality assurance, and the standard indicates that the university must have an administrative unit to ensure quality improvement, with a policy of internal quality assurance, in addition to strategic actions aimed at continuous improvement. Some of the minimum evidence that the 7 universities, which went through the accreditation process for the first time, had to present were an Internal Quality Assurance Policy; a Quality Assurance Administrative Unit visible in the organizational chart and procedure manuals for the monitoring and control of internal quality assurance, among others. Indicator 11 of the institutional reaccreditation matrix, a process in which 23 universities participated in 2022, indicates strategic actions aimed at continuous improvement and the standard establishes that the university must have a functional structure for quality assurance of institutional management and with systematically applied mechanisms, in all academic and administrative units, according to established guidelines. In the Matrix of Evaluation and Accreditation of Health Sciences programs (Resolution 19 of December 14, 2021), there is a Component of Quality and Continuous Improvement of the program; subcomponent Evaluation Mechanisms and the Quality Criterion is the existence of quality assurance mechanisms related to admission, teaching-learning processes, evaluation, and academic performance applied and in correspondence with the graduation profile while the standard demands that the university demonstrate that it has an ongoing program oriented towards quality and improvement of the program. In this context and in response to Quality Assurance, universities have adopted three primary instruments: the Institutional Development Plan (PDI), the Annual Operational Plan (POA), and the Institutional Educational Model. Through Self-Evaluation Reports, universities disclose their achievements and the critical aspects of their operations, and with the Adjusted Institutional Improvement Plan (PMIA), they demonstrate their progress in each accreditation process and annual follow-up, as well as with the Program Improvement Plan (PMC).

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

CONEAUPA aims to promote a culture of evaluation and quality in higher education institutions in Panama. In the exercise of its functions, it develops the general conceptual and methodological guidelines of the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the Improvement of Higher University Education Quality in Panama; provides technical advice, support, and training to HEIs, and plans and executes training programs in evaluation, accreditation, and quality management of higher education directed at those responsible for these processes, according to the monitoring conducted on universities, emphasizing areas that need to be reinforced (Law 52, art. 23). In line with its mission and vision, CONEAUPA has promoted an equitable and fair approach to improving the quality of higher education in Panama, enabling universities to demonstrate their commitment to continuous improvement and quality assurance.

Subcategory: 2.2. Support Actions and Advisory to Self-Assessment Processes.

Criteria	Scenario
2.2.1 The Agency conducts courses, workshops, seminars, and other targeted activities for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to facilitate the development of self-assessment processes.	Fully complies
2.2.2 The Agency provides guides and support materials to assist HEIs in developing self-assessment processes.	Fully complies
2.2.3 The Agency has mechanisms that allow institutions to stay in contact during the quality assurance process of higher education.	Fully complies
2.2.4 The Agency respects the confidentiality of information provided by the institution during its self-assessment process, within the framework of applicable legal provisions.	Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

CONEAUPA is responsible for evaluating and accrediting higher education institutions in Panama. To enhance university processes, it organizes courses, workshops, seminars, and other activities that offer improvement opportunities and facilitate the development of self-assessment processes for

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

each university's Technical Evaluation Units (UTEs). The agency also conducts orientation visits requested by universities and provides training during the self-assessment processes to reinforce the conceptual mastery of the Evaluation and Accreditation Model Foundations, the institutional accreditation matrix, reaccreditation, career, and the regulations that accompany the development of the process. Annually, CONEAUPA organizes training workshops to maintain the dynamics of exchange and application of regulations in the delivery of self-assessment reports by universities and consistently addresses inquiries by phone, email, and in-person as required by each HEI. Additionally, training sessions are recorded and shared with universities so they can be viewed as often as needed and used in internal training to ensure greater contact, involvement, and development of an institutional culture linked to the quality assurance process of higher education. University teams participating in various trainings fill out a participation form to ensure they are involved in each process, along with an attendance list to continue training actions as a criterion for collaboratively building knowledge and expanding mastery over the regulations and their implementation.

The aforementioned actions demonstrate the agency's commitment to supporting the development of self-assessment processes, which are fundamental to ensuring the quality of higher university education. CONEAUPA provides HEIs with support materials for developing their self-assessment reports, such as clear and understandable guides to the process, for example, the Guide for Institutional Self-Evaluation. Annex 1. Management Statistical Data and Annex 2. Instructions for the development of the Institutional Improvement Plan (Resolution 15 of September 14, 2020) and matrices composed of four factors (1. Institutional Project, 2. Academic Project, 3. University Community, and 4. Infrastructure), components, subcomponents, criteria, indicators, and a guide for evidence verification. These materials are reviewed, approved, and published by the agency to strengthen the process. Furthermore, in compliance with the principle of Transparency (Law 52, art. 5, numeral 5), the agency published the Guide for Decision Making on Institutional Accreditation (Resolution 9 of June 12, 2020).

Providing guidance and clear tools for the development of self-assessment processes, as CONEAUPA does, helps universities improve the quality of education they offer. The fact that these materials are reviewed, approved, and published by the agency shows the commitment and

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

seriousness with which processes are planned, conducted, and evaluated. The publication of the Guide for Decision Making on Institutional Accreditation also demonstrates CONEAUPA's transparency in its work and its commitment to the continuous improvement of higher university education in Panama. In general, these practices significantly contribute to the strengthening and development of higher education institutions in the country.

In response to COVID-19, declared a pandemic in Panama on March 13, 2019, and with the aim of maintaining the continuity of actions in the face of the global health emergency, CONEAUPA approved actions to address Quality Assurance processes in crisis situations (Resolution 16 of October 28, 2020) so that the relationship with universities would remain and they would feel supported, specifically in terms of follow-up to the Adjusted Institutional Improvement Plans (PMIA) and career plans (PMCA) and support in the development of processes. Externally, the agency offered training to external evaluator peers and staff responsible for internal quality assurance, in addition to incorporating technological mechanisms in external evaluation visits.

During 2020, CONEAUPA continued its work by conducting virtual meetings of the Plenary Council prioritizing activities focused on the approval and official publication of guides and regulations such as the one related to the Recognition of Accreditation Certifications and for joint accreditations of careers and programs (Resolution 11 of June 24, 2020) and the Guide for this recognition (Resolution 8 of June 12, 2020), as well as the Institutional Evaluation and Reaccreditation Matrix (Resolution 17 of December 28, 2020) and the Procedure for incident reports or events that have a direct or indirect impact on the normal progress of activities and/or processes (Resolution 12 of July 14, 2020). During that same year, CONEAUPA developed a self-assessment management diagnosis and conducted virtual meetings to address the requirements of universities. Additionally, a national call was made to conduct studies on quality assurance and accreditation processes of higher education institutions.

In the period 2020-2021, biennial visits to universities were conducted, technical orientation meetings with committees in charge of careers were held, and documentation for entry into accreditation and reaccreditation processes was received in response to the Call for universities participating for the first time in an institutional accreditation evaluation process and universities that did not have the institutional accreditation certification issued by CONEAUPA (Resolution 18 of July 7, 2021). In this

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

latter case, the legal gap regarding the situation of universities that, having presented themselves for the process, did not achieve accreditation was filled. Executive Decree 1295 of July 9, 2021 (GO 29-327-B), in its Article 7 which adds Article 39-A to Executive Decree 539 of August 30, 2018, establishes a period of one year for them to re-present themselves, thereby following up on the quality assurance process of these universities.

