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Executive Summary

The ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) International Conference is an annual event of the AUN-QA with the aims to bring together the QA practitioners both within and outside ASEAN to share and exchange QA knowledge and practices. This year, the conference was hosted by Mahidol University and Office of Higher Education Commissions (OHEC), Thailand; on 26-27 March 2018, Bangkok, Thailand. The main theme of the conference was “QA in Higher Education for SDGs: Converging Global Aspiration with National Realities”. The objectives of the Conference were:

1. To heighten the higher education system through the recognition and harmonization of quality development policy as well as to create trust between the universities, agencies and other stakeholders.
2. To share the QA knowledge and good practices among different countries and to provide better understanding and comparison on how different QA agencies within and outside ASEAN region develop their QA system
3. To provide a networking platform for the QA practitioners and experts from the universities and QA agencies

The Conference was participated by 416 participants from 10 ASEAN Countries, Armenia, Australia, Ghana, Nepal, Spain, and United Kingdom. The Conference was also participated by QA Agencies (INQAAHE, QAA, TEQSA, BAN-PT) and Tuning Academy.

In addressing the Sustainable Development Goals laid forth by the United Nations in 2015, several aspects of the SDG4 have been brought into consideration, with an emphasis on the shifting of focus from input-driven to output-driven (outcome-based education) and the utilization of learning outcomes to enhance quality higher education.

The conference provided comprehensive information on the functions of various QA agencies and their systems within and outside of ASEAN region, highlighting current global changes and trends such as the Industrial Revolution 4.0, disruptive technologies and innovation. Such tools are important in aiding students and faculties alike in adapting to an increasingly digital world.

The discussion panels offered a platform for QA professionals from multiple nations to share their experience and knowledge in QA. This opportunity not only allowed professionals to share obstacles and practices unique to their own country for the better implementation of certain practices under their own contexts, but also helped re-define the role of QA to ensure that graduates are well-equipped with the necessary knowledge and skills in an increasingly changing market.
### Number of Participants in AUN-QA International Conference 2018

1. Total Number of Participants by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. International Participant (Walk in 5)</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Local Participant (Walk in 1)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mahidol University Participant (Walk in 6)</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mahidol University AUN-QA Assessor</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AUN-QA Assessor</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. AUN-QA CQO (Walk in 1)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. VIP</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Speaker</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Office of Higher Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizer</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Organizer &amp; Media</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. AUN Secretariat</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Liaison</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Total Number of Participants by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thailand</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vietnam</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indonesia</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Philippines</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cambodia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Malaysia</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Myanmar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Laos</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Singapore</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Brunei</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Armenia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ghana</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Nepal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. England</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>416</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Total Number of Participants participating in the AUN-QA Chief Quality Officers’ Meeting 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Conference Programme for Monday 26\textsuperscript{th} March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (hrs.)</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07:30 – 08:30</td>
<td><strong>Registration</strong> (Music by College of Music, Mahidol University)</td>
<td>Napalai Ballroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 08:30 – 09:00 | **Welcome Remarks**  
Prof. Banchong Mahaisavariya  
Acting President of Mahidol University, Thailand  
**Opening Remarks**  
Clin. Prof. Udom Kachintorn  
Deputy Minister of Education, Thailand  
**Introductory Remarks**  
Ms. Chadarat Singhadechakul  
Assistant Secretary-General for Higher Education Commission  
Dr. Choltis Dhirathiti  
Executive Director of ASEAN University Network  
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nantana Gajaseni  
Acting Chairperson of AUN-QA Council  
**Exchange of Tokens and Group Photo** | Napalai Ballroom |
| 09:00 – 09:15 | **VDO Presentation** | Napalai Ballroom |
| 09:15 – 10:00 | **Keynote Lecture:**  
*The Challenges of SDGs for QA in Higher Education*  
*Speaker:*  
Dr. Libing Wang  
Chief, Section for Educational Innovation and Skills Development (EISD), UNESCO Bangkok | Napalai Ballroom |
| 10:00 – 10:30 | **Networking and Coffee Break** |  |
| 10:30 – 12:00 | **Panel Discussion:**  
*How QA Helps to Engage Quality Education for All?*  
*Speakers:*  
Dr. Susanna Karakhanyan  
President, International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE)  
Ms. Fiona Crozier  
Head of International, The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), United Kingdom  
Dr. Karen Treloar  
Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), Australia  
**Moderator:**  
Mr. Johnson Ong Chee Bin  
AUN-QA Expert and Trainer, Singapore | Napalai Ballroom |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | **Lunch**  
Please Check on your ID Card | Dusit Thani Hall / 22 Kitchen & Bar |
| 13:00 – 13:30 | **Delivering Quality Education: Methodology to Complete Cycle** | Napalai Ballroom |
of Degree Implementation from Curriculum Design to Teaching & Learning evaluation.
Speaker:
   Dr. Ivan Dyukarev
   Tuning Academy, University of Deusto, Spain
Moderator:
   Dr. Choltis Dhirathiti
   Executive Director of ASEAN University Network

13:30 – 15:00 Panel Discussion:
What Would be the Effective Government Policy toward Quality Enhancement in the Higher Education?
Speaker:
   Prof. Dr. Maria Cynthia Rose Banzon Bautista
   Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of the Philippines and Former Commissioner of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), The Philippines
   Prof. T. Basaruddin
   Executive Director,
   National Accreditation Agency for Higher Education (BAN-PT), Indonesia
   Dr. Nguyen Quoc Chinh
   Director of Center for Educational Testing and Quality Assessment,
   Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
Moderator:
   Prof. Ir. Dr. Shahrir Abdullah
   Director of Centre for Quality Assurance, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia

15:00 – 16:00 Poster Exhibition (include Networking and Coffee Break)

16:00 – 17:30 3 Parallel Sessions: Sharing and Learning

19:00 – 21:30 Dinner hosted by Mahidol University

Conference Programme for Tuesday 27th March 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (hrs.)</th>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:45</td>
<td>Keynote Lecture: Quality Education and Global Change: Roles of Innovation and Quality Learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Ir. Muhammad Anis. M. Met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rector, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:45 – 10.00</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Napalai Ballroom

Napalai Ballroom, Vimarnsuriya Room and Saladang Room

Napalai Ballroom
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 11.30</td>
<td>Panel Discussion: How do We Continually Monitor/Follow up/Evaluate the Outcomes and Impacts of QA Practices in the Universities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prof. Dr. Fauza Ab. Ghaffar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, Academic Enhancement and Leadership Development Centre, University of Malaya, Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tan Kay Chuan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Quality Officer, AUN-QA Trainer and Assessor, National University of Singapore, Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commentator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Prof. Dr. Wyona C. Patalinghug</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUN-QA Expert, De La Salle University, The Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assoc. Prof. Chavalit Wongse-ek</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUN-QA Expert, Mahidol University, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderator:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nantana Gajaseni</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Chairperson of AUN-QA Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>Closing Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Turnover Ceremony to Next Host</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>De La Salle University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Dr. Gerardo Largoza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of the Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Alyssa Peleo-Alampay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Remarks</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sompop Prathanturarug</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Vice President for Quality Development, Mahidol University, Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nantana Gajaseni</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acting Chairperson of AUN-QA Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 13.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please Check on your ID Card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 onwards</td>
<td>MU Campus Tour Option: 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIMSET &amp; Center of Applied Thai Traditional Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 onwards</td>
<td>MU Campus Tour Option: 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahidol University Salaya Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 onwards</td>
<td>Assessors Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AUN-QA Assessors only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday 26th March 2018
(Day 1)
Compiled by Rapporteur
Welcome Remarks

Prof. Banchong Mahaisavariya, M.D.
Acting President of Mahidol University, Thailand

On behalf of Mahidol University and the conference committee, I am greatly honored and delighted to welcome all of you to the AUN-QA International Conference 2018 organized in tight collaboration of Mahidol University, ASEAN University Network-Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) and Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC), Thailand.

Mahidol University has its origins in the establishment of Siriraj Hospital in 1888 by His Majesty King Rama V, and the hospital’s medical school is the oldest institution of higher learning in Thailand. Today we are multi-disciplinary and research-led institution with key competencies in arts, medicine and science. Mahidol University offers both Thai and international programs from bachelor’s degrees to Doctoral degrees.

Mahidol University expresses a strong determination to be a world class university. We strive to enhance the higher education quality in order to respond to the challenges of today’s world. This will lead us to the sustainable development in accordance with the university’s philosophy that is ‘True success is not in the learning, but in its application to the benefit of mankind’.

Mahidol University is honored to take part in this year’s AUN-QA International Conference under the theme “QA in Higher Education for SDGs: Converging Global Aspiration with National Realities”. This represents a unique opportunity for us to learn, to exchange, and to work together towards “Quality Education”, one of the Global Goals in the Sustainable Development Goals (or SDGs) set by the United Nations.

Finally, I would like to thank all the participants for joining the AUN-QA International Conference in Bangkok. I look forward to the fruitful and constructive discussions and collaborations. On behalf of the organizers, I would like to officially extend a warm welcome to you all and salute you by saying “Sawasdee” in Thai which means beauty and success that we all wish today.

“Sawasdee krub”
Opening Remarks

Clin. Prof. Udom Kachintorn
Deputy Minister of Education, Thailand

It gives me a great pleasure to open the AUN-QA International Conference 2018. I would like to thank our Keynote Speakers, presentation deliverers and participants, and congratulate the organizers especially the Quality Development Department of Mahidol University who hosts this conference.

Higher education is viewed as the most important key to build “human capital” for career, and to generate “intellectual capital” for innovation of the countries and of our ASEAN region. Higher education is also a major instrument to meet Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in several possible dimensions, such as poverty, inequalities, health and well-being, food security, work and economic growth, industrial innovation, responsible consumption and production, clean energy, climate change, sustainable cities and communities, and many more.

Universities in the 21st century are facing different challenges. It is our obligation to prepare students for the jobs that do not yet exist. Universities must change to be able to cope with Disruptive Technologies and globalized knowledge-based economies. Universities also have to adapt in order to respond to non-traditional students and to the new platform of teaching and learner centric education with individualized content. From all of the mentioned factors, universities must reform to survive.

To handle these challenges, quality assurance in education is a helpful and important instrument to establish the standard and enhance the quality education of the countries in the region. I appreciate the ASEAN University Network-Quality Assurance (AUN-QA) for strongly and continually recognizing the importance of quality in higher education and the need to develop holistic quality assurance systems to raise academic standards and enhance education, research, and services among AUN-Member and non-Member Universities.

Excellence is the gradual result of always striving to do better. By the “quality mind” of all distinguished participants here, I am certain that the alliance we cemented together will enhance the quality of education. We can predict the bright future and the sustainable development in our countries, our region and our world.

Thank you.
Introductory Remarks

Ms. Chadarat Singhaidechakul
Assistant Secretary-General for Higher Education Commission, Ministry of Education, Thailand

It is my great honor to address the Introductory Remarks to all participants of the AUN-QA International Conference 2018 today. Please allow me to briefly present The Office of the Higher Education Commission or OHEC. The OHEC is responsible for Thailand’s higher education, overseeing 170 higher education institutions at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

We have a significant mission to encourage quality assurance systems within all public and private higher education institutions by providing policy guidelines, supporting for knowledge sharing activities, and implementing related international projects. We have constantly encouraged Thai higher education institutions to work in close collaboration with ASEAN University Network to enhance quality and foster internationalization of Thai higher education.

Quality Assurance in education is not only about the regulations and the accreditation, but it is also regarded as the instrument for sustainably enhancing the quality of education. The more we learn, exchange and implement this instrument for higher education, the more we have the opportunity to reach Quality Education in ASEAN. Consequently, this will drive us directly to the sustainable development.

As a representative of the AUN Board of Trustees (AUN-BOT) together with the delegates from other countries, I am very delighted when the organizers of the AUN-QA International Conference 2018 informed me about the number of this year’s conference participants. We have reached more than 400 participants from ASEAN and other countries; Australia, Armenia and the United Kingdom. This is a good omen for establishing a strong and extensive network to achieve the Global Goal in educational dimension, the decisive key to solutions in other dimensions.

I would like to thank you all for participating in the AUN-QA International Conference 2018, Mahidol University for a warm welcome, and all devoted organizers for this impressive conference.

Thank you.
20 years ago, the Board of Trustees of the ASEAN University Network decided to found AUN-QA, ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance. 17 years ago, the first AUN Chief Quality Officers Meeting was agreed. 11 years ago, the first AUN-QA assessment at program level was conducted.

Today, this gathering is the evidence of the trust and professionalism on which our past success has been based and our future depends. What is so special about the AUN-QA? I found the answers after nearly 8 years of working with my colleagues; our assessors, Chief Quality Officer and with widest stakeholders of AUN-QA Network Universities and presented my thought for the first time in May 2017 at Central Escolar University, Manila when I was there to deliver a special talk. I have concluded there are 6 key success factors of AUN-QA some of which cannot be found anywhere.

Factor 1, the framework system and operations of AUN-QA are truly regional; when something is true in its nature you achieve the precious thing that is hard to attain; trust. In other word, trust is the nature of truly regional character of our system.

Factor 2, track records and Factor 3, proven benefits put together; 9 years in the making, 11 years of reliable execution, AUN-QA, today, has a solid track record with a proven benefit that are being shared and learned together at the front-line level of university study programs; the fact that I observe first-hand.

Another two factors; process-oriented for quality enhancement and the commitments and energy from all parties involved combined, these are not different from the QA principles and practices in other regions, I believe.

The last factor is very interesting; it may not be obvious to the first generation of my colleagues sitting there, who have together built up this QA network since its first inception in 1998, but it could not escape my observations. The fact that the practice of AUN-QA is without bureaucracy; imagine that! AUN-QA is totally a peer practice; no superiority, no bureaucracy involves. The assessments are done on a voluntary basis. The human resources involved in the quality assessment are on the same basis; you trust your friends, or do you trust the bureaucracy?

Ladies and gentlemen, the AUN-QA is here today and on behalf of the ASEAN University Network, I would like to welcome you to the AUN-QA International Conference 2018. I hope you will find it a rewarding occasion.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to Mahidol University for hosting this event and to the Office of Higher Education Commission or OHEC, the Ministry of Education, Thailand for the support that has been extended to the conference.
The future of AUN-QA; the collective future of higher education in South East Asia, we are willing to work in collaboration with our strategic partners from other regions and it is a must for us to collaborate and to learn from outside but with the characteristics that I have already presented to you, nothing can replace AUN-QA in the ASEAN region.

Back in June 1998, Yangon, Myanmar, the Board of Trustees of the ASEAN University Network under the meeting agenda 5.3 agreed that “University quality assurance was an important priority for AUN; particularly the field of teaching, learning and management”

Today, may we all here reply “the AUN-QA is here”.
Introductory Remarks

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nantana Gajaseni
Acting Chairperson of AUN-QA Council

On behalf of the ASEAN University Network Quality Assurance or AUN-QA, I am glad and truly honored to be among all of you, a true believer and practitioner of quality assurance and quality enhancement in higher education. I would like to extend my sincere appreciation to our host of this international conference and, also, I would like to thank Dr. Choltis for his kind introduction to the AUN and the AUN-QA.

This year’s conference will continue to further explore current QA situation in the region; taking into account the challenges of the United Nations’ the Sustainable Development Goals or SDGs for quality in higher education. As you all might be aware, the challenge of SDGs that we are currently facing is a complex and a huge issue. In that sense, I am very happy to be with distinguished participants from UNESCO, QA Experts, practitioners from all over the ASEAN and from renowned QA Agencies and Networks from INQAAHE QAA and TEQSA as to take this opportunity to engage in an active discussion and knowledge sharing during this one-and-a-half-day conference.

Ladies and gentlemen, Dr. Choltis has touched briefly on the AUN-QA and it has fallen to me to deal with more details. Hopefully, that will give you a deeper insight into what we hope to achieve. The AUN-QA was initiated in 1998 with the aim on enhancing the quality of higher education institution to the new higher height. To get in, the AUN-QA framework was introduced and developed as a holistic quality assurance system to raise academic standard and enhance the quality, research and service among its member universities. Since its inception, the AUN-QA and its system and mechanism have been implemented on voluntary basis within all AUN member universities. When the system has been tested, evaluated and well-calibrated, AUN network decides to extend its knowledge in QA system and outreach to other universities in the region in order to share the benefit of the system.

