



IQ2LT WEIGHTING BY CRITERIA

Percentage Distribution for Each Evaluation Dimension

This document provides the detailed weighting structure for the IQ2LT accreditation evaluation. The weights reflect the relative importance of each dimension and criterion in determining overall accreditation decisions. These weights are applied consistently across all institutions and programs seeking IQ2LT accreditation.

OVERALL DIMENSION WEIGHTS

Dimension	Weight	Rationale
1. Institutional Capacity	20%	Foundation for sustainable quality delivery
2. Program Design & Curriculum	25%	Core educational quality and content
3. Teaching and Learning	25%	Direct impact on student learning outcomes
4. Student Support & Resources	20%	Essential for student success and satisfaction
5. Quality Assurance & Enhancement	10%	Ensures continuous improvement
TOTAL	100%	

WEIGHTING METHODOLOGY

The weights were established through a comprehensive process involving:

- Review of international quality assurance frameworks and standards
- Consultation with education experts, quality assurance professionals, and institutional leaders
- Analysis of student success factors in technology-enhanced learning environments
- Alignment with best practices in distance education accreditation
- Validation through pilot evaluations and stakeholder feedback

Note: While dimensions have different weights, all criteria within a dimension are equally weighted unless otherwise specified. This ensures comprehensive evaluation across all quality aspects.

DETAILED WEIGHTING BREAKDOWN

Dimension 1: Institutional Capacity (20% of total score)

riterion Code	Criterion	W ight within Dimensio n	nContribution to Total
1.1	Mission and Vision Clarity	8.33%	1.67%
1.2	Governance Structure	8.33%	1.67%
1.3	Strategic Planning	8.33%	1.67%
1.4	Financial Resources	8.33%	1.67%
1.5	Human Resources - Faculty	8.33%	1.67%
1.6	Human Resources - Staff	8.33%	1.67%
1.7	Professional Development	8.33%	1.67%
1.8	Technology Infrastructure	8.33%	1.67%
1.9	Physical Facilities	8.33%	1.67%
1.10	Legal Compliance	8.33%	1.67%
1.11	Risk Management	8.33%	1.67%
1.12	External Partnerships	8.33%	1.67%
	DIMENSION 1 TOTAL	100%	20%

Dimension 2: Program Design and Curriculum (25% of total score)

riterion Code	Criterion	W ight within Dimensio n	nContribution to Total
2.1	Learning Outcomes Definition	8.33%	2.08%
2.2	Curriculum Structure	8.33%	2.08%
2.3	Content Organization	8.33%	2.08%
2.4	Credit Allocation	8.33%	2.08%
2.5	Course Development Process	8.33%	2.08%
2.6	Content Quality	8.33%	2.08%
2.7	Content Variety	8.33%	2.08%
2.8	Instructional Design	8.33%	2.08%
2.9	Multimedia Integration	8.33%	2.08%
2.10	Interactivity	8.33%	2.08%
2.11	Assessment Alignment	8.33%	2.08%
2.12	Program Review	8.33%	2.08%
	DIMENSION 2 TOTAL	100%	25%

Dimension 3: Teaching and Learning (25% of total score)

riterion Code	Criterion	W ight within Dimensio n	nContribution to Total
3.1	Faculty Qualifications	6.25%	1.56%
3.2	Online Teaching Experience	6.25%	1.56%
3.3	Faculty Training Programs	6.25%	1.56%
3.4	Teaching Methods Variety	6.25%	1.56%
3.5	Active Learning Strategies	6.25%	1.56%
3.6	Synchronous Activities	6.25%	1.56%
3.7	Asynchronous Activities	6.25%	1.56%
3.8	Faculty-Student Interaction	6.25%	1.56%
3.9	Peer Collaboration	6.25%	1.56%
3.10	Student Engagement	6.25%	1.56%
3.11	Assessment Methods	6.25%	1.56%
3.12	Feedback Quality	6.25%	1.56%
3.13	Grading Transparency	6.25%	1.56%
3.14	Academic Integrity Policies	6.25%	1.56%
3.15	Academic Integrity Tools	6.25%	1.56%
3.16	Workload Management	6.25%	1.56%
	DIMENSION 3 TOTAL	100%	25%

Dimension 4: Student Support and Resources (20% of total score)

riterion Code	Criterion	W ight within Dimensio n	nContribution to Total
4.1	Admissions Process	6.25%	1.25%
4.2	Pre-enrollment Information	6.25%	1.25%
4.3	Student Orientation	6.25%	1.25%
4.4	Academic Advising	6.25%	1.25%
4.5	Career Counseling	6.25%	1.25%
4.6	Personal Counseling	6.25%	1.25%
4.7	Technical Support Availability	6.25%	1.25%
4.8	Technical Support Quality	6.25%	1.25%
4.9	Technical Documentation	6.25%	1.25%
4.10	Library Resources	6.25%	1.25%

4.11	Learning Resources Quality	6.25%	1.25%
4.12	Accessibility Compliance	6.25%	1.25%
4.13	Disability Accommodations	6.25%	1.25%
4.14	Communication Channels	6.25%	1.25%
4.15	Student Community	6.25%	1.25%
4.16	Complaint Procedures	6.25%	1.25%
	DIMENSION 4 TOTAL	100%	20%

Dimension 5: Quality Assurance and Enhancement (10% of total score)

Criterion Code	Criterion	Weight within Dimension	Contribution to Total
5.1	QA Framework Documentation	6.25%	0.63%
5.2	QA Roles and Responsibilities	6.25%	0.63%
5.3	Program Evaluation	6.25%	0.63%
5.4	Course Evaluation	6.25%	0.63%
5.5	Faculty Evaluation	6.25%	0.63%
5.6	Student Satisfaction Surveys	6.25%	0.63%
5.7	Performance Indicators	6.25%	0.63%
5.8	Data Collection Systems	6.25%	0.63%
5.9	Data Analysis	6.25%	0.63%
5.10	Improvement Planning	6.25%	0.63%
5.11	Implementation Monitoring	6.25%	0.63%
5.12	Stakeholder Engagement	6.25%	0.63%
5.13	External Review	6.25%	0.63%
5.14	Benchmarking	6.25%	0.63%
5.15	Quality Culture	6.25%	0.63%
5.16	Documentation	6.25%	0.63%
	DIMENSION 5 TOTAL	100%	10%

APPLICATION OF WEIGHTS IN EVALUATION

The weighting system is applied as follows in the accreditation decision process:

Step 1: Each criterion is rated on a scale of 1-5 based on evidence review

Step 2: Criterion scores within each dimension are averaged to get dimension scores

Step 3: Dimension scores are multiplied by their respective weights (20%, 25%, 25%, 20%, 10%)

Step 4: Weighted dimension scores are summed to calculate the overall institutional score

Step 5: Decision is made based on overall score and individual dimension scores

Example Calculation:

If an institution scores: Dimension 1 = 3.5, Dimension 2 = 4.0, Dimension 3 = 3.8, Dimension 4 = 3.6, Dimension 5 = 3.4

Overall Score = $(3.5 \times 0.20) + (4.0 \times 0.25) + (3.8 \times 0.25) + (3.6 \times 0.20) + (3.4 \times 0.10) = 0.70 + 1.00 + 0.95 + 0.72 + 0.34 = 3.71$

Result: **Full Accreditation Awarded** (overall ≥ 3.0 , all dimensions ≥ 2.5)

IQ2LT Weighting by Criteria - Version 4.5 - November 2025

These weights are applied consistently to all institutions and are subject to periodic review.

For questions about weighting methodology, contact: standards@iq2lt-edu.org