As evidenced, CONEAUPA provides support during quality assurance processes, maintaining constant communication with universities and strengthening their capacities for self-assessment and continuous improvement. Moreover, guidance is provided, progress in the development of their Adjusted Institutional Improvement Plan (PMIA) and career plan is established, and the exchange of good practices is promoted to define strategies that facilitate continuous improvement in the quality of higher university education, as evidenced in the Guide for Promoting a Culture of Self-Assessment through the Development of the Institutional Improvement Plan of the Universities of Panama (Resolution 5 of May 27, 2021).

The information provided by institutions undergoing institutional and programmatic self-assessment and accreditation processes is confidential and is governed by the Code of Ethical Conduct and Corporate Responsibility (Resolution 4 of March 4, 2020), which must be strictly complied with by CONEAUPA personnel, as well as by members of the Plenary Council. Point 9. Information Management, indicates that "1. By virtue of our functions, we obtain, process, protect, and preserve information as an asset of the organization with responsibility, ethics, and in accordance with the applicable laws in higher education and with the systems established for the evaluation and accreditation of universities in Panama, their careers, and programs." Furthermore, prior to the start of the accreditation processes, all technical staff of CONEAUPA signed a confidentiality agreement that prevented them from sharing information about the universities assigned for the accompaniment of peers, the management of communication, and the documents that made up the administrative file of each HEI. On a broader scale, public servants of the central government, autonomous and semi-autonomous entities, and local governments are obliged to comply with the Uniform Code of Ethics for Public Servants (Executive Decree No. 246 of December 15, 2004) and to ensure understanding and application of the norm, they had to take the Ethics for Public Servants course which is considered an "effective tool for the application of preventive measures within the

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

institutional system to strengthen instructions to staff that ensure the proper understanding of their responsibilities and the ethical norms governing their activities," which was taught by the virtual academy of the National Authority for Transparency and Access to Information (ANTAI).

The importance of training and the provision of support materials for the development of self-assessment processes is highlighted, demonstrating CONEAUPA's commitment to contributing to the strengthening and development of higher university education institutions in the country. Furthermore, CONEAUPA's transparency in its work is noteworthy, demonstrated in the publication of guides and regulations and in the attention to quality assurance processes during the pandemic.

Subcategory: 2.3. Definition of Criteria and Procedures for External Evaluation.

Criteria	Scenario
2.3.1 The Agency recognizes and values institutional diversity, translating this appreciation into criteria and procedures that consider the identity and purposes of the Higher Education Institutions (HEIs).	Fully complies
2.3.2 The criteria and procedures for external evaluation have been defined following a reasonable process of consultation with key stakeholders and are periodically reviewed to ensure their relevance to the needs of the system.	Fully complies
2.3.3 The Agency convenes groups of experts from the academic community and the professional field as appropriate, for the creation and updating of its evaluation instruments.	Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

The statement of principles of the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for University Education in Panama, managed by CONEAUPA, acknowledges the diversity of university institutions and their various programs and teaching modalities, as well as the fair and equitable treatment of HEIs (Law 52, article 5, items 3 and 4). CONEAUPA is the national agency responsible for the

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

accreditation process of HEIs, both public and private, and it establishes the guidelines governing the context and scope of institutional, program, and career accreditation processes.

In the development of the matrices, special care has been taken to ensure that they provide sufficient openness for HEIs to respond to mandatory basic indicators and desirable secondary indicators, with a valuation scale ranging from fully complies (5) to does not comply (1), on both qualitative and quantitative scales that support decision-making (Resolution 7 of August 3, 2021).

For the self-evaluation process, the relevant regulations for the process to be developed (institutional, careers, programs) are provided, along with the corresponding matrix, which integrates four factors to be evaluated. This matrix arises from the call of national and international academics who review the criteria in each process, allowing for the updating of the instruments that will later be used for external evaluation at the universities. All this is contemplated in the Procedure for the Institutional Accreditation Process (Resolution 8 of August 3, 2021), as well as the procedure for the Institutional Reaccreditation Process (Resolution 10 of August 24, 2021), Accreditation and Reaccreditation of careers, External Evaluation Process, and Self-Evaluation Process. (see evidence flow).

Panama is recognized as the "bridge of the world, heart of the universe" and as a "melting pot," phrases that allude to cultural and religious diversity, tolerance, and acceptance of each person's and institution's identity, which also covers the diversity of HEIs that were accredited in 2022, with the established matrix. For example, Ganexa University, focused on the cultural and artistic part; Midrashá Jorev University, focused on strengthening Jewish identity and training professional women within its religious community outside of Israel; Hosanna University, with Christian values and principles that voluntarily entered the accreditation process; and Our Lady of Carmen University, which was created to provide opportunities for socially at-risk communities, all equally valued within a national regulatory framework where accreditation is mandatory.

From Law 52 of 2015 and its regulations in 2018, CONEAUPA has developed a systematic process of reviewing the regulations that support the various actions, considering the experience of accreditation agencies from other countries such as Colombia, Paraguay, Ecuador, Mexico, Costa Rica, as well as the national reality and the universities' experience in the processes. Additionally,

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

consultations were made with university experts and centers such as CINDA, reviewing the models of agencies from these countries, which allowed for establishing uniform criteria regarding evaluation, such as the phases of the processes: Self-evaluation, external evaluation by academic peers, and accreditation (Law 52, Article 8).

All planning actions for the processes, whether for institutional accreditation or reaccreditation, for careers, or programs, require a series of actions to be in line with the norms and the reality of HEIs in Panama. In this regard, the agency has developed a series of requirements, steps, or guidelines that include the creation of evaluation models, decision-making guides, evaluation model foundations, process procedures, matrices, and calls for entry into the respective evaluation processes for accreditation or reaccreditation. All these documents have been developed by the Technical Commission for Evaluation and Accreditation of CONEAUPA and approved by the Plenary Council.

CONEAUPA has implemented an institutional evaluation model oriented towards the continuous improvement of quality processes. This model focuses on reducing weaknesses detected in self-assessment processes, considered as areas of opportunity for improvement, and must align with established regulations. For external evaluation, a group of specialists known as external academic peers is involved, consisting of two national evaluators and one foreign evaluator, who are responsible for verifying the self-assessment report, the institutional improvement plan, and the internal conditions of the institution, a process that is in accordance with Resolution No. 11 of August 3, 2021.

It is important to highlight that the matrix used by the selected evaluators for external evaluation has been reviewed by CONEAUPA, together with the stakeholders involved in the evaluations of HEIs, to ensure its relevance and meet the system's needs.

The technical staff of CONEAUPA had the opportunity to learn about the models from other countries and the instruments used (2010-2011). This knowledge and contacts with other agencies were used to design the first Accreditation Matrix used in the first institutional call in 2012, which had 4 factors (University Teaching, Research and Innovation, University Extension, and University Institutional

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Management) and 185 indicators, also classifying indicators into essential (74), important (81), and convenient (30).