In 2013, AUN-QA has started to receive interested member from non-AUN member university and in that year, we have the first two associate members joining the network; today we are the network of 97 higher education institutions. Currently, AUN-QA network is working on more than 40 projects per year including AUN-QA assessment at both program and institutional levels. Capacity building including training for accomplishing program and institution assessment, assessor training and outcome-based education training.

We will continue to push forward to assist the higher education institution in the region to deliver quality education to our graduates who will later become an important workforce and drive forward the development of the ASEAN and beyond.

Ladies and gentlemen, behind the 20th anniversary, there are a lot of stories; and achieving milestones. It is clear to me that it is the commitment, the cooperation and the contribution from the university leaders down to the key expert who has dedicated brilliant ideas, excellent spirit of cooperation and their enthusiasm together with their strong desire to support AUN-QA and its work which have made AUN-QA such a success over these 20 years.

As we look back to our past achievement, let us not be too comfortable with what we have already attained, but use it to encourage us to resilient in that past and build on a brighter future. For this
conference, let’s us continue to be inspired by each other, and, in turn, inspire all the universities in this region to innovate new strategies and methods to increase the standards of higher education institution throughout ASEAN and beyond.

Thank you.

“Khob Khun Ka” (Thank you in Thai)
Keynote Lecture


By Dr. Libing Wang
Chief, Section for Educational Innovation and Skills Development (EISD), UNESCO

Based on the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations, which is a kind of panning approach in a long-term or the so-called sustainable development plan, quality education is listed as goal number 4. The goal is stated to ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all. Having quality education as one of the Sustainable Development Goal implies that education is getting even more visibility and importance in the global setting and its sustainable development’s aspects; especially when comparing to previous Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA) agendas.

The United Nations’ approach is very important for the developing countries since it can help the countries to prioritize number of development agendas and resources. The Sustainable Development Goals are consensuses which are agreed by the member states to follow and they are not legally binding for those members in any way. Many countries are already ahead of the targets while others are still far behind, but these goals can be like a platform for the member states to share their experience; the successful countries share their best practices while those countries which are not really doing well, join the other to really find their way out of the problem.

This is how the United Nations and UNESCO would be able to offer and promote quality assurance in higher education based on what they have seen and the information they have been collecting from their member states which is also how the development agendas were initially based on in the first place. The organizations are, in other word, helping the member states to mobilize resources from rich countries to the developing countries and, most importantly, to facilitate a kind of digital process to help the less developed countries to achieve the SDG through their policies of the development.
With reference to the principles of SDGs and how UNESCO’s approach work for the member states, Dr. Wang has put an emphasis on the targets of SDG 4 which are related to Quality Assurance in Higher Education which can be referred to as follows.

SDG 4.3 is to ensure equal access for all women and men to affordable and quality technical, vocational and tertiary education, including university and this is a mandate for the UNESCO. To achieve such goal, the UNESCO must encourage cross-sector policies for and between vocational skills development, Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) and tertiary education as well as Public Private Partnerships (PPPs). This is basically because people from different sectors do not really communicate with each other and an intersectoral approach should be implemented. Quality Assurance will, then, be facilitating comparability and recognition of tertiary education qualifications and eventually lead to credit transfers.

SDG 4.4 is related to skills development, technical education and vocational training and entrepreneurship. The entrepreneurship education has been emphasized a lot in the past few years; UNESCO has digital meeting on the issue yearly to promote this kind of education since it has been increasingly important these days. It is also essential to have demand-driven approach in education to really engage social partners in designing program to develop skills and competency that are really needed in the market. UNESCO has also been promoting work-based and classroom-based training and learning in combination with each other, TVET quality assurance and qualifications frameworks as well as a cross-border recognition of TVET qualifications to ensure that we will eventually achieve this target and it is very fortunate to see different sectors working with each other under national qualification framework.

SDG 4.b is to increase number of scholarships available for developing countries for enrolment in higher education, including vocational training and information and communication technology, technical, engineering and scientific programs, in developed countries and other developing countries. This is because many developing countries cannot only rely on a strong service sector. They will need to have a strong manufacturing sector which is only possible when there is a strong knowledge in science and engineering educations since they are the basis for a strong manufacturing-based economy. We have seen many professors and management with engineering background; most of university personnel are also with engineering or medical background and we do not really see many professionals with humanities background. The importance here is we need more personnel from humanities or social science too and this is the idea of SDG4 and a mandate for UNESCO.

To achieve SDG 4, Dr. Wang believes that another important thing is the paradigm shift in Asia and the Pacific and the most important transformation is the shift of focus from input-driven to output-driven and this can be done by putting more emphasis on the learning outcomes for quality higher education.

In the past, there had been a lot of efforts made to push the government and the public sectors to invest more resources on education but what is worth mentioning now is the quality which can only be achieved with learning outcomes since they are closely linked with each other in the Education 2030 agenda. Learning outcomes are important for recognition, for quality assurance and for any Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) and External Quality Assurance (EQA) process which should be included in the National Qualification Framework (NQF). However, the learning outcomes need to be identified to really make the other elements in the picture work effectively and efficiently towards quality education. The typology of learning outcomes depends on how learning is perceived, and this will be taken into consideration when assessment plays its role in the overall system. Moreover, the learning outcomes definition and assessment should also be aligned with NQF to achieve a holistic approach in quality assurance.
Apart from the main elements mentioned above, the operational environment of Higher Education Institutions has also been changing and this should also be considered for Quality Assurance and learning outcomes. There are more external interventions than before, and institutional autonomy has been increasingly challenged by social accountability. Universities, themselves, are no longer accountable for their own quality assurance. Rather, it is now about cross-checking between different stakeholders to accommodate greater accountability. In response to such social need, there should be a common template which can ensure ultimate sector-wide coherence, compatibility and relevance of Higher Education to the holistic human development and world of work. The template should also be on paper for reference and the implementation of this template should also be highlighted at subject level, discipline level, and occupation level. This roughly sums up the changes in scenario of Higher Education Institutions and gives a reason why there needs to be a paradigm shift in quality assurance for education management.

Dr. Wang had also mentioned Shenzhen Statement in relations to Quality Assurance the content of which is also aligned with SGD 4 and the Education 2030 framework with an emphasis on comparability, recognition and quality assurance in Asia Pacific. Moreover, the Shenzhen Statement also offers the current situation of the regions’ quality assurance which is also detailed above with an additional stress on culture of quality which can play a vital role for the Asia Pacific’s success in the educational agendas. This culture can only be achieved with an active engagement from all stakeholders.

Furthermore, Dr. Wang had also stressed on the differentiation of learning programs; academic programs, higher vocational programs, and professional programs and how different universities should identify and position themselves based on their distribution of different types of programs. This will help the universities avoid repeating the similar mistake of having expanded their programs in an inappropriate fashion which eventually led to low employment rate and salary level among universities’ graduates. Apart from that, the line between professional occupations and vocational occupations are blurring and convergence of content composition in university program design should also be brought into consideration for quality assurance as well. Dr. Wang proposed to investigate developing skill-based to competency-based while using a holistic approach for learning outcomes to ensure that the university graduates have what it is necessary in the market.

In delivering learning outcomes, different elements should be put into an integrated picture and one of the elements that should not be left off is the teaching staffs. They are usually specialized in their own subject area but only a few of them are trained in pedagogical studies or have high ICT competencies which are quite important for delivering learning outcomes nowadays when technology plays a major role in lives. Dr. Wang proposed higher education institution assist its teaching staff by providing a kind of central services in this matter while encouraging the staffs to take more of pedagogical studies and develop ICT knowledge.

Based on Dr. Wang’s suggestion, the learning outcomes and quality assurance will be successful in higher education only when there is a holistic approach in place. He also believes that there should be certain personnel taking care of this approach to be properly implemented; probably in a position called Chief Learning Architect. This position will be able to ensure that the university’s learning outcome and approach implemented at different levels; subject, profession and occupation in the program or university is also aligned with the National Qualifications Framework (NQF).

The National Qualifications Framework (NQF), itself, should also be based on the outcomes and it should be developed through all stakeholders’ active engagement to ensure that the content identified in the NQF is coherent both vertically and horizontally and externally and internally which will also complement to the holistic approach to learning outcomes mentioned before. The engagement is also an essence of the successful NQF development because people from different level did not really communicate with each other and that makes it hardly possible to really find out
what the stakeholders are really looking for in a graduate and without a clear goal or result, it is difficult to really develop a program or curriculum that can prepare the students for the world of work.

In achieving this kind of NQF both on paper and in implementation, the society should also have a culture of shared responsibility which will be a great element for the cross-checking nature of quality assurance. The culture will provide sense of belonging to the concerned parties and they will be playing their role in the system as one of the owners of the NQF which currently seems to be owned by the policymakers rather than the end-users.

Another issue in quality assurance in higher education in Asia Pacific is a fair recognition of qualifications. This issue can be aligned with the Tokyo Convention which is like a milestone for the Asia Pacific with regards to the recognition of higher education qualifications. Regional recognition should be based on quality assurance and UNESCO is now promoting harmonization-based recognition in the region along with the academic recognition with European region as one of the models to follow. What should also be emphasized here is that the recognition should be based on the quality of the students rather than the goodwill of member states. The recognition and quality assurance are usually viewed as 2 different elements and units, but they are complementary to each other in achieving lifelong learning systems. The notion of integrating quality assurance, qualifications framework and quality recognition to achieve mobile students and workers in regional and international level is the current agenda of Asia Pacific’s.

Based on such notion, the region is currently developing potential framework for regional higher education harmonization with an achievement of having Asia-Pacific Higher Education Area with regional credit transfer and accumulation system efficiently working in the region as an ideal goal. Dr. Wang points out that Asia Pacific has just finished the very first component which is the NQF and the second step is being worked on to achieve national subject-specific quality standards before coming up with a template for program development. This template will, in turn, play a vital role in developing regional credit recognition and transfer system in a longer run.
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How QA Helps to Engage Quality Education for All?
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Abstract:

INQAAHE’s contribution mainly revolves around the current expectations of the higher education key stakeholders and some proposals on the potential changes to the approaches of quality assurance to meet the expectations of the stakeholders. Some of the stakeholder expectations are reflected in the UN Sustainable Development Agenda Goal 4 on quality education. One tangible trend is a major need to move towards tackling the issues related to the social dimension of HE. QA is looked at as a tool supporting the HE providers in their efforts to link academia with the industry and, broader, socio-economic needs. The presentation will concentrate on the developments in implementing the action lines related to quality assurance in higher education as it links to the SDG4. References from the INQAAHE Global Study on the Impact of Quality Assurance will be made. Quality as Recognition of higher education outcomes and outputs is proposed as one of the solutions to the challenges posed.

International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education or INQAAHE is established in 1991 to share the idea and quality assurance. There are channels that INQAAHE has been sharing information: internationally peer-reviewed journal; quarterly bulletin and communiqués; recognition of quality assurance agencies against GGPs; INQAAHE funding scheme; a Global Survey of EQAAs and IQAs in cooperation with UNESCO.

Education has always been the driving force and the critical determinant of success for communities throughout history; each evolution phase was linked to a driving economic force. The shift towards a knowledge-based society and economy has increased the need for superior talent embodied by higher education, training, skills, creativity and innovation capacity. The major disruption that happened in the 21st Century, the introduction of E-Learning (distance learning) and mobile devices,
are a major breakthrough that affected a number of professions. Half of today’s jobs will not exist by 2025, 65% of enrollees in primary schools will have jobs that do not currently exist and 75% of professions will be STEM related.

Quality education is number 4 on the sustainable development goals (SDGs 4), therefore the approaches to quality education is significant; this approach is a major paradigm shift and all the needs must be identified. In order to take this approach, it is important to firstly understand the trends in external and internal quality assurance globally: all levels and modes, secondly to identify the major challenges, to provide recommendations for future investments, to promote relevance of QA to benefit our members and higher education community at large and lastly to produce Global Study Report to feed into the overall report for the UNESCO/INQAAHE/ICDE/CoL/WB/CIQG/ENQA.

Dr. Karakhanyan raised the question about Higher Education Quality Assurance, “Where do we stand in terms of relevance?” The approaches to higher education quality assurance should be diverse in accordance to the needs; however, they no longer serve the diversity of needs. According to INQAAHE Global Study on QA (2017-2018): in cooperation with regional networks and university associations, there are factors that are needed to be followed to keep the approach ‘relevant’: recognition of qualifications; coverage of diversity of higher education providers, profiles and performance; measurement of learning outcomes and learning gain; links with the labor market and measurement of employability; relevance of qualifications; knowledge development and transfer; and inclusive education. Furthermore, all development of QA should be transparent, independent and facilitating. Although there is no specific framework – there should be a framework at the government level and cascade down to the institutional level.
Speaker 2:

How does QA ensure inclusive and quality education for all?

By Ms. Fiona Crozier
Head of International, The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), United Kingdom

Abstract:
My contribution to the discussion will focus on three main areas: internal improvement or enhancement; external assurance; and public trust

I would suggest that, in order to have value that is recognized, not only by those that are carrying it out (external QA agencies) but also by those that are undertaking it (HE institutions) and those public stakeholders for whom it is relevant (students, parents, employers etc.)

In order for quality assurance to be really effective, the system or framework within which it sits must be coherent, valued and understood by all those involved in it or who have an interest in its outcomes. An external process that leads to no improvement or enhancement within a program or an institution is unlikely to provide the means for a meaningful engagement with internal processes. Equally, internal and external processes that are transparent and meaningful to stakeholders will yield little useful information.

I will argue that coherence, transparency and inclusivity in our internal and external quality assurance processes can provide an environment in which improvement can flourish and external stakeholders can provide input to the process and find trustworthy information that is useful to them.

QAA was founded in 1997, headquarter is currently in Gloucester, in the west of England. There are other offices in London, Glasgow and Cardiff. QAA is the UK’s independent, expert, higher education quality assurance agency; its mission is to safeguard standards and improve the quality of UK higher education, wherever it is delivered around the world.

The work of QAA are: delivering external quality assurance as required by each part of the UK; evidence-based external reviews of alternative providers; regulating the Access to HE qualification; stewardship of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education; system-wide analysis and dissemination of good practice; strategic international work (including partnerships); adviser to Government on applications for degree-awarding powers and university title; and engagement with students and
professional, statutory and regulatory bodies (PSRBs). The key of the QAA is the student; however, the weakest part is to talk to stakeholders and employers in the agencies to find out what it is that they need.

Ms. Crozier mentioned the questions for internal and external improvement, “What is internal/external QA for? Who is it for? How can internal/external QA processes be most effective? How does it link to the mission and vision of the HEI?”. The key is to communicate well with the stakeholders such as internal staff, students and with external world especially the employers - QAA will be effective if everyone at the institution can see the benefit, regardless of external factor (QAA Agencies). The coherence between internal and external can be done by communication and bring in the sense of inclusiveness.

Engagement in the broadest sense covers: student satisfaction; employers and other stakeholders satisfied; HEIs and QA agencies with an understanding of mission and remit in their broadest sense; and accountability leading to public trust. QAA believes it has an aspirational goal but engagement with employers is still weak, therefore being inclusive and transparent with stakeholders is the key to maintain the quality of the higher education.
TEQSA’s journey to engagement: Engaging with the sector to assure quality

By Dr. Karen Treloar
Director, Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA), Australia

Abstract

This presentation tracks TEQSA’s current journey with building an Engagement strategy that is local, global and has at its heart access to quality higher education for all. In 2016 TEQSA established its Engagement Group. The key focus of this group is to engage with the higher education sector both in Australia and internationally to provide strategic engagement and partnership, and to build a space for dialogue, connection and leadership in all aspects of quality and the application of the Australian Higher Education Standards. This presentation will reflect on how we strategically work with Higher Education sector, build partnerships, networks and collaborations and promulgate good practices. In particular, the presentation will focus on how TEQSA is building an engagement profile with limited resources, the challenges of building engagement strategies which are inclusive of all stakeholders, which encourage innovation, and support the development of deep relationships leading to quality higher education for all.