Valuing national experience and responding to consultations with universities, for the reaccreditation process of 23 universities that presented themselves at the first process (2012) and for the accreditation of new universities, a new accreditation matrix with 103 and 104 indicators respectively was prepared. The matrix was submitted to experts such as María José Lemaitre from CINDA and national universities for official validation (UTP) and private (Euromericana).

Similarly, national specialists have been consulted for the review of the matrix for careers in the areas of Health Sciences, Education, Social Sciences.

CONEAUPA enriches itself with the contributions of international and national experts with the aim of adjusting both its regulations and its instruments. Currently, with a prospective vision, a search for information and experiences is being conducted to design a third matrix aimed at evaluating the impact of HEIs, with fewer indicators and a credential of excellence, a task to be developed in the immediate future.

Subcategory: 2.4. Reconsideration and Appeal Mechanisms.

Criteria

2.4.1 The Agency has mechanisms for dispute resolution and implements them.

Scenario

Fully complies

2.4.2 The Agency ensures the impartiality of dispute resolution mechanisms, avoiding any potential conflicts of interest

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

It is important to note that CONEAUPA has mechanisms for dispute resolution, which ensures efficiency in the development of its processes. Universities have appropriate options for handling incidents that may arise during the course of activities or processes.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

The Agency pays special attention to the development of a Quality Management System that includes the management of incident reports such as complaints, claims, and non-conformities, which must be addressed promptly and may have a direct or indirect relationship with the normal course of the activities or processes being undertaken (Resolution No. 12 of July 14, 2020).

Should an incident be detected, it must be recorded on the form provided by the agency and reported by the process manager. Within the form, one or several incidents can be marked, and a brief description must be provided that includes all relevant information for analysis. Subsequently, the corrective action approved by authorized persons, such as the Executive Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, and the Administrator, will be implemented.

A case occurred with a new member of the CONEAUPA Plenum who, unfamiliar with the regulations, made public the reaccreditation results of the first universities, causing considerable discomfort among the HEIs. The Executive Secretary personally spoke with the involved individual, and a note was prepared and sent to all members of the Plenum.

Authorized individuals to approve corrective actions include the Executive Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Administration Manager, Technical Staff, Records Manager, Information and Technology Manager. Additionally, CONEAUPA has an email designated as "Public Inquiries coneaup@coneaup.edu.pa," to which students, teachers, national and international university institutions write requesting information or lodging complaints about various situations. It is frequently checked, and complaints, claims, and requests are forwarded to the Technical Commission for Academic Development (CTDA), to the HEIs themselves, while others are handled directly by CONEAUPA so that users receive prompt responses or the guidance they request.

In the context of incident management, if a university believes that an incorrect procedure has been carried out, the Rector has the authority to issue a corresponding written complaint to the Council, thus ensuring the impartiality of the process and avoiding potential conflicts of interest.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

As part of the accreditation processes, Rectors of HEIs receive the resumes of the external academic peers selected for the on-site visit and have the possibility to challenge them within a maximum of five days, thus anticipating potential conflicts.

The anticipation of conflicts of interest also extends to external peers, as stipulated in Article 44 of the Consolidated Text of Executive Decree 539, which regulates Law 52, prohibiting the external peer team and their relatives up to the fourth degree of consanguinity and second degree of affinity from belonging to the evaluated university institution.

Furthermore, the Plenary of the Council has an Internal Regulation that establishes prohibitions and conflicts of interest (Resolution No. 3 of January 29, 2020). For example, when a topic involving the university represented by a Council member is addressed, that member must withdraw from the session, and this is recorded in the minutes. This was the case during the presentation of the academic peers' evaluation for the accreditation of public and private universities (2022), where representatives ceded their place to another representative while the presentation was made, deliberated, and a decision was taken. Additionally, the Code of Ethical Conduct and Corporate Responsibility of CONEAUPA (Resolution 4 of March 4, 2020), in its Article 6, elaborates on the Impartiality of the CONEAUPA staff, including members of the Plenum.

Subcategory: 2.5. Publication of Accreditation Decisions.

Criteria

2.5.1 The Agency publishes accreditation decisions in accordance with the prevailing legal and cultural framework.

Scenario

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

One of the functions of CONEAUPA is to "Publicly issue accreditation certifications for institutions, programs, and courses that meet the established quality standards" (Law 52, article 23, item 8).

In fulfillment of this function, once the on-site visit processes are completed, the Executive Secretary of CONEAUPA presents to the Plenary of the Council the results of the evaluation carried out by

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

external academic peers based on the Decision-Making Guide (Resolution No. 7 of August 3, 2021), which forms the basis for the granting of accreditation certification for 4, 5, or 6 years to the HEIs.

Subsequently, the agency publishes the Resolutions with their decisions in the Official Gazette.

Similarly, CONEAUPA is required to publish the list of non-accredited universities on its website, after its publication in the Official Gazette (Consolidated Text of Executive Decree 539 of August 30, 2018, article 51).

Additionally, the agency ensures the fidelity and validity of the information contained on its website, which allows access to all state publications that the law mandates to be disclosed through this medium. In this way, the validity of the normative and regulatory acts is certified.

The clarity of the guidelines for processes aligned with legal regulations gives validity and legitimacy to the results, which are recognized and valued both socially within the country and academically outside of Panama, leaving no doubt about the transparency of its decisions.

Category 3: Processes associated with evaluation

Subcategory: 3.1. Documentation Required for Evaluation Processes.

Criteria

Scenario

3.1.1 The Agency has clear documentation relating to the processes of self-evaluation, external evaluation, and accreditation decision-making.

Fully complies

3.1.2 The self-assessment documentation explicitly states the purposes, procedures, and expectations of the process. It also clearly distinguishes between requirements (or essential criteria) and recommendations or suggestions.

Fully complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

3.1.3 The documentation on external evaluation clearly defines the main elements required, such as the standards used, criteria for decision-making, evaluation methods, report format, and others considered necessary Fully complies

3.1.4 The standards that lead to the accreditation decision are transparent, public, and ensure equal treatment of various institutions and programs. Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

CONEAUPA possesses the necessary documentation for self-evaluation, external evaluation, and decision-making regarding accreditation for institutional processes as well as for programs and courses. All these details are available in the flow of each process.

In 2010, the Foundations of the Model for Institutional University Evaluation and Accreditation in Panama were approved, as well as the institutional self-evaluation process (Resolution No. 1 of December 1, 2010). During 2011, Higher Education Institutions prepared for this process, which culminated in the accreditation certification of 23 universities between 2012 and 2015.

CONEAUPA has generated the necessary regulations for the development of the evaluation processes in accordance with Law 52 of 2015, which repealed Law 30 of July 20, 2006, and establishes the three phases of institutional and program accreditation (Article 8). CONEAUPA is responsible for the development and approval of the general conceptual and methodological guidelines of the System, as well as the documents that guide these processes, establishing criteria, indicators, and quality standards (Article 23, item 2).

It would be advisable to unify the procedures of the three phases into a Single Text, which would facilitate a comprehensive overview of the entire process for universities and the agency's technical staff.