TEQSA was established in 2012 and has been building an engagement portfolio for 18 months to regulate and quality assurance in higher education in Australia: 168 higher educational providers (43 universities, 11 self-accredited institutions and 114 non-university higher education colleges) TEQSA is a standard base and risk base regulator; it has 1.4 million students and 0.4 million are international students. The organization has an inward focus and technically focus; it has also been doing the approach of preoccupying more with protect the quality of higher education. The common trait in the group is the strong ‘can do’ attitude, working together to meet deadline and the sense of humor. Engagement and transparency are the keys to work with all stakeholders as well as the strong commitment to students to have higher education.
The objects of TEQSA Act in contribution to SDG4, “to encourage and promote a higher education system that is appropriate to meet Australia’s social and economic needs for a highly educated and skilled population”, to increase the awareness, engagement, inclusive approaches about QA. In 2015, internal engagement is non-existent within the organization therefore in 2016 the engagement group has been formed; the group has been working on how to engage and communicate with stakeholders to communicate with providers by holding regular meetings. The principles of engagement are significantly prioritized in addition to being purposeful with clear objectives from the beginning; collaborative consultation; informative and engaged; transparency and respect toward all the stakeholders.

The achievements of TEQSA are: redesigned newsletter, website and collaborative relationships with members of the media; held conferences, forums and provided good practice guidance; social media presence; MOUs, delegations, and staff exchanges; energy and enthusiasm. There were 400-800 participants in one year so far, the job is not only QA but to bring out the engagement and listen to stakeholders’ concerns about Australian education and to partner with QA agencies that pragmatic to deliver quality for all. Moreover, the aspects to cover in the future are: greater flexibility in terms of fee-for-service activity; exploration of new media; involve and enthuse staff; leverage skills in a digital world; and a globally networked future.

Q&A

1) People might ignore about QA if they are forced to fulfill the assessment in accreditation, people from the programs tend to manipulate the data because it is work-based requirement, which are easily manipulated, what should we do to solve that problem?
2) Is 5 years cycle relevant to today’s industry 4.0? What IQA and EQA are for? Are they for the employers, or to increase the quality of the education?
3) Is it the culture we should put in first before putting the system of IQA and EQA?
4) Can QA help us teach the students to be more ethical? Are we aiming too high to change people’s behavior using QA?
5) How do we understand about the dimension of QA? Is it about excellence? University ranking? What is Quality of education?
6) TEQSA is a risk based QA, what should we look for in terms of risk management?

There is no fixed solution to the problem about data manipulation; the emphasis on the relationship between internal and external quality assurance would help with this issue. Most agencies would like to help the institutions to improve, but they are struggling with the requirements from higher up such as the government. The best way to make it the system works is to ask the students, staff and stakeholders, what they actually want. External factors also include the struggles between the staff and the agencies, and the agencies and the government. To build trust with stakeholders is important to QA and people who have interest in higher education because building trust can also increase the engagement. Engagement is a key – stakeholders’ collaboration and engagement; information transparency; and being respectful. The objectives are the regulation that imposes on higher education, awareness on what quality is all about and inclusiveness.
The cultural change is also important; the evidence of higher standard adapted into the course review processes indicating that the system is working; there are very few countries that link QA with the needs in the system. People are trying to copy the regional or international frameworks without adapting to try to solve their own specific issues. Currently, only a few systems are actually using QA to solve the problem in HE of the particular countries; the agencies should try to be a link to the institution and national context because context is crucial because they are culturally difference. In UAE, the government separated it into 2 functions: quality assurance and license accreditation, but accreditation is just a tool for quality assurance. Regardless of EQA, doing it with confidence would make a different within the institution, the result is expected and that the difference is expected. The missing essence of quality culture to develop the culture could be how to define and integrate the institution into the QA culture. This should be the major part of the culture.

Graduates’ attribute, which can be the course level or organization level, the context of the organization will reflect the graduates’ attribute. The expected outcomes that the students will achieve can be the vision and mission of the institution. QA system, it is a holistic system that links every part of organization together to achieve state of purpose, the vision and mission. What the institutions are trying to improve? What are the expected outcomes? It is the quality of life of the students, employment after graduation, product or system? If the quality is the purpose - who define the purpose and how does it define? 50% of universities have the same mission. Diversity of development and context has changed dramatically. Quality can be recognized as recognition, recognition of all the outcomes. The stakeholders that we have identified, they recognize your output, if it is recognized then it is accepted – it means it is working and relevant.

For TEQSA, the organization rates all providers against a set of indicators every year, providers aren’t changing that much in 8 years for low and high risk providers. Low risk providers come for assessment we assess them against the core, small standard but the high risk we assess against many more standards. Put more attention to high-risk (colleges that are just starting out, QA is new to them) providers for them to meet the standards. Low risks usually have solid track records.
Abstract:

The objective of Tuning is to contribute to the elaboration of a framework of comparable and compatible qualifications, which should be described in terms of competences, learning outcomes, and workload.

The Tuning project has developed a methodology and a common language, which can serve as a common basis and links with the development of an overarching European framework of qualifications. The Tuning methodology has been considered valid worldwide and tested in several continents for the enhancement of graduates’ employability, recognition of degrees, ensuring of the quality of programs, and the training of the academic and administrative staff.

The Tuning Asia-South East (TA-SE) project is aimed at modernization of higher education in South East Asia by developing the following lines: curricula design and delivery, employability of graduates, recognition of the degree programs, quality of higher education, and staff training. The project is focused on the curricular reform in three subject areas: Civil Engineering, Medicine and Teacher Education. It is designed to adapt, restructure and test curricula using the European Credit Transfer System and recognition of degrees with the aim of developing and establishing study programs for the first cycle. TA-SE project is also focused on generic and subject-specific competences, structure of content, ECTS and students’ workload, teaching, learning and assessment methods, and enhancement of the quality of the teaching materials and educational process.

The countrywide consultation process with employers, students, graduates and academic staff has been organized to identify the most important competences. The main results of the project consist of the establishment of Subject Area Groups, Reference Points for the Design and Delivery of Degree Programmes, Degree Programme Profiles (including programme competences and programme learning outcomes) and Curricula of Degree Programmes (first cycle) in 3 subject areas.
Tuning is a project for universities, by universities; it is a meeting point to reflect on higher education (HE) with the process of learning together using a set of principles: ownership, respect for diversity, closeness to needs, efficiency, action by reference points. To invite many academics from the similar areas and discuss about the topic and the key of tuning are mutual respect and working together. It is an approach to design and deliver qualification HE degree programs, as well as setting an articulated system of communities of learning by using mutual sharing methods.

The 3 main concepts of tuning are: recognition, quality and relevance. Tuning is an outcome-based learning by having student-centered and competence based system; it is important to keep it relevant to the communities. Tuning offers a common language for everyone to understand and compare, as it is an articulated set of tools jointly developed by the academics to build a global referencing points (in the regional, national and global level). The concept of tuning is global because it is related to international standards, while it is also local in terms of the context and outcome because the choices are made on the regional level.

The Tuning methodology has two clear pillars, which are: firstly, the design of compatible and comparable degree programs those are relevant to society and have mechanisms for maintaining and improving quality. Secondly, a contribution to a full implementation process supporting capacity building – continuous staff development and research into curriculum development, teaching, learning and assessment.

There are 2 main concepts and definitions in Tuning: Competence is a broad concept whereby representing a dynamic combination of knowledge and understanding at different levels; skills and abilities; and attitudes and values. Competences are used to define degree profiles; they are formed in various course units and assessed at different stages. Some competences are subject area related (SSC) (specific to a field of study) while others are generic (GC) (common to any degree programme).

Learning outcomes are desired outcomes of a process of learning that are formulated by the academic staff on the basis of input of internal and external stakeholders. While the students obtain competences during the process of learning, learning outcomes are statements of what a learner is expected to know and understand after the learning period is completed.

Meta profile is a group’s representation of the structure and combination of competences, which gives identity to a thematic area; it is a referential element and they are always mental constructions, destined to reflect and analyze the possible and diverse real degree profiles.
**Degree profile** is a competence and learning outcome of what graduates should know, understand and be able to do by the time they have successfully completed the programme. The degree profile takes into consideration the professional and social needs in the regional (local) or national level. Each university has a set of strengths as well as its own mission to fulfill. The profile gains capacity for being recognized through the meta-profile. From the degree profile, the program can be designed, following the 10 steps.

**10 steps to design a program:**

1. Agree on the name, which is clear and reflects the aims and the purpose of the program
2. Define and indicate length and level of the program; indicate if the program gives access to further study
3. Explain the social need of the program
4. Explain future fields, sectors of employment / occupation of graduates
5. Describe the degree profile of the program in terms of generic and subject-specific competences. Define the competences and formulation of learning outcomes at program level
6. Link of the degree with the agreed Meta-Profile
7. Describe the structure of the program: units/courses/modules with their learning outcomes and learning, teaching and assessment strategies
8. Check the program overall consistency (both at the unit level and at the inter-unit/program level)
9. State how internal quality control will be carried out and the improvements identified will be incorporated
10. Add information on any other aspects your institution and/or accreditation body requires for a program (re)design proposal to be considered for approval
Q&A

1) What way that local variables be addressed in the framework of international standard and in which portion?
2) Who is the sponsor of this project, how much do they have to pay?
3) Due to the rapid expansion, have you measured the actual impact on the performance of the students and the institutions?

For institutional and regional context, each local can add on to it; it is comparable because base on the Meta profile, each case addresses differently depends on the local institution, in accordance to the institutional needs. It is local because it addresses the needs of the local and institutions. The EU commission is the one who sponsored the project; to build high education project therefore it is not commercial and is not charged to participate. Researches on each country are changing all the time; they are written for 3 years. The academia can change and revise it because meta-profile is not final – it can be revised in 3-5 years. Many projects that have already launched cannot be copied because people who would like to start the project need to understand the program first and apply it to do their own tuning programs afterward.
Panel Discussion
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Speaker 1:

QA in the Philippines: Achieving ACADEMIC excellence in a historically market-oriented higher education system

By Prof. Dr. Maria Cynthia Rose Banzon Bautista
Vice President for Academic Affairs, University of the Philippines and Former Commissioner of the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), the Philippines

Abstract:

Drawing insights from the challenges confronting Philippine higher education, the presentation briefly discusses issues of quality assurance in developing countries dominated by private higher education institutions. It specifically focuses on a range of feasible government policy and program strategy options.

In the very first part of this section, Dr. Bautista explained and talked more deeply into details about Quality Assurance in the Philippines, through explaining how the Quality Assurance in the Philippines works and helps achieve Academic excellence in the market orientation in the history of the Philippine Higher Education. She also mentioned about how the Philippines chose the appropriate assessment tools to evaluate and improve their high education institutions from various types of the quality assurance. Moreover, she shared and expressed on how the government policies can make a big impact on Higher education development in the Philippines.

Dr. Bautista thinks that we cannot apply only one assessment tool to evaluate quality of institutions in every country because there are different factors varied on the higher education landscape in each country. Therefore, the Quality Assurance should be more specific and customized for the HE landscapes of each country. The Philippines is one of many countries that has its own higher education characteristics and it is statistically different from the rest of our colleagues in Southeast Asia in many ways in terms of Quality Assurance. One of the important factors, that differs the Philippines from any other countries, is a very big difference in landscape of Higher Education as illustrated in the picture below.
According to the Distribution of the Philippine Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), there are a total of 1,935 HEIs consisted of private institutions, 88% and public institutions, 12%. If we consider the number of the HEIs including the satellite campuses of the universities and colleges, there will be approximately 2,500 institutions over the Philippines.

Referring to the Philippines roadmap, there are a total of 3.8 million HEIs which are 44% of public institutions and 56% of private institutions. Nonetheless, comparing the number of HEIs from the distribution with the Philippine roadmap, the number of the private institutions has been increasing from 56% to 88%. Therefore, this reflects and shows that most of the institutions are very small; in other words, it significantly shows that quality assurance in developing countries dominated by private higher education institutions.

As Dr. Bautista has mentioned earlier that every country has its own ways and its features in terms of HE system. The HE system in the Philippines has been influenced by the US education system which the overarching ideological legacy of the system enables the state to have the market facilitated and in the same way, the market can get assured of quality by shutting down those low-quality institutions.

In terms of ideological frame, the Philippines does not have any mechanism that really assures the market operations like in the US system, which has its own loan system provided for students before going to college; to support a market for accreditation by ensuring enrollment in quality programs and institutions. However, the students can only receive loans to study at higher education institutions that are accredited. This brings about a market for accreditation and eventually makes school and programs with no accreditation get closed by the market.

For higher education, the market can normally close programs and institutions of poor quality and enable them to thrive and move even further as Dr. Bautista has already stated. However, the market in the Philippines, unlike in the US, cannot close any institutions because its higher education system has no mechanism for market-facilitated quality assured programs and institutions and the situation itself is currently complicated and difficult but inversely, the regulatory mechanisms do support the market.

There are 100 Education Governmental Agencies that have no explicit mandate for quality assurance, but a mandate for improving the quality of Higher Education by not having such a national accreditation agency for Higher Education or BAN-PT like in Indonesia but having a Commission Higher Education mandated to take care of Higher Education System of the Philippines. This means that having government mandates can help improve quality education levels. In terms of
improving more in quality assurance, the government mandate is in charge of the Quality Assurance with its functions. It is the one that provides perimeter, builds recognition for progressive higher education institutions, its monitors and maintenance and also sets the standards of the monitors and maintenances.

It takes responsibility and commitment of the Government Agencies in Setting, Monitoring, and Evaluating Minimum Standards. Hence, the Philippines at the moment have a system of broaden bands of accreditation. For many years that they have been a member participating in the ASEAN discussions about the Quality Assurance and Quality Education Framework. And there are always frequently-asked questions about what is the qualification system of the Philippines? What is the accreditation like? The most appropriate answers for these questions -- Great accreditation is something voluntary. Beyond the minimum standards, there are voluntary assessments of quality beyond the standards, quality assurance and government agencies.

There are a lot of different types of organizations or agencies with their particular quality assurance functions. In the Philippines, the government is in charge of setting standards, giving permission and recognition, monitoring and evaluating all institutions. Moreover, there are also a commission on higher education, the market diagram for programs and a higher education broad.

Government Agencies play a crucial role in Setting, Monitoring, and Evaluating Minimum Standards of HEIs through the process of voluntary assessment of quality beyond compliance with minimum standards. It means that the HEIs will be not accredited when they are not assured of the quality beyond the minimum standards through voluntary assessment.

There are three major types of organizations that provide voluntary assessments: Quality Assurance by Government Agencies, Accreditation by Private Local Organizations and Accreditation and Assessment by International Organizations.

The Government Agencies are responsible for Quality Assurance based on programmatic level and institutional level in which the Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Maritime Industry Authority and Legal Education Board (LEB) are in charge of taking care of these two different levels of the assessment.

In terms of programmatic level, centers of Development (COD) and Centers of Excellence (COE) are involved in this QA assessment. In terms of institutional level, there are five principal types of agencies: Institutional Sustainability Assessment (ISA), Autonomous/ Deregulated Status (private HEIs), State Universities and Colleges (SUC) Leveling/ Normative Financing (SUCs) and Philippine Quality Award (PQA) Framework for Education Performance Excellence taking care of ensuring the quality of HEIs.

Following by the Private Local Organizations that are responsible for accreditation assessment with three different levels: Programmatic Accreditation (i.e. Federation of Accrediting Agencies of the Philippines and National Network of Quality Assurance Agencies), Professional Organization-Based (i.e. PICAB) and Institutional Accreditation (i.e. PAASCU).

For International Organizations, there are also three major tools assessed by international organizations but slightly different from the previous ones. The first tool is programmatic accreditation related to the fields of Engineering (i.e. ABET, Washington Accord and Sydney Accord), Business (i.e. AACSB), ICT (i.e. ABET and Seoul Accord), Hotel and Restaurant management, Architecture and Maritime. The second one is Program and Institutional Assessment which has various disciplines (i.e. AUN-QA). The last one is Institutional Certification (i.e. ISO family of standards)

At the institutional levels, the commission actually has institution sustainability assessment autonomous and regulated with in colleges and universities. The regulations of market levels sustainability assessment are as followed: a higher education government agency has no explicitly
stated mandate for QA but that performs some QA functions, hence, the Commission on Higher Education grants of permits and recognition of programs and institutions and monitors programs or institutions that are not autonomous or deregulated through regional Quality Assurance Teams (RQATs) and Technical Committees/Technical Panels. Another regulation is a system of voluntary accreditation, for the Philippine context, it refers specifically to having achieved the QA standards of recognized External QA bodies which are beyond the minimum education standards set by the state. In conclusion, the Philippine system of QA has a very complex body which can be divided into different sub-bodies with different QA functions and at the moment, they are not fully complemented to each other.