The Foundations of the Model for Institutional Accreditation (Resolution No. 5 of March 5, 2020, p. 13) establish Self-Evaluation as the first phase and indicate its purpose, procedures, and what is expected from the process, emphasizing coordinated work within the Higher Education Institution (HEI).

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

The Guide for Institutional Self-Evaluation (Resolution No. 15 of December 14, 2020) details the management statistical data and the instructions for developing the Institutional Improvement Plan. These guides are based on lessons learned from previous processes and are constantly updated to improve quality, establishing essential criteria, formats, and standard requirements for the submission of documentation, as well as recommendations for conducting the internal evaluation processes of HEIs. All these guides are based on CONEAUPA's Accreditation and Reaccreditation Matrices.

CONEAUPA establishes that external evaluation is the second phase of the accreditation process (Law 52, Art. 8). This phase includes procedures, formats, and reports of the results. CONEAUPA has documents such as the Foundations of the Evaluation and Accreditation Model (Resolution No. 5 of March 5, 2020) and the matrices for institutional, career, and program evaluation. These matrices capture the substantive functions of universities through components, subcomponents, quality criteria, indicators, and standards with their respective verification guides. Additionally, there is a procedure for the university reaccreditation process, which sets out each of the steps of the process in detail (Resolution No. 10 of August 24, 2021).

To guide the ad hoc Commission, composed of external academic peers in the corresponding valuation and in the preparation of a substantiated final report for decision-making on accreditation and its validity for 4, 5, or 6 years, the Guide for Decision Making on Institutional Accreditation and Reaccreditation (Resolution No. 7 of August 3, 2021) and the Guide for Decision Making on the Accreditation and Reaccreditation of careers and programs (Resolution No. 3 of July 29, 2022) are used.

Both the Guide for Decision Making on institutional accreditation and for careers and programs have been approved by the Plenary of CONEAUPA and published in the Official Gazette, as well as on the agency's website, to ensure a fair, equitable, and transparent process in evaluation and decision-making. To achieve this, an awareness process is carried out that includes support, training, and seminars directed at Higher Education Institutions. This guide enables effective and fair decision-making, as evidenced in the period between December 2022 and January 2023, when 23 universities underwent the reaccreditation process, with results that included 1 accreditation for 4 years, 1 for 5

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

years, and 21 for 6 years, reflecting an effective process of guidance, training, and support (Minutes of the CONEAUPA Plenary Council Meeting, November 7, 2022, presenting the result and decision-making of accreditation).

In compliance with the principle of transparency, the list of accredited and non-accredited universities is published on CONEAUPA's website, after the corresponding resolution is published in the Official Gazette (Single Text, Art. 51). On the website, you can find the Resolutions of the 23 reaccredited universities and the 5 accredited for the first time, as well as a link to the Official Gazette.

Subcategory: 3.2 External Evaluation

Criteria	Scenario
3.2.1 During on-site visits, interviews are conducted with various sectors of the institution and key external stakeholders.	Fully complies
3.2.2 The "in situ" evaluation process encompasses facility visits and assessments that directly influence the teaching-learning process.	Fully complies
3.2.3 Mechanisms are in place for institutions or higher education programs to report any failures or misconduct by the evaluation committee at the time they occur.	Fully complies
3.2.4 The Agency evaluates the core functions of institutions or programs according to their mission and purposes.	Fully complies
3.2.5 The Agency ensures that the institution or its programs have effective tools and processes for the evaluation of expected learning outcomes, both during the formative process and at the time of graduation.	Satisfactorily complies
3.2.6 The Agency ensures that there is an evaluation of faculty members within the institution or program, and that the results are consistent with the institution's goals.	Fully complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

3.2.7 The Agency ensures that the institution or program has institutional planning mechanisms that allow for the continuous improvement of the quality of education provided to its students.	Satisfactorily complies
3.2.8 The Agency verifies that the program or institution complies with its mission, vision, values, and policies by promoting institutional diversity and ensuring that criteria or standards do not hinder this diversity.	Fully complies
3.2.9 The Agency verifies the implementation of improvement plans for careers, programs, or institutions, with the aim of promoting continuous improvement.	Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

CONEAUPA maintains a Peer Review Bank (as established in the Single Text, Art. 42) of professionals interested in participating in the accreditation processes. To join, one must complete a form that serves as a reference for the selection of peers. In the second process initiated in 2021, the peers were trained by RIACES in collaboration with CONEAUPA.

Peers are grouped according to their training and experience, and those who will participate in the on-site visit commissions are selected randomly. This selection takes place at CONEAUPA's offices, with the participation of a member of the Council Plenum designated for this purpose. The selection record includes the list of chosen academic peers, along with an alternate for each commission in case a replacement is necessary.

Once selected, peers are notified that they have been chosen and are sent a contract specifying their responsibilities. A national peer leads each peer commission. Each peer has a designated time to prepare their individual report, after which a meeting convened by the Agency takes place to prepare an integrated report.

As part of their duties, peers agree on the questions they will ask and the aspects they will focus on during the on-site visit. If necessary, they may request additional information from the self-evaluation or the accompanying evidence. The Agency has an agenda format in which both the peers and the university agree on the on-site visit schedule, which includes meetings and interviews with students, faculty, authorities, administrative staff, graduates, and employers.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

As observed in the agenda that is part of the administrative file for each university's process, the peers conduct an on-site visit and contrast the information received with what they find. The indicators verified to check compliance are in factor 4 of the institutional and career evaluation matrix, which refers to infrastructure. However, this is also a cross-sectional aspect evaluated during the on-site visit.

As part of the process monitoring, CONEAUPA has established an incident reporting procedure for situations that affect the smooth running of the process (Resolution No.12 of July 14, 2020). In the process conducted, there were no incident reports from the universities.

It is important to highlight the role of the technical staff assigned to each university's process to ensure that it is carried out with the greatest objectivity and efficiency. This staff is responsible for keeping the Executive Secretary informed of any situations that may arise that contravene the process's development, but also acts as a liaison between the peers, the university, and CONEAUPA.

It is worth mentioning that peers fill out an evaluation survey of the Agency, a self-evaluation of their performance, and an evaluation of the commission coordinator. In addition to this, the technician assigned to the university for the process development provides an oral report and, in case of incidents, a written report.

The National System of Evaluation and Accreditation for the Improvement of Higher University Education Quality in Panama establishes as one of its principles the recognition of the diversity of university institutions, as well as their different programs and teaching modalities, and treats each of them fairly and equitably (Law 52, Art. 5, items 3 and 4).

The matrices are designed so that each university can evidence its functions and programs according to its mission and objectives. For example, there are universities with religious orientations such as Midrashá Jorev (Jewish), Hosanna University (Evangelical), and Our Lady of Carmen University (Catholic), as well as in specific fields like Ganexa University of Art or the University of Distance Education of Panama (UNADP) and the University of Certified Public Accountants (UNESPA). All have presented their self-evaluations and improvement plans in response to the corresponding

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

matrix, whether for accreditation or reaccreditation, demonstrating the objectivity of the matrix and its development prioritizing aspects that allow for evidence while also characterizing each university institution's unique features and identity.

Both the institutional accreditation and reaccreditation matrices, as well as the program matrices, pay special attention to learning processes and their evaluation through a variety of techniques and tools from the beginning to the end of the student's education. For instance, in the institutional accreditation matrix, Factor 2. Academic Project, component 4. Academic Foundations, according to the teaching-learning modality; subcomponent 8. Teaching and Learning Strategies; indicator 32: Record of the evaluation of prior and acquired learning by students per period and modality, requires that the HEI minimally document the following 4 evidences from the Verification Guide: 1. Guidelines to guide the application of diagnostic, formative, and academic knowledge tests for students of all modalities; 2. Regulations that govern the process of diagnostic, formative, and summative evaluation of student learning; 3. Analysis of its application according to career, programs, and modality; and 4. Report of corrective actions taken from the analysis of the results of the statistics of repetition, lag, dropout, and abandonment of careers and programs, according to modality.

Specifically, indicator 45 of the evaluation matrix for Health Sciences careers (Resolution No. 20 of December 14, 2021) states: Policies for the evaluation of learning and its standard establishes that the career must have Learning Evaluation Policies that integrate the cognitive, skill, dexterity, attitudinal or value, or competence areas, according to the defined professional profile.

The minimum verification guide requires presenting 1. Learning evaluation policies; 2. Mechanisms for the dissemination of the evaluation of learning; and 3. An annual report evidencing that at least 90% of the faculty are aware of the learning evaluation policies.

The Agency pays special attention to the evaluation of learning and collaborates with the Technical Commission for Academic Development, responsible for the oversight of universities, in the drafting and approval of the rules related to the presentation of the curricular design of careers and programs presented by private HEIs (Resolution No. 02 of January 29, 2020). These rules are also applied by public universities due to their responsibility in overseeing the offerings of private universities.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

3.2.6 Faculty evaluation is an essential element to ensure the quality of student training. The Institutional Reaccreditation Matrix establishes in Factor 3, University Community, Component 11, Faculty, Subcomponent 20, Suitability and Competencies, Indicator 77, that institutions must have updated records of faculty evaluation mechanisms and their results at all sites, levels, and modalities. The minimum verification includes: 1) updated and valid mechanisms to evaluate faculty performance, 2) record of results, 3) training programs based on the results, 4) record of decisions, and 5) action plans for improvement.

For Health Sciences careers, Indicator 92 establishes that universities must have a faculty performance evaluation system. The minimum verification guides include: 1) institutional policies on faculty, 2) instruments for the evaluation of faculty performance, 3) plan for the dissemination of policies, 4) annual performance evaluation report, and 5) annual report of analysis of results and action plans.

In conclusion, the evaluation of the faculty is a priority and is part of the quality assurance system for the educational offerings in each modality.

The Institutional Evaluation and Accreditation Matrix (Resolution No.6 of March 5, 2021) establishes the importance of a culture of self-evaluation to improve quality, as evidenced in Factor 1. Institutional Project, Component 3. Financial Management; subcomponent 5. Control and forecasts: Indicator 20. This indicator requires that the HEI present documents showing the budget allocation and execution for the past three years, with percentages allocated to the substantive functions of the university, such as teaching, research and innovation, extension, and management. This way, the planning function in the realization of the university's substantive functions by each HEI is demonstrated.

In the accreditation matrix for Health Sciences careers, it is found in Factor 1. Institutional context of the career; Component 1. Organizational structure of the career; subcomponent 1. Organization; indicator 1. Functionality of the organizational structure for the management of the career according to its needs and those of the institution. This indicator establishes that the career must have an operational organizational structure and a document showing the correspondence of academic development planning with teaching, research, extension, and linkage with society. Additionally, it

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

must have a Career Development Plan that identifies its needs and a mechanism for monitoring and evaluating the results obtained. These elements clearly evidence the forecasting function at the institutional and career level, which responds to quality assurance.

In the accreditation matrix, the subcomponent of Quality Assurance and indicator 10 establish the importance of administrative procedures to promote internal quality assurance of the various processes. The standard establishes that the university must execute self-evaluation processes that promote the university community's reflection to improve quality.

In summary, the institutional and career evaluation and accreditation matrices emphasize the importance of self-evaluation as a tool to improve quality in each modality.

The evaluation matrices demonstrate their effectiveness by accommodating institutional diversity and evidencing the compliance with the mission, vision, values, and policies of the institutions, without being an obstacle to their development. In this regard, the self-evaluation of various universities such as Midrashá Jorev, Hosanna University, Our Lady of Carmen University, Ganexa University of Art, University of Distance Education of Panama (UNADP), and University of Certified Public Accountants (UNESPA), who have presented their improvement plans in response to the corresponding matrices, whether for accreditation or reaccreditation, is highlighted.

The Agency provides a series of instruments to guide HEIs in the design of the Improvement Plan, which include the Guide for the presentation of compliance with the Adjusted Institutional Improvement Plan (PMIA) (Resolution No.1 of January 28, 2021) and the Guide for Promoting a Culture of Self-Evaluation through the development of an Institutional Improvement Plan (Resolution No.4 of May 27, 2021). The regulations also establish the annual delivery of the PMIA Development Status Report by HEIs, and a verification visit of progress at the midpoint of the accreditation validity is conducted.

Additionally, formats for the Verification Report of the Progress Status of the Adjusted Career Improvement Plan (PMCA) and a Guide for the presentation of the Institutional or career and/or university programs Improvement Plan (Resolution No. 14 of October 28, 2021) have been approved.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Before entering the accreditation processes, HEIs submit a Compliance Report of the PMIA and PMCA, and compliance is verified.

However, an opportunity for improvement for the agency would be to systematize the monitoring of improvement plans through platforms or systems that allow better backup of documentation. In general, the implementation of these instruments allows HEIs to identify opportunities for improvement and strengthen capabilities for the development of improvement plans, which contributes to the continuous improvement of the quality of education.

Subcategory: 3.3. Peer Reviewers

Criteria

3.3.1 The Agency maintains a register of peer evaluators that matches the characteristics of the evaluation and accreditation processes conducted annually, which is used for organizing external evaluations.

3.3.2 The Agency has appropriate mechanisms for the recruitment and selection of peer reviewers, and these are disseminated among stakeholder groups.

3.3.3 The Agency develops training processes, evaluations, and regular updates for its peer reviewers.

3.3.4 The peer evaluator committees adhere to the guidelines and procedures established by the Agency for performing their duties.

3.3.5 "In situ" evaluations are conducted by peer reviewers appropriate to the characteristics of the institution/program being evaluated, and they can contribute from various perspectives, including those of institutions, academics, students, employers, or practicing professionals.

3.3.6 The Agency assesses the academic performance and conduct of its peer evaluators, using this information to update the registry and the training activities conducted.

Scenario

Fully complies

Fully complies

Fully complies

Fully complies

Fully complies

Fully complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Self-Assessment:

CONEAUPA is responsible for selecting and appointing Academic Peers to conduct external evaluations as part of the accreditation processes. According to Article 42 of the Consolidated Text of Executive Decree 539, the Academic Peers Data Bank (ad hoc technical commissions) is managed by the Executive Secretariat. The agency conducts an open call for national and international candidates, allowing interested individuals to submit their data and documentation throughout the year. CONEAUPA periodically evaluates and selects peers based on its needs.