What is QA-RELATED GOVERNMENT Interventions?

The government is advocated with the policies of achieving and approaching learning outcomes in higher education. It prescribes, in a policy, a QA approach appropriate to the type and mission of the Philippine higher education institution. As Dr. Libing Wang has mentioned earlier that there are different types of institutions. There are different missions and chances. The QA could actually be customized and suitable for each type of institutions. It also recognizes the QA bodies through policy or Memorandum Orders which is the policy for universities. It recognizes accreditation by QA bodies in the grant of Centers of Excellence, Centers of Development, Autonomous and Deregulated Status. In other words, it supports QA by ensuring the accreditation features in the grant of those organizations. It also provides limited funding to HEIs for accreditation by QA bodies to actually go for accreditation.

Recommendations for government policies:

First, the policies have to be in alignment with the ASEAN Qualification Assurance Framework. It is something that they have been pushing up for a while. The government is already committed to that due to the enrollment of the Philippines in the ASEAN Quality Assurance Network or AUN-QA. Second, the policies needed to be prescribed the establishment of an Institutional/Internal QA in all Philippine HEIs which have been debated in the Philippines for a while because there is a strong resistance of institutional QA that has been addressed. Therefore, it should be prescribed that every institution, if possible, should have the IQA by itself. But in the other hand, there is a need to push institutions to look at themselves and to set up their IQA. it’s very difficult for institutions to change the ways they have been doing things. They just do it because they are told to do so without their own inspirit. Obviously, at the beginning of the process, there is always our Complaints complaining about the forms that we need to fill up in the assessment process. But after doing it for a while, you will finally understand what it really means. Commitment and dedication is crucial at the very first step of assessment for the institution staffs as well as the government agencies.

Dr. Bautista has recommended the government to make the issuance of CHED Memorandum Orders with corresponding legislated financial support, if necessary, in order to make the alignment with the ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework, prescribe establishment of an Institutional/Internal QA in all Philippine HEIs, expand supports for program and institutional accreditation of HEIs and also support for expansion and capacity building of existing QA bodies.

She also recommended more about focusing on building Formal Recognition of Professional and International Accreditation and Assessment Bodies which also meet the criteria; making more recognition of AUN-QA program and institutional assessment of member universities that are among the elite HEIs in the Philippines; making more harmonization of accreditation standards through an activated CHED Coordinating Council for Accreditation because she believes that AUN-QA is not the only one tool that is the best tool for standard development.
There are a lot of arguments when discussing about adding other types of accreditation standards into the Philippine HE system such as the BAN-PT. To be able to make it happen, there is a need to coordinate and complement across the system bodies and also provide support for the regular external audit of recognized accreditation bodies which she addressed that they aim to eventually advance in taking care of this in the Philippines.

Lastly, it takes a very long time and a lot of efforts to see how this is going to work and what it actually means. To be able to achieve what we expect, we need a lot of inspirit of works! Hence, these are big challenges that they have to be prepared and keep on improving it. Without government supports, it will be more difficult. Thus, government policies and agencies do play an import role as a big impact on the quality education development. It is crucial for any country to have the government policies harmonizing the effective government policies for further development of quality assurance and quality education.
Government Policies on HEQA case INDONESIA

By Prof. T. Chan Basaruddin
Executive Director, National Accreditation Agency for Higher Education (BAN-PT), Indonesia

Abstract:
Higher education sector is now facing tremendous changes entering the so-called postindustrial (or Industrial 4.0) era. This talk will present the government policy on quality enhancement in higher education in Indonesia particularly in conjunction with the complexity of quality assurance for higher education due to the afore-mentioned development trend. Major policy areas include: accreditation system, internal quality assurance system, national higher education database, and qualification framework.

Prof. T. Basaruddin, currently Executive Director at National Accreditation Agency for Higher Education (BAN-PT). Prof. Basaruddin started his talk with the explanation on landscape of HE in Indonesia followed by Higher Education Quality Assurance (HEQA) which is related to Historical Perspective. He then discussed more about Government Policies on HEQA in Indonesia and explained how the Government of Indonesia has been playing a very important role in encouraging HEIs to get engaged in the process of HEQA. He also went in details about the historical improvement of HE accreditation establishment, its status and requirements. Furthermore, he mentioned and compared the current criteria with the new ones driven by the Indonesian Government. He finally concluded his talk expressing his opinions and thoughts toward the Key Question of this session, “What Would be the Effective Government Policy toward Quality Enhancement in the Higher Education?”

Every country has their own landscape of Higher Education system, like the landscape of the Higher Education in Indonesia, it is very much similar to the one from the Philippines as mentioned by Dr.
Bautista. There is cooperation, nowadays, amongst the institutions as well as the students in the last 15-20 years. The number of students enrolled in HEIs in Indonesia has exponentially increased as shown in the Figure below.

The total number of HEIs in Indonesia is around 4,500, which the large majority is private institution followed by the government or public institution with around 200 institutions or even less than that. In terms of the number of students, it is currently around 5 million students. The Indonesian Government has a strong intention to increase this number of enrollment and take it as a big concern as well as the quality functions.

There are 3 major strategic issues in Higher Education in Indonesia that the government takes this as a must-do issue to improve the HE development in the country. The first one is access and equity issue, the government is trying to increase the number of student enrollment; particularly in remote areas and small islands due to struggles with access and equity. Following by strategic issue on Quality & Relevance, which there are always the issues on increasing the number or the quantity instead of focusing to maintain more quality. The last one is Governance. Autonomy needed to be provided for making institutions deliver quality in higher education.

Indonesia is still at the very beginning step and new in the quality assessment with its history of Higher Education Quality Assurance started in 1990.

In 1990, there was HE Reforming which clearly makes the word “Quality” stated in terms of a function of Autonomy, Accountability and Accreditation: \( Q = f(\text{Aut}, \text{Account}, \text{Accred}) \), where Aut = Autonomy, Account = Accountability, Accre = Accreditation. This is the first time that the word “Accreditation” explicitly introduced to government policies in Indonesia.

In 1994, the first national accreditation agency for higher education (NAAHE) was established which is currently his institution. Dr. Basaruddin also highlighted that accreditation has to be defined on its own standards, not on the government standards.

In 2003, Compulsory Program accreditation was established which contains program level and capacity of accreditation that are based on voluntary.

In 2010, the government launched the National Qualification Framework (NQF) and has been launched for only 8 years.

In 2012, the government put in place very serious statement in the Law known as HE Law – HEQAS in order to make people follow and get into the quality assurance system.
In 2014, there was the first National Standard on HE which is the first achievement of Indonesia HE comparing this in 1994; there were no national standards for accreditation for Higher Education.

In 2015, the government started to do the multiple agencies, particularly, for problems of discipline-based accreditation agencies.

In 2016, there was a new setup NAAHE due to HE Law - HEQAS (Ministerial decree). The government has engaged more interaction on Higher Education of Quality Assurance System (HEQAS) with both IQA and EQA.

“Accreditation itself has to be defined on its own standards, not on the government standards.”

The Government takes place in introducing higher education reform. This raised up the full definition of Quality introduced to the government; the quality is defined as the function of autonomy, accountability and accreditation as Prof. Basaruddin has mentioned before.

The standard is monitored by the National Board of Education Standard which is in charge of controlling and evaluating programs or institutions and making sure that they meet the national standard; if not, then they are unaccredited.

The Government itself has applied Key Policies on HEQA which mainly consists of IQA and EQA and measured against National Standard on Higher Education. Furthermore, the government also established Law for program level accreditation compulsory and declared to establish obligations for QA system. Hence, both IQA and EQA are compulsory by law. According to the law, any individual universities have to establish or put in place the Internal Quality Assurance System overseen by the Ministry (c.q. Regional offices for Higher Education). Therefore, the IQA and EQA should be also measured against the national standard as well; If not met the minimum standard, then it is not accredited.

For internal quality assurance (IQA) as stated by Dr. Treloar, it has to be internally motivated; thus, the government has to try and play a major role to inspire and make universities motivated to do it by themselves. For the external quality assurance (EQA), it is in the form of accreditation aside from the life academic and based on both program and institution levels conducted by Accreditation Agency.

Prof. Basaruddin explained that the accreditation agencies are usually autonomous and independent as well as his current institution: the National Accreditation Agency (NAAHE) or (BAN-PT). It has been defined as autonomous or independent agency and focused on both institutional and programmatic levels. Likewise, it is fully funded by the government in terms of financial support.

There is also another type of agency called Discipline-based Accreditation Agency. It contains program level that is self-financed. There is currently only one agency (i.e. health related disciplines) but the rests are still under control of the NAAHE. In addition, accreditation status is needed for accreditation assessment for institutions to issue out diplomas (licensing). It is valid for the maximum of 5 years and divided into three levels: Good (C), Very Good (B), and Excellent (A).

Accreditation System for HE

Another important point that the government needs to carefully look at -- Accreditation System for Higher Education. It is necessary to first define the criteria; the government currently set up the criteria for accreditation system. It can be divided into 7 criteria:

1. Vision and Mission
2. Governance
3. Students
Nonetheless, the criteria should be driven by the National Government and must be based on the National Standard. And there is one more big problem; that is, these existing criteria are driven by the national standard and very input-driven; therefore, the manipulation of data is still existed. In order to find a better solution for the issue of cycle of manipulation, the government plans to set the new criteria as followed:

1. Vision & Mission
2. Governance
3. Students,
4. Faculties and Staff,
5. Resources (Fin, Facilities, Infra)
6. Learning
7. Research,
8. Services,
9. outputs and outcomes

These new criteria are set to be the new instruments, which are more specific, outputs and outcomes oriented. The government, hopefully, these instruments will encourage the institutions to apply it to eventually eliminate the cycle of manipulation.

Prof. Basaruddin explained that accreditation is a process of improving to recheck and evaluate whether the universities and institutions still meet the National Standard which consists of 5 steps as followed:

1. Desk Assessment
2. Site Evaluation
3. Decision
4. Monitoring
5. Evaluation

The government hope that changed processes will hopefully change people mindsets, and will hopefully help them see the benefits of being accredited and to improve quality.

In the last part of the talk, Prof. Basaruddin raised up the Key Question of this session, What would be the effective government policies? He thinks that we have to integrate both IQA and EQA into Higher Education system. In addition, the quality has to be driven by Quality Assurance System.

However, there will always be criticism and some complaints from staffs of universities and institutions. Because staff think that integrating IQA and EQA to evaluate the quality of their institutions gives staff a lot of burden to do. This might be the effect due to lack of collaboration from different sectors (caution of the quality) of the society for taking care of the quality of the country, which is quite a big deal and not that easy to do individually.

Therefore, he recommended that we should keep in mind that quality improvement is not only the responsibility of the institutions in higher education but also the government and the society, especially, the employers and external sectors.

Prof. Basaruddin hopefully believes that if there are the collaborations amongst these major sectors harmonizing and joining together, everyone will not feel that applying and integrating the IQA and EQA to HEQA gives them a lot of burden and will finally get motivated to make it by themselves.
Otherwise, when the students are graduates and go out finding for jobs, they might not get the jobs because sometimes, the employers do not see whether or not they have enough knowledge or skills by only looking at their diplomas.

Prof. Basaruddin also marked up a very important aspect, -- “The Government should be consistent with government policies and does not keep changing the policies that are not consistent; otherwise, it might make a big confuse for those who are doing their valuable jobs on HEQA.

With reference to the current involvement of the Government toward quality enhancement in Indonesia. The Government of Indonesia puts quality as one of its prime focuses on HE. Moreover, it has been in commitment in programs implemented and the ultimate roles of higher education system where the ultimate goal on HEQAS is to create and sustain a culture of quality at all concerned parties.

Prof. Basaruddin also thinks that the government should provide the autonomy and demand the accountability to HEIs with serious concerns on the main challenges as the Indonesia has a huge size and vast geographical spread in terms of institutions as well as the number of locations. He finally concluded his talk with another concern on the next big challenge in Catching up with rapid development of technologies (Industry 4.0 era) which has been affecting the operation of HE all over the world.
Government policy on quality enhancement in higher education in Vietnam

By Dr. Nguyen Quoc Chinh
Director of Center for Educational Testing and Quality Assessment,
Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam

Abstract:
Quality assurance (QA) for higher education has been one of priorities of Vietnamese government since early 2000’s. Since then, the QA system in Vietnam has gone through 3 development stages: Setting up stage (2003-2006): Establishment of the General Department of Education Testing and Accreditation (GDETA), responsible for guiding the institutions to implement quality assurance system and procedures; Developing QA regulations, guidelines, action plan; Capacity building for internal & external assessors; Development of QA policy and integrated in Law, Education Acts and other Government documents. Pilot assessment stage (2006 – 2012): Assessment of 40 universities, and 17 programs. Consolidate and develop stage (2012- 2017): Set up independent accreditation agencies; Revised legal QA documents; Assessors training; Making real assessments. Recently, the successful implementation of AUN-QA framework at many Vietnam universities lead to the government’s decision to use AUN-QA standard in national QA practice. The AUN-QA sets of criteria were adopted and adapted to be the national criteria for higher education accreditation at program level from 2016 and at institutional level from 2018.

This new change in policy has been proven to bring many advantages to the QA practice in Vietnam thanks to the system-oriented, process-oriented, and principles-based characteristic of the AUN-QA framework. However, the implications of AUN-QA criteria to Vietnam institutions face many challenges such as: lack of QA policy and guidance; lack of QA experts; wrong perception about QA; and uneven development in QA practice among HEIs.
Dr. Chinh has expressed his perspectives on the Quality Assurance in the context of Vietnam. He pointed out how the engagement of the government enables Vietnam Higher Education Quality by the forcing the HEIs Law by drawing an overview picture of Quality Assurance in Vietnam perspectives in order to point out differences compared with the previous stories of QA from the Philippines and Indonesia.

Dr. Chinh firstly presented his talk with the overview picture of Quality Assurance and Higher Education in Vietnam which is quite unique at the moment. He also pointed out differences compared with the previous stories of Quality Assurance from the Philippines and Indonesia. He excitedly stated this is the first time that they have achieved to use a National Quality Assurance Framework (NQAF) in Vietnam and he explained in details how the application of QAF become a National Quality Assurance in Vietnam.

Higher Education Statistic

As shown in the table, Vietnam has over 200 universities (235 universities), which its majority is a public university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>1,767,879</td>
<td>449,558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>1,523,904</td>
<td>392,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>243,975</td>
<td>57,533</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, to the rest of the world, the Vietnamese student population has been increasing the past 15 years. There were about 1 million students in 2005. From 2016 until 2018, the number increased to 2 million students. Nevertheless, Vietnam differs from the Philippines and Indonesia in terms of organization. Vietnam is mostly dominated by public universities whereas Indonesia and Philippines are dominated by private universities.

Furthermore, both nations have different structures of the system. The HE System in Vietnam has been influenced from many foreign countries starting from France followed by the Soviet Union. At the moment, Vietnam is influenced by the US and European systems. With reference to the application of different structures from various countries, there are a lot of approaches in Higher Education in Vietnam. Hence, they constantly run this process and are under construction on improving the HE system.

Higher Education System

Vietnam has several different kinds of HEIs. There are 6 major types of universities in Vietnam. The first type are the National Universities, these are not single universities. National Universities has their own systems of the universities. Institutions that fit this example include, Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City (VNUHN) with six university members. The second one called Regional Universities. These universities belong and depend on three big provinces: Hue, Danang and Thai Nguyen with their own system management located in different regions of Vietnam. The rest of them are Provincial Universities, Military Universities, Universities and under control of Ministries and Private Universities.
This shows the HE system in Vietnam has different complexities of HEIs. However, it has been constantly under reforming and growing fast with a one big confronting and similar challenge like other countries -- limited resources. Therefore, the quality assurance is a very important issue that they need to put into the system to make assured of the quality system.