Registration forms for peer recruitment are available on the CONEAUPA website. Once the requirements are completed, personal and professional information is evaluated according to the general criteria required. The peer selection process is regulated by the Resolution containing the External Evaluation Process (Resolution No. 12 of August 24, 2021). CONEAUPA also maintains relationships with other international accrediting agencies, which have provided peer evaluator references for its database.

Peers registered in the database receive training prior to each external evaluation process. Guides for preparing documents before the on-site visit are also provided, and a video call is conducted to address major concerns. After the on-site visits, the performance of the ad hoc Commission's coordinating peer is evaluated, and a self-assessment survey is administered to each external peer.

An opportunity for improvement would be a reflective meeting with national academic peers to evaluate the entire process, including the performance of external academic peers.

CONEAUPA has specific regulations for each phase of the accreditation process. Both the Resolution related to the External Evaluation Process and the commitment agreements signed by the peer evaluators are subject to established guidelines and procedures. Additionally, each ad hoc Commission is accompanied by technical staff from the agency, whose role is to ensure compliance with the process as stipulated in the regulations.

Peer evaluators selected for "in situ" evaluations are chosen following the established procedure, ensuring that they are appropriate for the characteristics of the institution or program being evaluated.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Furthermore, institutions and programs are offered the opportunity to object to the selection of a peer if they consider them unsuitable for conducting the on-site evaluation. A member of the ad hoc Commission is a national peer, who plays an active role in contextualizing national regulations and the substantive characteristics and functions of the evaluated institutions.

Once the on-site visit is completed, the performance of the ad hoc Commission's coordinator is evaluated, and this information is tabulated to verify their performance, as well as the self-assessment of the academic peers. The agency's technical staff also provides a report on the development of the visit and any incidents that may have occurred.

An area for improvement is to expand the peer bank by extending invitations to other agencies so that a larger number of professionals whose profiles meet the requirements of various processes in different areas of knowledge are available. Similarly, it is advisable to offer them training and contextualization in country-specific processes, as was done with RIACES.

Subcategory: 3.4. Decision Making

Criteria

3.4.1 The Agency makes accreditation decisions within collegiate bodies and bases its decisions on the results of self-evaluation reports, external evaluation, and responses in cases where they exist. If other backgrounds are considered, these must have been previously informed to the institutions.

3.4.2 Decisions are impartial, rigorous, and consistent, even when based on reports from different evaluation teams.

3.4.3 Decisions are based solely and exclusively on public criteria or standards and procedures, and are justified only in relation to these criteria and procedures.

3.4.4 The documents that record accreditation decisions are clear and precise, and are securely maintained.

Scenario

Fully complies

Fully complies

Fully complies

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

The National Council for Evaluation and Accreditation (CONEAUPA) serves as the evaluator and accreditor of higher education institutions and also administers the National System for Evaluation and Accreditation for the improvement of higher education quality in Panama (Law 52, articles 19 and 20). Article 23 outlines its functions, including the organization and coordination of the external evaluation phase of universities by external peer evaluators.

The Consolidated Text of Executive Decree 539 specifies in its article 48 that the Council conducts a comprehensive assessment of the self-evaluation report, the Institutional Improvement Plan (PMI), the final report from peers, and other elements, if applicable, to grant accreditations. The Decision-Making Guides for institutional, program, and course accreditations establish the procedures for substantiating decision-making regarding accreditation.

The Agency has a decision-making body, the Plenum, composed of eleven honorary members "who represent the different sectors involved in the development and transformation of higher university education in the country." Once the on-site visit process is completed and the final report is received, the assigned technician compiles the university's administrative file. The Executive Secretary receives the file and, if the university does not achieve 6 years, sends a formal communication with the final report from the Ad Hoc Commission, granting 5 days for the university to respond if it so wishes. The response is reviewed by the Executive Secretary and sent to the Ad Hoc Commission, which meets and analyzes it. This step concludes with the acceptance or rejection of the response, which remains as an internal report of the Agency.

In the session of the Plenary of the Council, the Executive Secretary presents the Decision-Making Table and the Table of results obtained by each university undergoing the process. The Plenary deliberates in a transparent and expeditious manner. Regarding the responses, the Executive Secretary explains them to the Plenary, including any incidents that may have occurred, and whether the university decided not to respond, indicating its agreement with the outcome, after which the Plenary deliberates and makes a decision on the period of validity for the institutional or program accreditation.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

It is worth noting that in the first process conducted in 2012-2015, there was no Decision-Making Table, which favored very subjective decision-making, a situation that has been rectified with excellent results since there was no possibility of influencing the outcomes presented by the peer evaluators.

CONEAUPA makes impartial, rigorous, and consistent decisions, using the criteria established in the Decision-Making Guide and relevant regulations. The documents are comprehensively valued, even when they are based on reports from different perspectives of the evaluation team.

It is important to reiterate that the procedure indicates that each external academic peer prepares an individual report and then they prepare a consensus report that is used for the on-site visit, making it clear that there is a reflective and debate process supported by the self-evaluation, the evidence, and the improvement plan, which as indicated, is the basis of the on-site visit and the drafting of the Final Report, endorsed by each member of the designated Ad Hoc Commission.

The decisions issued by the Agency are based exclusively on public criteria and procedures, which are part of the national regulations and are published in the Official Gazette. The decisions are justified only in relation to criteria and procedures. During the Accreditation Phase, the basis for decision-making, the outcome of the process, and the delivery of the institutional or program accreditation or reaccreditation certification are detailed.

The documentation that records CONEAUPA's accreditation decisions is clear, precise, and is securely preserved as they are published in the Official Gazette. The minutes of the CONEAUPA Plenary, which record the debate and arguments of the members, are securely kept in both bound print and digital formats in the offices of CONEAUPA and are available for verification at any time.

Additionally, the university has access to information about the development of its process and the certification issued by CONEAUPA, as well as its dissemination on the Agency's website, following its publication in the Official Gazette.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Criteria

3.5.1 The Agency publishes its regulations, evaluation model, evaluation standards or criteria, procedures, evaluation instruments, and their grading methods on an easily accessible site.

Scenario

Fully complies

3.5.2 The Agency publishes accreditation decisions and other relevant information in a manner that is clear and accessible to various types of users.

Fully complies

3.5.3 The Agency has identified its stakeholder groups and undertakes actions to keep them informed about the information they require.

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

The National Council for University Evaluation and Accreditation (CONEAUPA) serves as the state accreditation agency under the Ministry of Education (MEDUCA). Its primary function is to ensure that Higher Education Institutions across the country comply with government regulations. These regulations are published in the "Regulations" section and "Resolutions" subsection on the agency's website and in the Official Gazette, where all information regarding the processes of self-evaluation, external evaluation, and accreditation decision-making can be found, as well as the laws and decrees governing the National System of Evaluation and Accreditation.