**National Policy in Quality Assurance**

Dr. Chinh guided us to the story of the establishment of the National Policy in Quality Assurance, the government has put the National Policy in Quality Assurance into the Education Law for the first time in 2005. The government then set up another Higher Education Law in 2012, which made Quality Assurance and Quality Accreditation compulsory for all HEIs in Vietnam. Due to the new law, each university is obligated to take responsibility for Quality Assurance. It is needed to have a unit and a system for IQA. Moreover, it is stated in the Law that accreditation results can be used for classifying and ranking of the HEIs. The HEIs, that have good QA results and practices, can get many benefits and more privilege for development; in other words, they will have more autonomy.

**Development of QA System in Vietnam**

Quality assurance (QA) for higher education has been one of the priorities of the government since early 2000’s. Since then, the QA system in Vietnam is divided into 3 development stages: Setting up stage (2003- 2006), Pilot assessment stage (2006 – 2012) and Consolidate and develop stage (2012- 2017).

**Setting up stage (2003- 2006):**

From 2003 until 2006, the first stage was called “Setting up period”. In this very first stage. There was the establishment of General Department for Educational Testing and Accreditation (GDETA), which is the department directly responsible for taking care of HE system on behalf of the Ministry of Education in Vietnam.

The Ministry of Education developed QA legal documents: regulations, guidelines, action plan, through Capacity building for internal and external reviewers, Development of QA policy integrated in Law, Education Acts and other Government documents since 2003 and 2006.

**Pilot assessment stage (2006 – 2012):**

From 2006 to 2012, the second stage “Pilot Assessment” was launched to provide assessments for institutions started with the first assessment of 12 universities supported by Dutch experts in 2006 and 2007. One year later, there was another assessment of 8 universities with consultancy of American experts in 2008. After that, there were 40 universities assessed through the criteria set up by the Ministry of Education. Finally, there were 17 programs that had been assessed in 2012.

These three stages of QA system development in Vietnam enabled them to see the variability and the reliability. However, it did not work very well as they expected in the very first pace of the development process. Because they had the results of 14-university assessment with the unexpected and unreliable percentage of variability and reliability.

Therefore, QA had to create new lessons during the 6 years and had to utilize more effective practices and figure out areas in need of focus.

Even though this process had not led them prospective results, it still gave QA another moving forward pace to the next step to consolidate the system.

**Consolidate and develop stage (2012- 2017):**
The process of consolidating the system was a series of continuously taken action from 2012 to 2017. During this time, universities set up four different centers of Educational Accreditation known as the independent accreditation agencies which are CEA-VNU-HN, CEA-VNU HCM, CEA-UDN (2013) and CEA-AVU&C (2015).

Following the previous step, they have revised legal QA documents from the assessment standards for universities (06/VBHN-BGDDT, 04/3/2014), colleges (08/VBHN-BGDDT, 04/3/2014) and vocational institutes (07/VBHN-BGDDT, 04/3/2014). Moreover, they has also driven and made a lot of efforts on capacity building by providing training courses for the assessors in order to make them become more expertise and improve the tools for the improvement of the quality and accreditation assessment.

After that, the Ministry of Education had the Standard for University (06/VBHN-BGDDT) based on the standard revised on the previous step. There are 10 criteria: Mission, objectives, Management, Curriculum, Academic activities, Staff, Students, Research, International Relation, Library, Infrastructure and Finance, with 61 sub-criteria which is quite similar to the other standards existing in the world.

The Journey of the Real Assessment

Hence, the journey of the real assessment has begun. There is no pilot assessment anymore as the MoE have already developed a better tool. During the period of 2016 to 2017, the four centers of education accreditation had been having a lot of assessment.

By this time, over 100 institutes had been assessed and there were only 60 institutes and 7 programs that got accredited. They have been running on the assessor trainings. There are 1,000 people as certified assessors and 350 people qualified as official accreditors, which 200 of them are actively involved in the assessment.

This new change in policy has been proven to bring many advantages to the QA practice in Vietnam and it had been worked quite well; thus, the institutes saw the benefits of assessment and this made other people get interested more and more in accreditation.

The Influence of AUN-QA in QA in Vietnam

Another interesting part is the Influence of AUN-QA in QA in Vietnam. Before the reforming, the tools are made by the Ministry of Education. Many universities in Vietnam have been brought into AUN-QA. There are three official AUN-QA Members that bring a huge impact on the QA system in Vietnam: VNU-HCM (1999), VNU-HN and Can Tho University.

There was first assessment of three institutions by AUN in 2009. Other universities also started to participate in AUN-QA. The number of AUN-QA members has been increasing. There are more 19 associate members by the end of 2017.

There were many programmes assessed by the criteria of AUN-QA in 2009. With this impact, the Ministry of Education has decided the very radical decision by adopting and adapting the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) to become Vietnam National Criteria.

The MoE decided to apply the AUN-QA sets of criteria to be the national criteria at programme level in 2016 with the total of 87 AUN-QA members by the end of 2017 and also at institutional level in 2018.

Dr. Chinh marked up that there are two sets of statement for criteria on AUN-QA. Vietnam criteria are 90 % similar to the AUN-QA ones and 10 % different based on the context of Vietnam with the interesting move and support from the Ministry of Education.
Challenges and current state of the HE system in Vietnam

However, the implication of AUN-QA criteria to Vietnam institutions faces many challenges such as: lack of QA policy and guidance; lack of QA experts; wrong perception about QA; and uneven development in QA practice among HEIs.

As Vietnam has many documents that make the institutes be able to cope with the new challenges. Majority of the documents are based on the foundation of AUN, 90% similar to AUN-QA criteria. It is still good at the program level. They are still new and have a few experiences. The universities have been recently preparing for the first stage for the new criteria. Their system is in the transition state. They have had luck of getting the guidance from the government level. But it is still not enough guidance for improving the whole system.

Lack of QA policy, guidance from the Government level

Another big challenge is about the real understanding about QA. They still have a lot of wrong perception about QA. Thus, there must be more training and programmes provided for the QA staffs and assessors to have more understanding and awareness about the right perception on QA. Moreover, lack of QA experts, financial resource and the resistance to change the ways people do things, are the most common challenges that they have faced like any other countries.

There are uneven developments in QA practice among HEIs. Some are very progressive and willing implement reform. Some are reluctant and refuse to do. These are the real situations and current challenges in Vietnam.

Advantages

However, there are a lot of advantages. Dr. Chinh proudly told us that the Government of Vietnam is very determined and committed to pursue a very big mission of turning all the higher education institutes in Vietnam accredited by 2020. That is a very big project strongly stated by the Government. Vietnam has had good practices from leading institutions which are also the members of AUN: VNU-HCM, VNU-HN and many members.

Dr. Chinh closed his talk by expressing his gratitude for strong supports from AUN-QA family, QA community and network in Vietnam and in ASEAN which has been growing rapidly and popularly. He finally reminded us that improving the quality of higher education system needed a lot of commitment from everyone in the society, we have to become unite in order to achieve our missions because

“Quality is a Journey, not a destination!
If you want to go fast, go alone.
If you want to go far, go together!”
Q&A

1) How do the government policy and the quality assurance framework manage to change or maybe too fast forward the landscape of higher education in your country?
2) What is the biggest lesson learnt in your country?
3) Should one country have one QA framework; if not, the multiple frameworks should be regulated into one?

There were three highlight topics discussed on this panel discussion. The first topic was focused on how the management system of government policy and quality assurance framework is in order to fast forward the landscape of higher education in the Philippines, Indonesia and Vietnam.

Based on Philippine contexts, the Philippines has applied two major frameworks into its higher education: the National Qualification Framework and the Quality Assurance Framework. The National Qualification Framework is depended on internal regulations which are set up by the government which is different from other countries in ASEAN. The government has been adjusting the setup of basic education system for 13 years. All the technical standard and committees are working hard on gathering the minimum guideline and formalizing all the curriculum suited for the qualification framework to learning outcomes and frameworks. The delivery of the qualification framework requires a lot of mindset changes. As they have not been inspired yet; therefore, one of the challenges is to look at the interface technical in higher education. The Quality Assurance Framework has also been adjusted to the mindset changes of people. As the Philippines still have no dimension and body. There is also no government obligation to make everybody follow the rules and law as in Indonesia or Vietnam. Some of programs are considered of six-program level, some needed to be unpacked because they are not at level 6. As there are different types of institutions with different missions, some groundwork are needed to be considered and continued process to further fast forward the landscape of higher education of the country.

In Indonesia, there is one common problem existed in every institution -- the willingness and true understandings in the framework; people are still not self-motivated to do the tasks but to follow the obligation. They still do not understand well how the system works. Therefore, the key issue to make a better move in higher education system is to focus on the professors because they are the key players and should be leading to one direction. According to the national framework, it is crucial to be focused on and put in place the quality assurance unit in all the universities. Hence, the Indonesian government is adjusting the curriculum to the standard and describing the learning outcomes and the objectives.

In Vietnam, the Vietnamese government plays a major role in pushing people to follow the obligations. However, there is some vulnerable issues to be focused on as it is growing very fast in the development process; therefore, the guidance should be very clear. The government needs to constantly help people in improvement with clear guidance, long-term plans and further.

The second topic mentioned in this panel discussion was about lessons learnt in each country. It is a fact that the development in higher education does take time. After proceeding the process for a while, some countries might achieve new success but others do not. But what they have got one thing in common; every country has got new lessons learnt from each step from their development process. However, the lessons learnt in each country varied and depended on the country’s contexts and factors.

In the Philippines, they are facing with a lot of extreme challenges. There are many high quality institutions but still not enough as there are still some that do not meet any standard requirements. The balance between academic accountability and autonomy are also the important issues.
Furthermore, people first start to do this for compliance, but after a while, there always comes the resistance. Therefore, it is necessary to change the QA bodies by continuing to hold discussions and workshops and make more engagement with stakeholders. It would help the private accreditation bodies to really open up.

The big lesson learnt in Indonesia -- everyone usually considers QA as an obligation not a need; therefore, the government takes this as a big issue and aims to make people’ mindset changed to have strong awareness of having the QA to their HEIs in Indonesia because they believe that the QA has to be seen as a big responsibility of not only academic staffs and professors but also every party of the society. Like in Vietnam, they also take this as a serious mission -- the government needs to encourage every institution to be aware of the importance, the needs and the benefits of IQA.

The panel finally mentioned about applying one or multiple frameworks to the higher education of each country; applying only one framework might not be as much effective as expected because there are a lot of differences in terms of the contexts in each country. Therefore, the framework applied to the higher education system should be individual. Moreover, it should be adapted and can be used in different frameworks.
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Prof. Dr. Prasit summarized what have been happened during 14 years of using Thailand Quality Award (TQA) as a quality development framework at Siriraj Hospital. It is a quality development framework aligned with the Malcolm Baldrige quality award (MBNQA) in the US. He mainly focused on the journey of development, the brief history on how to choose the appropriate evaluation for the Medical Higher Education in Thailand.

Prof. Dr. Prasit started to explain the brief history of medical education development and the healthcare system in Thailand. Western medicine first arrived in Thailand in 1752 which was when Ayutthaya was the capital of the country. King Naraj of Ayutthaya initiated diplomatic relations and trade with the French. Then, a small western hospital like a house was constructed and maintained by missionaries. There was also a return of western medicine in Thailand as there was an American doctor arrived in Siam in 1835. The doctor provided delivery of several treatments such as Cholera, vaccination, etc. Those treatments and medical procedures were translated in the first Obstetrics book in Thai.

The development of hospitals and medical education in Thailand started in 1881 which temporary hospitals were built for treatment of cholera outbreak. Later in 1888, King Chulalongkorn donated a piece of land and money for the construction of Siriraj Hospital. In 1890, the first Medical School was opened with the three-year course and then there was the establishment of the “Royal Medical College” in 1893. After that, King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital was founded in 1914 and in 1916, Chulalongkorn University was upgraded from a school and established the Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital.
Medical Education: Quality Assurance and Accreditation System

All medical education curriculums must be approved by both the Thai Medical Council and the Ministry of Education via the University Council to see whether or not the doctors from medical education of Thailand are competent enough to look after the patients. Thus, the quality system was established by approving the programs. Individual universities are responsible for approval of the MD, but the Medical Council is responsible for approval of the competency of graduated doctors or so called the Medical License by conducting the national licensing examination. The curriculum has to be revised every 5 years and the input from several levels of stakeholders is gathered for further evaluation processes done by both of the university and the Medical Council.

Before 2011, the quality and accreditation system in Thailand was more or less similar to other countries before 2011 using IQA and EQA. The IQA or internal quality assessment or assurance will be done annually by both the university and the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC); whereas, the EQA or external quality assessment or accreditation will be done every 5 years due to the Law by the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (ONESQA).

Curriculum and Evaluation

By the end of the third year, the university will conduct an examination to evaluate the medical students in order to get passed into the next year classes. However, the Medical Council will conduct the National Licensing Examination (NLE) which is the key pass examination as in the US system. The first round of the NLE called NLE1 which will be conducted at the end of the third year. It is an MCQ type of examination to evaluate the knowledge of basic medical sciences. The NLE2 is to evaluate the clinical knowledge and also the MCQ type evaluation held at the end of the fifth year. The clinical competency will be evaluated at the end of the final year.

In sub-medical school such as Siriraj Hospital, there was also a short-case and long-case evaluations but it is not allowed compulsory. Because in some medical schools, there was no long-case evaluation (MEQ). Students have to pass both the university evaluation to get an MD and also pass the NLE in order to get a professional license. There are some students who do not pass the NLE but get successful in the university conduct examination. Thus, those students can get the MD but not allowed to do any medical practices in the country.

There are also foreign and international medical students currently studying at the university. Students can get the MD from the exam conducted by the university; in the same way, they are not allowed to do the practices. They need not to take the NLE like the native Thai students because they are not allowed by Law to do the practices in this country.

For the quality and accreditation systems, the university used the IQA and EQA before 2011. But after 2011, the evaluation system in the country had to be complied with the organization or institution level. The university is using the Education Criteria for Performance Excellence (EdPEx) accredited by both the university and office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC). For medical education at program level, the university uses the standards of World Federation for Medical Education (WFME) framework to accredit the basic medical education in Thailand by the Thai Medical Council via Institute for Medical Education Accreditation (IMEAc).

The diagram below shows that the medical students have to pass the organizational evaluation, quality evaluation programs, and also the quality of the programs in order to maintain the education.
EdPEX is a quality framework privileged for the education criteria of Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) to empower the organization to accomplish its mission, improve results, and become more competitive. It is equivalent of education criteria of MBNQA.

The plot below showing the application of Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award (MBNQA) in the framework in different countries. As there was some economic crisis in the US during the middle of 1980. The MBNQA was established before 1990 in order to allow the industrial companies in the US to learn how to improve the quality system, the efficiency of the performance and how to increase the competitiveness of the business. After that, the financial situation in the US started to be better as shown in the plot.

Unlikely, the peak of the economy in Japan was in 1990; then, it started to continuously decline. Therefore, Japan decided to use the MBNQA framework to set up the Japan Quality Award (JQA) to improve their economic situation as well as Thailand. Thailand also adopted the MBNQA to help the Thai companies and businesses in Thailand improve their competitiveness. Prof. Dr. Prasit said that the quality system of their higher education is still based on IQA and EQ at that time. But they decided to adapt the MBNQA into the TQA. Thus, the framework of TQA was rewritten more in details. If they can follow this framework, it might improve the quality of their Faculty of Medicine.

In 2005, there was a team including Prof. Dr. Prasit who went to attend the ceremony of the MBNQA in Washington DC. The reason why they went there was to look at the six awardees, especially at Bronson Methodist Hospital which was the only one hospital that won this award. After coming back from Washington DC, MBNWA got confused among the management of their Faculty of Medicine whether or not they will continue using the IQA and EQA. If they decide to use this new one, there will increase a lot of workloads for everyone. They studied the framework in detail and held many workshops on TQA framework between 2006 and 2010. The main issue is to debate on whether using excellence framework on business and nonprofit or excellence framework on education or excellence framework on healthcare.

A patient that comes into the hospital is also a subject for education and research. If the QA framework is used on university hospitals, there would be no problem but in business, it would be seen as an unnecessary cost given that a hospital business could instead put the funds towards new equipment or sending their doctors to go abroad for training and experience.
If using only the MBNQA framework on the healthcare in the hospital, it is too difficult to do. However, if a QA framework on business is utilized; the application of the framework into the education needs to be held as well as the research and the hospital. If a patient has to stay longer in the hospital than initially thought, it means the medical staff is ineffective. Short-term hospital stay is one of the criteria used to evaluate the effectiveness of the hospital. But, for education, QA needs the patients to stay longer in the hospital to be the subjects for medical students, trainees and specialists to study and learn.