A noteworthy aspect involves the coordination between CONEAUPA and the Technical Commission for Academic Development (CTDA), which has led to the unification of oversight instruments in accordance with Article 32 of Law 52 regarding the Favorable Report that the CTDA must issue for the accreditation of courses or programs. These instruments include faculty, student records, student evaluations of the course or program, approved or updated curricular design, and physical facilities. To acquaint universities with the tools that inspectors will apply, an orientation session was developed for universities in the Health Sciences area entering the accreditation processes, and a second session aimed at the inspectors (see the training program from April 13 and 26, 2023).

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

The agency makes all information related to the accreditation process publicly available on its official government website, allowing any interested party to access it. Additionally, they offer telephone support to users to provide guidance on using and searching information on their website.

3.5.3 CONEAUPA identifies its stakeholder groups, which include higher education institutions, students, graduates, and faculty. To keep them informed and up-to-date, the agency organizes seminars, trainings, and workshops in the three phases of the accreditation process. These events are directed at the accreditation teams, who in turn share the information with their stakeholder groups, such as students, faculty, employers, administrative staff, authorities, graduates, and professionals, inviting them to participate.

Furthermore, to enhance its customer service, the agency has a "Public Inquiries" site accessible by email. This channel allows users to make inquiries related to the functioning of the entire system, which are answered by the Executive Secretary or the Deputy Secretary. If necessary, inquiries are forwarded to the Technical Commission for Academic Development (CTDA).

After each training session, a space is provided for inquiries, which are answered by the agency's technical staff. If necessary, the technical staff discusses among themselves based on the regulations to provide precise responses.

Therefore, it can be affirmed that CONEAUPA fulfills its primary function of ensuring compliance with government regulations in Higher Education Institutions at the national level. Moreover, it is distinguished by its efforts to make all information regarding the accreditation process public and accessible, as well as by keeping its stakeholder groups informed through various communication channels and training sessions.

An area for improvement involves establishing coordination with the CTDA to understand the responses that this entity, as part of the System, provides to public inquiries related to oversight aspects.

Category 4: External Activities of the Agency

Subcategory: 4.1 Accountability

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Criteria

Scenario

4.1.1 The agency has mechanisms in place to periodically provide public accountability regarding the fulfillment of its mission and purposes.

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

CONEAUPA is the Evaluating, Accrediting, and Governing Agency of the System for Evaluation and Accreditation to Improve the Quality of Higher University Education. The Council is independent and decentralized, with financial, administrative, and regulatory autonomy, its own assets, and legal personality, and is represented by various stakeholders involved in the development of higher education in the country.

CONEAUPA's public accountability aims to present activities that align with its mission and purposes as the sole accrediting agency in Panama. The mechanisms used for this accountability include immediate posting on social media of activities being undertaken; a monthly activity report by the Executive Secretary to the Council members; and the production of an annual report presented to the Minister of Education and the Cabinet Council.

Information about CONEAUPA's management is also sent to the Minister of Education, who is the President of the Plenum, and is shared in media interviews, meetings with the President of the Republic, and at national and international events, in accordance with its purposes.

In monthly sessions, the Executive Secretary presents the consecutive agenda, verifying the regulatory quorum, approving the agenda, approving the minutes of the previous session sent to the Plenum members five days prior, presenting received correspondence, communicating completed activities and advancements according to the Annual Work Plan, and discussing activities requiring the Council members' approval and the Executive Secretary's Report.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

The established approvals aim to set regulations and their publication in the Official Gazette, as well as their dissemination to the university community, for the processes of accreditation and/or reaccreditation, whether institutional, programmatic, or course-based, as determined by the regulations.

Furthermore, the Agency continuously publishes all its activities on its Instagram account (CONEAUPA), which serves to publicly validate its activities and the execution of processes in accordance with its mission and vision. This social network also serves as a public domain for the agency's accountability to the educational community in Panama.

Finally, the Agency's annual report is presented to the Minister of Education and provides relevant information for the Minister to prepare the educational sector's report to be presented before the National Assembly, and it is published on the MEDUCA website for dissemination to the general educational community.

This report compiles the Agency's annual activities directed towards the accreditation processes with universities, as well as all activities involving the Agency in the dissemination of processes and engagements with other agencies, all aimed at fulfilling its purposes, mission, and vision.

CONEAUPA is committed to transparency and public accountability, responsibly aware of the importance of informing the general educational community about its management and activities. The immediate posting of activities on social media, the monthly activity report, and the annual report presented to the Ministry of Education are indicators of the commitment to enhancing higher university education in Panama.

Subcategory: 4.2. Contribution to Policy Design.

Criteria

4.2.1 The Agency periodically publishes studies on the quality of education in institutions or higher education programs based on the analysis of the collective results of its evaluations or accreditations.

Scenario

Satisfactorily complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

4.2.2 The Agency plays an active role in the discussion on the quality of higher education within its context.

Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

The Agency systematically compiles the scores achieved by universities on the accreditation matrix, which serves to guide universities in terms of improvement projects, forming part of the academic quality. It also analyzes the alignment of the Adjusted Institutional Improvement Plans with the quality assurance of the universities. The PMIs of the reaccredited universities are presented to the Plenum of CONEAUPA for approval and, through official communication, they are notified of their approval to commence the development of the projects. The Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) must annually report the progress of their Adjusted PMIs and receive a mid-term visit for monitoring by CONEAUPA's technical staff.

The Agency also participates in various conferences to disseminate the results obtained and to exchange information with other entities. Furthermore, it collaborates on initiatives such as the one by the Institute for Training and Use of Human Resources (IFARHU) in the study on the country's human resource needs, which guides the offerings of both new and existing universities, impacting the processes of approval of new universities and accreditation.

CONEAUPA also participated in the International ARCA Meeting on Higher Education in Guayaquil, Ecuador, in June 2022, where it presented the best practices of disruptive strategies from its universities and organizations to achieve competitive success in the global society. At this event, Mr. Deputy Minister Castellero presented country-level reports on the quality of education at university institutions in Panama, as well as advancements based on the results obtained from their evaluations or accreditations.

From May 3 to 5, 2023, the Agency has been invited to participate in the General Meeting of the members of the Ibero-American System for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (SIACES) and the Second EU-LAC Academic and Knowledge Summit involving national agencies from Latin America that address the public policy of evaluation and accreditation of university institutions and

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

programs. At this event, the agency will have the opportunity to share advancements and benefit from the experience of other participating agencies.

CONEAUPA plays an active role in improving Law 52 and its regulations, addressing gaps that emerge as it evolves and consolidates as a national agency.

CONEAUPA collaborated on a book published by the Latin American and Caribbean Institute for Quality in Distance Higher Education (CALED) focused on Quality Assurance during the Covid-2019 pandemic, which disclosed the regulatory framework and outcomes, including participation in a conference in July 2021.

The Agency plays an active role in the discussion on higher education quality by participating in meetings, conferences, and presentations at the Bar Association and the Supreme Court of Justice regarding the quality of lawyer training; with the Social Security Fund on issues related to the practices and scope of accreditation with COMAEM for medical schools in Panama.

CONEAUPA shows an active and participatory commitment to the discussion and enhancement of higher education quality in the country, collaborating with various entities and participating in national and international conferences. However, an opportunity for improvement can be identified in the production of periodic publications based on the analysis of the combined results of its evaluations or accreditations, which could further contribute to the assurance of quality education.

Subcategory: 4.3. International Updates

Criteria

Scenario

4.3.1 The Agency participates in international networks or associations for quality assurance.

Fully complies

4.3.2 The Agency stays updated regarding international discussions on quality assurance and considers the relevant elements from these discussions in the analysis of its processes.

Fully complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

Self-Assessment:

The National Council of University Evaluation and Accreditation of Panama (CONEAUPA) fulfills one of its roles, which involves promoting and establishing cooperation links with prestigious evaluation and accreditation agencies, as well as managing its inclusion in international accreditation networks and agencies. CONEAUPA maintains an agreement with RIACES and contacts with other agencies for the collaboration of external peers.

Among the current agreements, there is one with the Mexican Council for the Accreditation of Medical Education A.C. (COMAEM), which aims to contribute to the improvement of the quality of professional medical practice, and the Central American Agency for Accreditation of Architecture and Engineering Programs (ACCAI), which defines, regulates, and applies principles and standards of good practices for the accreditation of academic programs in Engineering, Architecture, and Design in the region.

There is also an agreement with the Council for Higher Education Accreditation A.C. (COPAES), which aims to accredit higher education academic programs in Mexico. Additionally, the Committee for the Evaluation of Pedagogy and Education Programs A.C. (CEPPE) seeks to contribute to raising the quality of education in Mexico and Latin America through a continuous process of updating and improving its accreditation methods. Finally, the Mexican Committee for the Accreditation of Agronomic Education, A.C. (COMEAA), establishes actions and agreements with CONEAUPA to carry out joint activities in the evaluation and accreditation of academic programs in the agronomic area.

Furthermore, there are agreements with important organizations in the field of education, such as CACSLA (now AICE: International Agency for Educational Quality) and CACECA, recognized by the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (COPAES).

The agency's staff has participated in various calls and events to exchange information and improve their own practices. For example, in 2021, they participated in the RIACES OBP2021 call, an event held via Zoom, and in the XIX RIACES Assembly, which took place in September 2022 in Colombia.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

It is worth noting that in July, commemorating the Agency's anniversary, a Virtual Conference was held addressing topics such as the quality of higher education during and post-pandemic from a humanistic and critical perspective, as well as successful synergies that enhance the content and teachings at HEIs in relation to sustainable innovation with positive impact on both students and professors. The conference featured participation from university rectors, members of the CONEAUPA Plenum, international peers, and university quality assurance units.

As we can see, CONEAUPA is committed to the continuous improvement of the quality of higher education in its country and in the Central American region. This is evident in its active participation in international quality assurance networks and associations, as well as its ongoing updates on international advances and discussions in this field. Moreover, it considers the relevant elements of these discussions in the analysis of its processes, demonstrating its commitment to academic excellence and continuous improvement.

Subcategory: 4.4. Collaboration with Other Agencies

Criteria	Scenario
4.4.1 The Agency benchmarks its practices, criteria, indicators, and processes against those of comparable agencies to enhance its policies and procedures.	Fully complies
4.4.2 The Agency collaborates with other agencies in providing information on qualified peer reviewers.	Fully complies
4.4.3 The Agency is aware of the activities of other agencies in the region and has mechanisms to connect and collaborate with them.	Fully complies
4.4.4 The Agency has operational collaboration agreements with other similar national or international bodies.	Fully complies

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

4.4.5 The Agency promotes mutual recognition of its accreditation decisions with other agencies. Fully complies

4.4.6 The Agency collaborates with agencies in the evaluation of transnational programs, both for programs under its jurisdiction being offered abroad and for foreign programs entering its jurisdiction. Fully complies

Self-Assessment:

The CONEAUPA has conducted a self-evaluation, comparing its practices, criteria, indicators, and processes with those of equivalent agencies to enhance its policies and procedures. Documentation supports these comparisons, revisions, and feedback received from other agencies about the matrices approved by CONEAUPA. For example, technical staff have visited CNA Colombia, ANEAES in Paraguay, CNA Chile, and JAN in Cuba to understand their processes and matrices (2012), which served as references for the development of the first institutional accreditation matrix. Additionally, consultations were held with experts such as María José Lemaitre from CINDA and Bernardo Cuéllar and Zulma Marucci from Paraguay.

In 2022, CONEAUPA and RIACES organized a Diploma in Quality Assurance in Higher Education for over 50 national and international peer reviewers, a highly enriching activity as peers not only refreshed theoretical aspects of accreditation and quality assurance but also engaged with the matrices and standards of CONEAUPA to carry out the processes. They also had the opportunity to connect with other agencies, establishing mutually beneficial relationships among participants in their roles as peer reviewers.

The agency maintains a database of qualified peer reviewers and consults with other agencies to understand how they conduct the accreditation process and coordinate joint activities, such as the in-situ visits conducted with COMEAA in Mexico and virtually with ACCAI.

The international academic peer database allows for the evaluation of the agency's processes in relation to other countries, and feedback provides a benchmark for improvement.

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

The Agency has operational collaboration agreements with other similar national or international bodies. Agencies such as COMEAA and ACCAI have established agreements with CONEAUPA to issue certifications for the recognition among agencies of accredited programs. The process includes visits by national peers to the university's country, coordination of an agenda previously agreed with the university, exchange of process information, and meetings with interest groups. After the visit, an evaluation report is prepared with recommendations for the university's improvement plans. Finally, CONEAUPA recognizes the accreditation decision issued by the Agency and issues the corresponding certification.

The Agency promotes the mutual recognition of its accreditation decisions with other agencies. CONEAUPA has reached not only a national but also an international level; it has conducted accreditation processes in 30 universities and is now participating in accreditations outside Panama. It has participated in four international accreditations in Mexico, in Guatemala with ACCAI, recognized the certifications issued by COMEAA for five agricultural science programs at the University of Panama, and participated as peer reviewers in the programs accredited by this agency, as well as having a relationship with CEPPE to accredit programs and careers at the Central American level.

The Agency collaborates with agencies in the evaluation of transnational programs, both in terms of programs under its jurisdiction being offered abroad and for foreign programs entering its jurisdiction. CONEAUPA has also sent comparative analyses of matrices to initiate the accreditation process with the CEPPE agency.

A memorandum of understanding is being coordinated with the ACAP for the evaluation of the postgraduate academic offer in higher education teaching from public and private universities.

The Agency coordinates and follows up on the evaluation processes of medical schools from official and private universities, facilitated by the Mexican Council for Accreditation of Medical Education A.C. (COMAEM), an entity endorsed by the Council for the Accreditation of Higher Education (COPAES), the Ibero-American Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (RIACES), the World Federation for Medical Education, and The National Committee on Foreign Medical Education

Guidance on Alignment with Best Practices

Self-Assessment Summary

and Accreditation (NCFMEA). For example, CONEAUPA coordinated the Induction to Accreditation Workshop Course aimed at teams responsible for the accreditation process of the Medicine career. The training was conducted virtually by COMAEM from Monday, April 17, to Thursday, April 20, 2023.