Finally, they decided to use the framework of business with three main missions in 2011: Education, Research and Hospital or Healthcare. All missions are shared resources. They decided to do it this way because there is always uncertainty on the results of the three main missions because of shared resources and also rapid changes of government policy, national budgeting system and technology. In order to reduce the uncertainty, they finally decided to use TQA with MBNQA. When they use the frameworks of TQA and MBNQA together, there are sub-financial factors. They have to make sure that they have enough budgets for not only running the center but also enough for education and research. They also have to think that whether or not there is enough money to improve the quality of institution, invest in staffs, nurses, and provide the faculty members scholarships.

Thus, there were some of them suggesting using the business framework. Another big reason that made them use those frameworks – rapid changes of ideas and regulations and norms, systems of the government; the system is also changed which is a problem. In other countries like Vietnam is also facing the same issue as Thailand in the past.

In the early step, they apply the TQA which now means equivalent to MBNQA. There are almost 16 thousand employees in the faculty. They cannot make all of them know about the TQA. Therefore, they start their early steps with the administrative team to make them understand the concepts of the TQA to lead the organization. They only tell the team what they are going to do without mention the term of TQA. Because it might make people feel they have more burdens if they mention about a new term to their team.

They understand how the Thai culture is and then they plan how they can move and deploy the concepts by proving the information of what they are going to do, without introducing any new term. Then, they set up the responsible committees and teams and have a regular Meeting to discuss on the organizational profile leadership for 6 months to see where they are and what the competency core of their organization is. Then, they move on the leadership, governance and social responsibility, strategy, how to develop and implement the strategy of the organization.

There are a lot of stakeholders and customers that they have to focus on, for example, medical students and parents, funding agents, etc. The measurement analysis and knowledge management is quite initially difficult at the faculty of medicine at the moment. They do not have a very good information obtained from those data. We have a lot of consultation, expertise both inside and outside country to select and manage the reliable data. They have a lot of data but not a good knowledge management, measurement and analysis. There is a strong culture and welfare management model at the faculty, which makes their workforce very competitive and strong, hence, it is easy to use this culture to drive people thoughts and works.

For operations, it is focused on how the organization designs, manages and improves key processes, work systems and work processes. As there are a lot of regular meeting to discuss on how the organization performs in terms of customer satisfaction, finances, human resources, supplier and partner performance, operations, governance and social responsibility, and how the organization compares to its competitors. Thus, the conclusion from the discussion related to those topics led to the design or revision of the management systems and operations which is implemented the management systems, operations, and followed up.
There will be meeting and discussion again if the results were not as expected. They have to run 3-4 cycles and loops before getting the results, the results were quite stable, consistent and getting better. It is nothing that can be done just only one cycle. More cycles and loops, more meetings to close the existing gaps and identify our new gaps. You have to do, plan, evaluate and look at the results whether or not they are as you expected. If not, you have to resolve and find another better way to finally get the stable results.

In 2016, they decided to apply the results they got to the TQA and later in earlier 2017, they finally obtained the TQA class. As they have also applied TQC in January of 2017, it brings them ten-page recommendations and make them realize that they still have a lot of works to do by running more cycles and loops and having more meetings and discussions to close the existing gaps and identify the new gaps; in order to make sure that they can provide the best services to their customers. Because quality is not a destination, but it is a journey of its approach.

**Q&A**

1) The medical education program has the six-year program and the national licensing examination in Thailand is also similar to the US?

2) For medical educational programs, we should follow the standard of the academy or the AUN-QA?

The medical education in Thailand is based on six-year program which can be divided into three separated periods. The first one is called pre-medical year (1st year). The second one is called pre-clinical year (2nd-3rd year). The last one is a clinical year (4th-6th year). For the national licensing examination, it is more or less the same as the US called National License Examination (NLE). The reasons that the hospital applies two systems into the medical education: Program Quality Award (WFME) and Thailand Quality Award (TQA). Because they are different but support each other. They have different pros and cons but when combining these two together. Using these two systems together enables the medical program management more effective in both terms of organization and curriculum systems. They allow the medical program to not only have a very good curriculum but can also produce good doctors as the expectation.

To decide which standard, you should follow for medical education program in your country; the first thing that you have to do is to define your expectation and its level. Your country should follow and apply the appropriate tools and ways that allow you to reach your expectations. For medical educational program in Thailand, Prof. Dr. Prasit explained that using only the MD from the US is not enough to make medical students in Thailand be on the international level because there was an announcement in the US that those obtained the MD will not be approved by the international level and can obtain the international standard. This will make the students not allowed to touch the patients in the US. To make sure that medical education curriculum reaches the international level; WFME was applied and used for the medical programs because it is global and not only used in a US system.
In this parallel session, Dr. Nguyen presented his experience on how to implement the AUN-QA framework to make the IQA system, how to apply the AUN-QA framework and also lessons that his team have learnt based on the case study at Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City (VNUHCM), Vietnam.

Dr. Nguyen started to explain that AUN-QA Framework is a very good tool that can help anyone in quality management in higher education institutions (HEIs). The framework has to be really logical and also stated in the guideline available for further review for everyone. It has three different steps: Functional, Systemic and Strategic QA. At VNUHCM, the framework is converted into criteria divided into two levels. The first one is the institutional level which has 25 criteria and more 111 sub-criteria for running the university. The second one is the program level; it has 10 criteria and 50 sub-criteria. Thus, learning outcome, programs, teaching and assessment are the first considered factors to be focused on; in order to start running the criteria.

Dr. Nguyen explained more in detail on how VNUHCM apply an AUN-QA tool in its QA system. Vietnam National University Ho Chi Minh City (VNUHCM) is not a normal single university; it has six-member universities. By 1995, the government of Vietnam stated the need of having universities; they decided to establish two national universities by merging the prestigious universities and VNUHCM was one of them.

Therefore, VNUHCM was founded in 1995 and consists of 6-member universities: University of Technology, University of Science, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, University of Information Technology, International University and University of Economics and Law, which are 1 school, 2 institutes and 30 affiliated units. Furthermore, there are 60,000 undergraduate students, 10,000 graduate students and 6,000 faculty members, researchers and administrators.
VNUHCM Organizational Structure

The organizational structure of VNUHCM can be divided into three major levels as shown in the diagram above. The first one called VNUHCM Board of Trustees. The second one is President and Vice Presidents with the supports from the strategic planning unit and academic council. The last one is under control of the president which consists of member universities and institute and affiliated organizations. Moreover, there are also functional departments responsible for providing support and help for the president such as academic affairs, human resources, external relations, etc.

The application of AUN-QA framework at VNUHCM

Dr. Nguyen continued to go in dept on how VNUHCM implements the AUN-QA within its structure. The development of quality assurance at VNUHCM which was begun in 1999. It was the year that VNUHCM become an AUN member. There was also the establishment of CETQA which takes control of monitoring the whole QA system of the VNUHCM. After 10-year implementation of AUN-QA, there were finally three programs of VNUHCM assessed by AUN-QA in 2009. The university staffs had more confidence in their self-assessment with a very high score of 4.92 points. Then, they decided to invite other external assessments to the QA system of the university

Clear statement of the AUN-QA assessor

Dr. Nguyen strongly marked up what the assessor had commented on their university assessment. The assessor clearly gave a lot of compliments to their programs; nonetheless, he pointed out that if they focus more on the clear connection between the learning outcomes and the curriculums, they will go even further because having only a good program without a good designing of the program is still not good enough to make an impact on the whole system. Therefore, everyone at VNUHCM realized that focusing on that improvement point; the program will be improved even more.

Due to the assessor’s comments by that time, it also made them realized that the external assessment really helps them to find out what they have to do. Thus, they started finding for the answer on how to connect the learning outcomes and curriculum together and finally found the CDIO learning approach.

Hence, they decided to find the way to develop the program by participating as a member of the CDIO in 2010. In addition, they also wrote the big proposals asking for support and collaboration from the government in learning to design their curriculum. They continuously have had a very big and long-term project until 2017. The long process makes them realized about the learning outcome. Without the clear statement of the AUN-QA assessor; they would not know the way to improve themselves. Therefore, this is another proof that the AUN-QA assessor is really helpful and makes them keep on doing the AUN-QA framework through the tool of AUN.
After that, VNUHCM was assessed again by AUN-QA in September 2017 on 38 programs and 1 institute which is the University of Technology. This made them become more confident in their IQA system. Therefore, they design the programs starting from making the learning outcomes to run teaching and learning assessments of the QA process. To be able to start the process; a clear system is required in the university.

**VNUHCM’s IQA System**

As VNUHCM already has a clear system as shown in the diagram below. There are three major sections of people in its IQA system: QA council, QA units and CETQA.

In the QA council, there are four of powerful people responsible for making authority to order the quality assurance procedure for anyone to follow: the president, the vice president, and the writers of the member university. The second section is the QA units, there are six of QA units; for example, there is a QA unit at faculty provided to help the council to overlook to another QA activities. The last important section is the center of education (CETQA). It is in control of coordination, monitoring and promoting of the QA procedure within the system.

**Process for Internal Quality Assessment**

When the staffs at VNUHCM start to run the process for Internal Quality Assessment. They start with the QA policy as shown in the diagram above. The QA policy will be stated by the QA council and
then it will be made into another step: a very clear plan for internal quality assessment. After that, they can perform their self-assessment done by member universities, and then assessment done by the CETQA assessment teams until they get assessment results from the assessment team and see whether or not the results meet the improvement expectation.

Dr. Nguyen explained that, in the past, the staffs did not know much about the QA. Thus, they asked the AUN-QA to provide training of their system. After they got a lot of clearer and better understandings. Therefore, there are a lot of competency building activities. There are more than 500 staffs attended internal training on AUN-QA for building good understanding of AUN-QA frameworks and also 50 staffs attended training held by AUN-QA, 16 staffs attended assessors training workshop by QAA and British Council for building up a network of trained and experienced internal assessors. In addition, there are also many annual workshops on QA in various themes such as IQA, student assessment, etc.

In terms of internal assessment, VNUHCM does both the internal and external assessments. There were 54 programs assessed internally and 38 programs externally by AUN-QA. At the beginning, there are always complaining. But after taking assessments, they have more understanding to run the programs better. They see clearer what their problems are. Thus, the internal assessment does help improve the quality of the programs.

The implementation of the AUN-QA framework at VNUHCM makes other universities become active about the assessment. Vietnam National University Hanoi has also been assessed on 21 programs with 6-member universities within its system.

Some achievements in quality assessment of VNUHCM

Based on the good foundation of the IQA system, VNUHCM is currently focusing on reaching in the more difficult criteria, at the moment, there were 2 programs accredited by the ABET which is a European accreditation. There were 38 programs assessed by AUN-QA, 7 programs awarded with EUR-ACE label Institutional accreditation. By the end of 2016, there were 5 member universities accredited by the Ministry of Education (MOET). Later in 2017, University of Technology was also accredited by HCERES and assessed by AUN-QA.

Factors that can make the IQA system stronger

Dr. Nguyen emphasized that it has been taking almost 20 years for them to achieve what they expected. He also pointed out that there are a lot of deciding factors that can make the IQA system stronger.

The most important thing is commitment, support and determination of the leaders. VNUHCM is lucky to have the system constantly focused on the IQA system. Once people are determined to do things. Then, they can create and write a good and effective quality policy. Thus, quality policy is another factor to be focused on; VNUHCM is the only one that has issued the policy of the QA.

Moreover, people have to have specific and feasible plan to make a specific focus on good resources and good examples and then let them run a small success to make other new programs follow those examples. People also need to have awareness and sense of responsibility in quality assurance.

Dr. Nguyen also stated that it is very crucial to provide trainings for leaders and administrators and academic staffs to have more knowledge, good communication and understanding about the procedure; for example, what PDCA is and for the context of VNUHCM, it is very crucial to understand the concepts of CDIO as well.

Lastly, instruments and forms are needed for the IQA system to collect the opinions for further quality control and management and self-assessment at each division. It is also needed to bring
appropriate mechanism and policy into real application and constantly maintain co-operation with domestic and international QA agencies.

Dr. Nguyen finally concluded that VNUHCM has regular internal and external assessments. Without efforts and consistency of everyone at the university as well as the Vietnamese government, they would not have come so far. Thus, AUN-QA is one of the effective tools that provide a complete mechanism for HEIs to build up or improve QA practice in a structured manner that are frameworks and guidelines for setting up and check, test and improve external quality assessment. Furthermore, the mechanism is well-fit in the ASEAN context and in alignment with international development. Therefore, to optimize the framework’s effectiveness, it is important that HEIs adopt and adapt them to fit their specific contexts.
In this part of the parallel session, Dr. Wahyuniati presented her talk on the Implementation Strategy of Indonesian National Qualification Framework Curriculum at Syiah Kuala University located at the Northwestern Indonesia.

Dr. Wahyuniati stated that “Change” is a big challenge and task to do in order to inspire and motivate people to make changes in new things as well as changes in curriculum development. It did take a lot of efforts to make the curriculum changed at Syiah Kuala University.

Syiah Kuala University was established in 1961 and was accredited by BAN-PT which is a National Product of Indonesia. In this university, there are 22,899 students and 1,491 lecturers with only 49 professors. There are 493 lecturers with doctoral degrees and 13 faculties. There are also 132 study programs. In 2015, it was mandate by the Ministry of Higher Education of Indonesia for implementing regulations of National Standard of Higher Education and Curriculum based on the Indonesian National Qualification Framework (IQF/ KKNI).

Dr. Wahyuniati believes that IQF or NQF is a neutral equalizer to see the quality system of the institution. Once the results come out, we can know what we have to improve in our curriculum based on learning outcomes. As mentioned by Dr. Wahyuniati, to make people gather together to make a change, it needs a lot of commitment and also some push. Therefore, the basic policy was declared to push people to do things at Syiah Kuala University.

Dr. Wahyuniati explained more in detail that to make sure that the outcomes will be as we expected. Firstly, it has to relate and refer to the university’s vision and mission. Secondly, it is required to do research of quality and documents. Thirdly, it is required to attract and get experts as well as academic committee to help us.
Dr. Wahyuniati stated that the curriculum is seen as a living document based on the need. After making some changes, Syiah Kuala University keeps talent and communication of the great experts to make sure that the curriculum development that they made are supported by a lot of tactical connections. It is also important to refer to the micro and macro mechanisms.

IQF is also one of the important framework to update the curriculum. As of now, SKU has 132 study programs. In one program, it does take time and money to apply the framework to the program. To change the curriculum, it is needed to be clear and based on the IQF which needs money support provided by the university. Moreover, they implement one curriculum for study program at the office, they do the check and review with all productive stuff to make sure that their document is good enough for further implementation to the students.

IQF has used 10 key policies for their curriculum development at Syiah Kuala University as followed:

1. University’s vision is needed to be well-defined: innovative, independent and reputable.
2. Quality documents of policy, standard and manual must be provided for further steps of implementation.
3. The implementation of the curriculum needs to be proceeded simultaneously.
4. There must be the involvement of experts, stakeholders, association and academic community to work and collaborate all together to reach the goal.
5. University has to provide funding for curriculum updating.
6. The policy needs to be supported by other foundations such as juridical foundation.
7. The implementation of one curriculum and study program must be authorized by rector.
8. The compulsory course must also refer to rector’s decree.
9. The implementation must be done by odd semester of academic year 2016/2017 at the latest.
10. Other technical items must refer to the curriculum, guidebook authorized by the rector.

In terms of objectives, there are three major objectives focused on the implementation of the Indonesian National Qualification Framework curriculum at Syiah Kuala University. The first objective is to make sure that every program has equal knowledge, equal perception about IQF and how to make a curriculum based on that IQF. The second one is to produce standard documents of curriculum, learning outcomes, semester learning plan, and evaluation method. The last objective is to produce curriculum’s coach in each study program. Because the university realizes that people tend to be naughty. Thus, coaching is required to be an instructor to observe and see how effective the lecturers have performed in the classes.

Methods and strategies

To finally implement the framework at this university, understanding in the whole methods and strategies is also important. At Syiah Kuala University, they started their process by issuing a guidebook which was screening by one special team at both internal and national level. After that, they issued the curriculum of the guidebook. Then, SKU used the guidebook for all curriculums and make them updated. Finally, SKU organized a lot of workshops in standard level and review the semester learning plan. There are a lot of workshops held both inside and outside of the university. For example, the activity focused on socialization of KKNI based curriculum of academic affair which the stakeholders played a role in this activity. Another example is the curriculum’s guidebook FGD which is a curriculum’s evaluator by using the guidebook to lead the documents and also to create and update the curriculum. They Syiah Kuala University plans to improve the evaluator of the curriculum based on the competency as there are a lot of different contents waiting to be reviewed.

Moreover, there has been organizing a lot of workshops for monitoring and evaluation to determine the instruments that the university needs such as workshops about teaching and learning. SKU has invite competent people to be observers to see how their lecturers teach and let the observers make an evaluation and give feedback back to the lecturers. This will allow the lecturers to see whether or
not the curriculum being used in the class is effective enough for our student learning outcomes. Furthermore, they also organize roadshows to keep inspiring and connecting with the evaluators that might feel tired and are not motivated to continue to do their tasks.

In terms of evaluation, there are 132 study programs at the university; one study program will be assessed by 2-3 evaluators. To be able to evaluate all the programs they have; therefore, they pick up the best one to show their study program and do in depth training for the push.

In conclusion, understanding, coaching and document understanding are what they have got from the whole process of implementation strategy of the Indonesian national qualification framework curriculum. Their understanding of the study programs become more concrete on the procedures and mechanisms of KKNI based curriculum formulation, learning outcomes, and semester study plan and evaluation method for all study programs. There is also coaching provided for curriculum development in each study program and also training provided for better understanding in documents which are 132 documents of updated curriculum based on IQF of KKNI-based curriculum.

After all the implementation process, Syiah Kuala University has successfully implemented the KKNI based curriculum. Therefore, Dr. Wahyuniati finally concludes that a good curriculum requires having a learning outcomes formula that gives a balance between scientific competences as well as the attitude components, knowledge, attitudes, general skills, and specific skills need to be accommodated in the curriculum as the mandate of KKNI. Dr. Wahyuniati also emphasized that it is required a lot of virtue for study programs and effort to make this accomplished. Another reason that made them successful is that they never wait for the vow to come, they just go out, find it, and make it done!
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Abstract:

This presentation will look at changes to the AUN-QA assessment model from version 2.0 to version 3.0. Summarized results of the assessments made will be presented, with comparisons made across country and field of study. Comparison among the assessment criteria and how well they have been achieved will also be presented. Issues on how version 3.0 can be further improved will then be raised to the audience and fellow assessors.

Dr. Tan Kay Chuan shows how the AUN-QA Version 2.0 and 3.0 are different with the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version 3</th>
<th>Version 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Expected Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>1. Expected Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Program Structure and Content</td>
<td>3. Program Structure and Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching and Learning Approach</td>
<td>4. Teaching and Learning Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Assessment</td>
<td>5. Student Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic Staff Quality</td>
<td>6. Academic Staff Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Staff Development Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support Staff Quality</td>
<td>7. Support Staff Quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is obvious that the number of assessment criteria in 2 versions are different; There are only 11 criteria in version 3.0 while version 2.0 has 15 criteria; Dr. Tan Kay Chuan believes that the higher the number of criteria, the more difficult the assessment can be conducted and the latest version of AUN-QA turns out to be more coherent with certain criteria in version 2.0 combined into a single criteria in version 3.0; for example; criterion no.6 and no.12 in version 2.0 are now combined in academic staff quality which is the criterion no. 6 in version 3.0. Criterion 14 and 15 in version 2.0 are combined as criterion 11 in version 3.0. The main purpose of such action is to strengthen the focus on the quality enhancement for the framework.

Overall Verdict Score Comparison

Another thing that should also be focused on is the largest and smallest difference sets in terms of new assessment; based on the figure above, it is clear that Program Structure and Content has a reduction of 0.25 points from version 2.0 to version 3.0 while Academic Staff Quality has an increase in ratings.

Moreover, the comparison analysis based on 3 participating countries; Indonesia, the Philippines and Vietnam has also been presented, between the 2 versions by showing the mean rating scores achieved in each criterion with highlight on the higher scores between the 2 versions. The overall ratings are higher in version 2.0. However, when it comes to each criterion consideration, it is also
aligned with the overall verdict score rating with the criterion 3 with the biggest decline and criterion 6 with greatest improvement.

However, it should also be noted that comparison between countries might not be that strong just yet because version 2 has been in force for at least 5 years while the new version has only been brought into implementation last year. The available data is the full-length for version 2 but only 1 year or even less for version 3. If the comparison is still deemed valid, one of the main trends to be focused on is to look at the highest and lowest number; showing which item the country in question is strong or weak at. For example; Vietnam has faced a decrease in program structure and content while the country gets higher ratings on the academic staff quality. Indonesia, on the other hand, has quite high ratings in different criteria with the score between 4 and 5. The score of 4.xx is quite an average but if any country can score an overall rating of 5, it can be viewed as a role model for other countries.

The session also goes further with the comparison at university and faculty level based on the AUN-QA in different version to show how the 2 versions are different in assessing and how these differences have an impact on the ratings.

Dr. Tan Kay Chuan has highlighted that this session is about all the numbers and it might cause certain difficulty to really understand and follow up on everything since there is hardly any significant difference or improvement in this version. However, working with the new model also helps the concerned parties to work more easily and conveniently. The AUN-QA version 3.0 is obviously a model with less criteria and this makes it a model people find easy to work with. It also offers more clarity for all parties involved and criteria are more coherent which can be regarded as a qualitative improvement while the model itself offers pure quantitative data for quality assurance framework.

**Q&A**

1) How do you find the challenges from changing from version 2.0 to version 3.0 and how to justify the version 3.0 is better?

2) The increased ratings or score of the AUN-QA framework might not have to be necessarily because of the different versions of AUN-QA but rather because of other factors in the context of the universities, themselves. How can we actually know that this version really improves with better ratings or it is actually because of the university?

3) Should version 2.0 and version 3.0 have the similar score?

4) Why don’t we look at SAR (self-assessment report) and use it to compare with the 2 versions?

The session has raised certain concerns on the transition from AUN-QA version 2.0 to version 3.0; whether the newer version is really better than the previous one and the changes in rating are really due to the new version or because of other factors.

Dr. Chuan pointed out that the 2 versions were built up in different context; version 2.0 focuses more on the quality development while version 3.0 is for the quality enhancement, and that they should not really be compared to each other. This is also a reason why certain criterions in version 2.0 are combined as 1 criterion where it is reasonable to do so in version 3.0. As for the ratings, version 2.0 uses 2 decimal number in the ratings given to each criterion but the decimal place is now omitted in version 3.0 except for the grand average ratings which offers more clarity and coherence.
to both assessor and the participating programs. Yet, it is difficult to realize the real quality based on the numbers as they only offer one side of the whole story.

As for other factors that could rather be more influential to the different ratings between the 2 versions than the frameworks, themselves, Dr. Chuan admitted that there are confounding factors in this study that cannot be controlled because this framework is based on the assumption that all programs assessed are at the similar level. However, when this assessment has been applied, different universities have their own way of dealing with things; some are very good at being assessed while some are only doing this kind of assessment for the first time and this is not something that can be controlled. Moreover, there is no data of such program which has been assessed by both version 2.0 and version 3.0 at the same time. There are certain programs which have been assessed with both versions 2.0 and 3.0 but they cannot really be compared to each other due to the difference in the time of assessing. Another factor that should be considered here is that the participating program is getting better and better and this is also something we do not have any control on.

Despite these issues, the AUN-QA framework of no matter which version should be more valid when comparing to the assessment result based on SAR. This is because it is obvious that most universities would give a high score for their own assessment either it is the program, faculties or even the university, itself. The assessor, on the other hand, would give more neutral score ratings which are usually lower than the result from SAR.

While the different versions of framework can cause confusion among different universities and participants, the comparison that can be drawn across faculties, countries, university between the 2 versions are still useful and beneficial for the whole region. These comparisons and differences offer an overview of higher education in the region as well as a general finding on which country, university or program is strong or weak at which criterion. This can be an example of the beneficial points of developing version 2.0 to version 3.0.

AUN-QA always continually improves the standards of work and we are now even looking into developing version 4.0. For this, it would be best if there is a full set of assessment to look at the AUN-QA system; to include a survey from all programs assessed asking the assessors on how they feel about the assessment to really get a full picture of AUN-QA in making assessment for the past years.
Institute of Technology Bandung (ITB) is one of the oldest institutions in Indonesia. It was formerly known as Technische Hoogeschool (TH) and offers a wide range of disciplines in many fields with a strong focus on technological and engineering programs. The institution offers different academic programs; 49 bachelor programs, 52 master programs and 26 PhD programs.

ABET stands for the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology and was founded in 1932. It is a federation of 35 professional engineering and technical societies; IEEE, ASCE, ASME, AIChE, CSAB and such with 4 commissions; Engineering Accreditation Commission (EAC), Technology Accreditation Commission (TAC), Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC) and Applied Science Accreditation Commission (ASAC). ABET has accredited programs both within and outside the United States.

In order to get ABET Accreditation, a university program has to be evaluated to assure that it meets the quality standards as well as criteria set by ABET. The main elements for such accreditation are the process of establishing objectives and outcome, assessment of achievement (objectives and outcomes) as well as continuous improvement. There are 9 criteria with 8 of them regarded as common criteria while one of them is specific to the program being accredited.

The main philosophy of ABET comprises of 2 loops of process with a focus on the Program Education Objectives (PEO) and Program Outcomes. The emphasis of the first loop is on defining the PEO and find out on how to get to the data which will be used to evaluate the objectives. Similarly, in the second loop with its focus on the outcomes, the university has to define the program outcomes as well as the curriculum that supports those outcomes and how to assess them through data collection method and to follow-up for continuous improvement.

The PEO should be aligned with the institutional mission and visions and measurable and there should be an established process to review and update those PEOs; something that could tell the university that they have already met their objectives. The program outcomes developed based on those objectives must meet with those of ABET to be accredited. The methods to assess those
outcomes as well as the result of such assessment must be documented. The program, itself, needs to incorporate the outcomes as well as the assessment methods and the assessment process and plan should be set out for the period of 3-5 years with continuous improvement as per ABET philosophy.

Institute of Technology Bandung (ITB) has implemented certain strategies to get ABET Accreditation and these strategies are shared in the session. The main strategies are to establish the Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) and External Quality Assurance (EQA) that complements each other based on different frameworks such as ABET, ASIIN, JABEE, etc., and to shift the institute’s curriculum paradigm to be Outcomes Based Education (OBE), Learner Centered Education (LCE) with certain focus on the continuous improvement and also with international accreditation and benchmarking incorporated.

Based on the OBE Business process which can be referred to below, the university has made the PEO consistent with the university’s vision and mission with a measurable quality. They are also developed in alignment with the international accreditation agency and benchmarking as well as Indonesian Qualifications Framework. These objectives are like the foundation from which the programs outcomes are defined and used to develop the curriculum. The students would go along with the curriculum and through the outcomes assessment the result of which will be reviewed and analyzed for further improvement.

These PEOs and learning outcomes are set out to be consistent with ABET criteria and to be measurable. This is because they need to be quantitatively measured and reported for continuous improvement through several reviews and adjustments. These are executed in combination with the consistent implementation of OBE and CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement).

Dr. Arifin also shared the lessons learned for the successful ABET Accreditation with the audience. The institution would need full engagement from the whole faculty throughout the assessment activities and process. The process of such assessment should also be made as simple as possible to avoid difficulties in execution. It is also important to develop a high-quality assessment plan, so that
there would not be too much and redundant assessments. They key success, is believed to be the course and outcome assessment plan design. The plan also needs to be implemented and reviewed consistently as well as the direct assessment of student work. The assessment result should also be accurate for further review and continuous improvement.

Additionally, Dr. Arifin has also highlighted contribution of stakeholders to put an emphasis on the engagement of the whole faculty being assessed since there are different contributions from each stakeholder that play an important role in achieving the accreditation. For instance, faculty staffs need to understand the standards and the criteria they must meet; the program chair must understand the whole procedure and plays a leading role in developing the curriculum based on OBE approach; and even the Dean, himself, can also provide support in many aspects.

**Q&A**

1) Can you tell us about the direct or indirect assessments set up for each outcome?

An assessment plan and a good methodology have to be chosen to assess each outcome; direct and indirect measurement/assessment; this methodology needed to be set up before doing assessment. The direct assessment is usually used with those outcomes directly defined by the program while the indirect assessment is used with other elements.
Thu Dau Mot University has about 17,000 students and offers both post-graduate and undergraduate programs. The university has become the CDIO member in 2015, Associate AUN Member in 2017 and has passed the National Education Accreditation Standard in 2017.

The presentation is mainly to share how to achieve and assure the quality and to improve continuously based on the approach of AUN-QA standards through the application of CDIO (Conceive Design Implement Operate) initiatives. Thu Dau Mot University has faced certain problems in getting assessment at its program level and wanted to adjust and improve the programs, so they have brought the CDIO into application to really get the program re-designed for the required standard in terms of quality assurance. CDIO helps the university to design and revise the curriculum as well as provide philosophy and framework for them to be applied in their curriculum to be assessed by the AUN-QA framework.

CDIO Design and Process has been introduced with a brief description of the overall process. This can also be referred to the following figure. With CDIO, the university starts with defining the learning outcomes based on the CDIO syllabus, the university’s vision and missions as well as other learning outcomes already exist in the program and conduct a survey with the stakeholders as well as meeting with the professionals from different disciplines concerned where possible. Based on the analysis and result of the survey as well as other relevant, the curriculum is restructured to be an integrated curriculum which has its own learning outcomes, teaching and learning activities as well as assessment method. With the new curriculum, we also seek feedback from the teachers and students for further improvement to the curriculum.
CDIO has assisted the university to achieve pedagogical design for the curriculum with the theory of having learning outcomes and teaching approach and assessment and evaluation aligned with one another in a constructive fashion. For the learning outcomes, the university has chosen to follow the approach of CDIO syllabus with a focus on disciplinary knowledge, personal and professional skills, interpersonal skills as well as CDIO skills. The university has made a big move from directive instruction to learning-centered instruction. The new approach promotes collaborative learning and it can help students to understand certain issues through collaborative actions in different context. Learning by doing has become very important for the students; they have to work in teams on different projects to learn through their experience. With the assessment, the university has adopted the criterion-referenced assessment with a strong focus on the validity, reliability and efficiency when designing assessment plans for the students. Moreover, other assessment approaches such as product-based assessment, and performance-based assessment have also been integrated into the assessment approach of the university to ensure the assessment result is diagnostic, formative and summative.

In order to promote learning-centered instruction and achieve the CDIO framework, the university staff is also a key factor. Therefore, the university has also developed competency framework for their professionals with emphasis on learning design, and professional, instructional, assessment and technological skills. All of these are also aligned with the international standards and AUN-QA and CDIO framework as well as the university’s goals. There are different ways of developing the university staffs; face-to-face training, online training and blended learning. The staffs are required to apply what they have learned through these training in their practices and share the experience with their colleagues. Certain models have been employed for the professional development scheme. The workshop model of ISW (Instructional Skills Workshop) is an example of what the university has been implementing in this regard. The model requires the professional to achieve certain things in training and bring what they have learned into practice and share it with their colleagues in order to improve their professional practice.

Some of the changes university have seen since the implementation of CDIO have also been presented. First of all, students are more active in the learning process. The course is now integrated to support the CDIO initiative rather than theory-oriented. Learning outcomes are now determined by the feedback from the future employer from different industry. Assessment is more informative; different skills are being assessed with different kinds of assessment rather than focusing on conducting a knowledge test.
Q&A

1) Do you find any complication when you have to go through the AUN-QA framework and the CDIO?

Based on the case of Thu Dau Mot University, the two frameworks actually share a lot of things in common and they can be mixed very well. The university does not find any difficulty in using CDIO to design their curriculum. Both frameworks share the outcome-based principles in education as well as the constructive alignment. It can also be said that the CDIO helped the university to design the curriculum, teaching approach and the assessment plan for their students while making it easier for them to achieve AUN-QA.
The speaker has overseen the process of program assessment at multiple levels and for the case of Mahidol University, outcome-based education is also one of its main goals which can also be seen in the motto “true success is not the learning, but in its application to the benefit of mankind”. The programs available at the university have already incorporated such motto in the program designing process and Dr. Onparn believes that there should not be a problem for applying AUN-QA or CDIO framework with the university programs.

Most of the university’s programs have been deployed for a very long time which means the university can get information from many stakeholders; alumni, employer and such, to develop outcome-based education. However, in the practical world, the university has only used the AUN-QA framework recently in the past few years. This presentation will share the experience from applying AUN-QA framework into the Faculty of Science programs for 3 years.

Faculty of Science offers a total of 46 programs; 12 bachelor’s programs with 6 of the programs delivered in Thai language and the rest as international programs, 17 international Master and 17 international Ph.D. programs. The programs taught in Thai did face certain issues in applying the regional and international quality assurance framework such as AUN-QA. This can also be a lesson for those delivering teaching in their own language apart from English. However, we have managed to go through the framework with 2 of the Thai programs being currently in the stage of compiling the SAR in the framework and one of the programs has already come up with the English version of such report.
AUN-QA Version 2 was firstly implemented in 2015; it was the very first time that the faculty has learned that the university aimed to use AUN-QA at the faculty and program level. The faculty, had, then, already applied for using the AUN-QA framework in the whole program instead of the framework of Thailand’s Office of Higher Education Commission (OHEC). The Commission granted permission for the university to use AUN-QA as the Internal Quality Assurance system and that is why AUN-QA has been applied in all Mahidol University’s programs.

Only version 2.0 was available for us at that time and with the lack of workforce and certified personnel as an assessor; there was not even the university’s own program that offers the kind of training, the faculty had adopted the framework as a checklist instead. In 2016, AUN-QA version 3.0 was already available and the faculty decided to use this new version of AUN-QA as its IQA framework. This is partly because there were differences at the program level and the faculty level as well. Some staffs and program committee have certain qualifications but do not have experience in using the AUN-QA framework at that level yet. The Faculty, then, opted for certain programs to use a brief version of AUN-QA template internally developed by the Faculty of Science. However, some of the programs are quite advanced and they can even write a full report based on the given guidelines of the framework. By the year of 2017, most programs can supply the university with a full and complete SAR.

Moreover, the university also has system in place to apply the framework for the whole university. Self-assessment has been done for all the programs since 2016. In the same year, the Faculty of Science has also completed assessment with AUN-QA framework at its program level within the Faculty and Mahidol University has also provided the system to achieve AUN-QA framework at the university level too. The Faculty has got some assessors; partly from the AUN-QA and partly from the internally trained AUN-QA assessors to assess the programs and the current progress can also be summarized as per the table below.

Based on the table, the Faculty has already completed the university’s AUN-QA framework’s assessment while the university, itself, is still in the process. However, there is also the national framework of CUPT (The Council of University President of Thailand) which allows university programs in Thailand to apply for national assessment, but the faculty would rather move from the university level to international framework of AUN-QA instead.

As for the assessors involved in the site-visit for internal assessment at the faculty level, Dr. Onparn has drawn a summary on the assessor team comprises of assessors with different qualifications. Most importantly, the team also has to have an AUN-QA assessor and the faculty has only started to have sufficient assessors trained by Mahidol University; currently about 20 internal AUN-QA assessors, to pay a site visit for the assessment of the Faculty.
The timeline for the Faculty assessment by AUN-QA is as per above. The Faculty is currently working on the committee set up and expects to provide the Feedback report by the end of August; the report can be prepared by the program and the department can use the feedback report to adjust the strategy for further development and the new version of the strategic plan will be submitted by the end of this year. The cost of all the internal quality assessment is around 100,000 Baht per year and it takes a pool of 60 assessors with a total of about 300+ man-hours to complete the whole process.

The Faculty has also conducted an after-action review to find out about the key success factors of its internal assessment and a friendly atmosphere seems to contribute to the success of the assessment significantly since the internal assessment also involves assessing the staffs and colleagues and such atmosphere can provoke better engagement from all stakeholders. This element should always be at the center of assessment since they can give relevant feedback for a continuous improvement in quality assurance.

In conclusion, the Faculty has successfully deployed the internal quality assurance and decided to terminate one of the programs which do not seem to do well in the outcome-based education system and develop a new program based on the AUN-QA framework. The Faculty has also successfully got one of the programs assessed by the AUN-QA. There is also a challenge in the dual degree program assessment since this kind of program is delivered though a collaboration with other university. Moreover, the Faculty will have to continuously improve its internal quality assurance’s efficiency and effectiveness.

Q&A

1) What are the most challenging things in implementing AUN-QA framework version 2.0 and 3.0?
2) Is version 3.0 of AUN-QA better and easier to use than version 2.0?
3) What criteria did you find problematic when implementing the AUN-QA version 3.0?
As the session is about sharing hands-on experience in implementing AUN-QA framework, the discussion mostly focuses on the challenge and problems in such implementation and as the speaker had been through both versions of AUN-QA framework, certain comparison has also been raised during the discussion.

The major problem at the very beginning of such implementation is the lack of knowledge and understanding of the AUN-QA framework; it was the first time the staff heard about such framework. The Faculty, then, decided to take a small step to create a checklist based on the criteria of the framework. The staffs were asked whether they can answer certain questions on the checklist or not or even if there is any proven evidence in such criteria that can be provided to answer that question. That was how the Faculty started with the AUN-QA framework; there was not even scoring or rating at the time. After that, there was a site visit from the AUN-QA and further consultation has been conducted. Later in the year of 2016 and 2017, the Faculty had managed to have their own assessors trained by Mahidol University’s Quality Development Division which means that they can give the score and value-added feedback for the program to improve in the future. That was how the Faculty executed and dealt with the lack of knowledge and experience. These challenges are also a reason why the brief AUN-QA guideline had been implemented first.

Another problem that the faculty has faced implementing the framework is to deal with the criteria which are directly concerned with the program itself. This is a reason why the program committee and program chair will have to improve. For the rest of the criteria, they are already supported by the Faculty; the staffs have been helping each other to develop understanding and improving the quality of teaching and learning process.

As for the version 3.0, the speaker commented that it is more concise in terms of number of the criteria and coherent in terms of the alignment with the assessment. It also makes sense to really combine certain criteria together especially when there are both a self-assessment and an assessor’s assessment along the way.
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Abstract:

Getting the AACSB accreditation is a journey that requires commitment, endurance, diligence, and resilience from the Faculty and University, in addition to financial and human resources support. In this session, we would like to share our experience working towards obtaining the AACSB accreditation. We will begin by highlighting the importance of getting AACSB accreditation. Subsequently, the journey taken will be described. This includes analysing the current situation in terms of academic staff, students, academic programs and other criteria (standards) imposed by AACSB. After identifying what we have, we then proceeded by determining what needs to be improved as well as articulate strategies and action plans to ensure we meet the AACSB standards. We hope that this session would be useful for other universities seeking AACSB accreditation.

What is AACSB?

AACSB stands for Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business; it is one of the most internationally recognized accreditation body in the world for business program. AACSB provides internationally recognized accreditation for business and accounting programs at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral level.

The AACSB Accreditation Standards challenge post-secondary educators to pursue excellence and continuous improvement throughout their business programs. For now, less than 5% of the world's 13,000 business programs have earned AACSB accreditation.

The process of getting the AACSB is:

1. Examine the standards
2. Ascertain the current situation
3. Determine what needs to be improved
4. Articulate strategies and action plans to ensure standards are met
5. Plan continuous improvement

Accreditation standards:

- **Strategic Management and Innovation**
  - Standard 1: Mission, Impact, Innovation
  - Standard 2: Intellectual Contributions, Impact, and Alignment with Mission
  - Standard 3: Financial Strategies and Allocation of Resources

- **Participants – Students, Faculty, and Professional Staff**
  - Standard 4: Student Admissions, Progression, and Career Development
  - Standard 5: Faculty Sufficiency and Deployment
  - Standard 6: Faculty Management and Support
  - Standard 7: Professional Staff Sufficiency and Deployment

- **Learning and Teaching**
  - Standard 8: Curricula Management and Assurance of Learning
  - Standard 9: Curriculum Content
  - Standard 10: Student-Faculty Interactions
  - Standard 11: Degree Program Educational Level, Structure, and Equivalence
  - Standard 12: Teaching Effectiveness

- **Academic and Professional Engagement**
  - Standard 13: Student Academic and Professional Engagement
  - Standard 14: Executive Education
  - Standard 15: Faculty Qualifications and Engagement

Importance of AACSB accreditation

Students: ensuring students receive a quality education by meeting high academic standards; the students can evaluate a school’s educational quality easily; demonstrating that a business school meets the high standards; guaranteeing that the students are applying for a quality degree; giving students more access to recruiters. There is an increase in numbers of international students for postgraduate level; by being a member of AACSB, we get database access, international recruiter looking for our graduates.

Employers: sending a message to potential employers on the reputation of the school in general; candidate from FBA, UM graduated with an accredited degree—meaning candidates are also high standards; accreditation requires constant and periodic improvement to the curricular – the students’ skills are relevant to the real world; no question on the validity of the degree especially International recruiters.

FBA: increase the quality of business and accountancy programs; constant improvement in the curricular; increase reputation internationally; better chance in hiring and retaining best professors and researchers; attracting more quality international students; and serves the public interest.

In conclusion, in addition to financial and human resources support, the keys to apply for the AACSB are: commitment, endurance, diligence, and resilience from the Faculty and University. The driving force is needed, at least one person to encourage the team when the proposal has been rejected/turned down.
Q&A

1) What is the cost of the accreditation activity and if other frameworks were used, would the same benefit be achieved?

2) What does accreditation actually give and is it a good balance with the investment?

The cost was about 200-300 USD for the fee and also for attending seminars within the 7 years period. Any business school with A1 Triple Crown such as London business school has AMBA; it is for MBA program initially but now AMBA has already expanded to other programs. AACSB is an institutional accreditation but AMBA is a program. For EQUIS, it is going toward more on internalization; although they have the same elements, but the way data is presented is different. The internalization of EQUIS is more important than the other two; it needs a lot of work and time consuming. After the University of Malaya got the AACSB, there are more international students applied for the PhD programs, in research methodology in PhD level, there are only 5 are Malaysian, the rest are international students because international students are looking for international accreditation before applying for the courses.
The concept of internationalize the curriculum is to design the curriculum for both domestic students as well as foreign students; the content, assessment, teaching and learning activities being internationally oriented; it is to prepare students to work in an international and multicultural context, considering internalization at home and outbound student mobility.

In internationalization of curriculum design, the requirement of professional practice and citizenship; assessment of student learning; and systematic development across the program, are at institutional, regional, national and global level. To internationalize the curriculum, there are 4 groups of reasons: political, economic academic and cultural/social. Political is to concern on institution and country’s position in the world; economic is how institutions/programs contribute to human and financial resources for the country; academic is to develop, enhance and achieve international academic standards in research, teaching and learning; and cultural/social development concentrates on the role of the country’s own culture and language.

There are cases in Asia indicating the improvement in higher education:

*China and Japan:* Focus on foreign language and linguistic – in recent years, there are a lot of programs with international subjects. In *China* particularly, there are 486 international programs focusing on interdisciplinary programs. While in *Singapore*, the programs focus on domestic
students’ value and attributes, the subjects include: intercultural awareness and engagement; an international competitive edge; and global citizenship. In Thailand, policy makers have developed the strategies toward ASEAN regional hub through the students exchange program, currently with Indonesia and Malaysia for higher education. For Vietnam, the ministry of education and training has encouraged Vietnamese higher education institutions to build up and expand relationships with international organizations and foreign institutions.

The internationalization of education management for master degree, for example, Harvard graduate school of education provides education policy and management program (EPM) that prepare for the graduates to lead the organization and initiatives that will create the 21st Century systems of education. In Melbourne, the MEM course integrates practical knowledge, conceptual frameworks and state of the art research with a global perspective. The King’s College in London aims to build and invest in strategic partnership with world-class institutions to enrich the students’ experiences, increase the global impact of research and reach new international communities. Whereas, Mahidol University, Thailand: proposed the program to emphasize on the understanding of the ways of life and cultures of other ASEAN countries and global community.

The global learning outcomes are to develop graduates to obtain global awareness and intercultural competent; having global perspective which is the ability to conduct a multi-perspectives analysis of local, global, international and intercultural problems; and the graduates should have global engagement which is the willingness to engage in local, global, international and intercultural problem-solving skill.

Above is the performance assessment and indicator to internalize the higher education that are being used.

The conceptualization of internationalization of curriculum and quality assurance is as followed in the diagram below:
1) The rationale of internalizing the curriculum, regarding choice of the university. Should we start to internalize the curriculum or not? If we start – what do we want?

2) What is the effect of students’ mobility?

3) What are the challenges of internalization?

To enhance the curriculum can be done by being recognized by other countries; the institutions should start with the questions: what are the needs, readiness and resources of the university. The faculty may not have experience in the initial stage, therefore to encourage the professors to go abroad to learn from other universities can help. Professors themselves and the support from the policy level are the resources that will help developing the universities. To implement or develop any internalized curriculum; it can be very challenging, both inside and outside university. University wanted to do one thing but may not have enough resources i.e. experts, recruitment from other countries. The issue could be whether the graduates would want to be the educators or not and moreover how to keep them as a valuable resource in the country.
A study conducted by VNU-INFEQA in 2015 focusing on the employment of VNU graduates in 2014, indicated that 84% of graduates are employed within the 6 months after graduation; however, less than 40% had jobs that are relevant to their majors.

This is the internal quality assurance at VNU; the VNU accreditation council is reported directly to the VNU Board of Presidents and VNU institute for education quality assurance is responsible of all the quality assurance office include: affiliated schools; VNU member universities; and research
institutes, training and research center offices. Those offices are also directly under the VNU board of Presidents.

The research on alumni survey was conducted in 2016 at VNU, Hanoi, through phone and e-mail; the purpose of the survey is to explore the relevant level of the knowledge, skills and competencies of VNU graduates with the requirements of their current jobs through the perspective of VNU 2015-2016 alumni cohort. The Questionnaire includes 23 items (of which 10 items are about knowledge and skills), corresponding to the report requirements of alumni survey requested in the document by the Ministry of Education and Training.

The survey included the percentage of relevance knowledge: general theoretical knowledge; major-related specific knowledge and skills; and major related practical knowledge. Most of the trained skills do not meet the graduates’ job requirements; they are not very confident about their practical skills either. The 5 skills that the graduates are expected to achieve after graduation are: analysis, synthesis, creativity, independence, teamwork and communication skill.

In conclusion, using alumni satisfaction as one of the sources to improve quality in higher education is a QA approach to explore the gap between labor market and higher education. Data from two member universities of Vietnam National University Hanoi supported previous researches and also suggested to be a significant source for program assessment. Alumni’s experiences and satisfaction in all areas of education provided comprehensive assessment in terms of quality of professors and departments; as well as to student experiences include: campus life, extra-curricular activities, and technology resources. This procedure is an inseparable part of the IQA system to analyze whether or not a program is sufficiently aligned with the competencies needed in the labor market. The survey was an effective linkage between academia and the labor market, as confirmed in UNESCO survey. The survey results from graduate students in 2015-2016 indicated above 90% of graduates are employed after graduation. However, a high proportion of graduates are unsatisfied with the knowledge that the programs provided to them (Basic theoretical knowledge; specific knowledge; relevant practical knowledge); the skills that they are supposed to acquire through their studies indicated a large gap between job market and education at Higher Education institutions.

Although, the survey has given the VNU the idea on the graduates and employment, there is a limitation when the survey was conducted. It cannot give an in-depth understanding on how each skill and type of knowledge influenced the work performance of graduates; the future research will be on the graduates’ employability for a better understanding of this study.
C3:

**English Language Level of Supporting Staff: An Analysis via AUN-QA Scope**

By Ms. Surakarn Yoovathaworn
Administrative and Clerical Division, Office of the Dean, Faculty of Science, Mahidol University, Thailand

All of Mahidol University, Faculty of Sciences (MUSC)’s Master and PhD Programs are international programs. In the past, academic staffs that are members of the program committee handled most communication between students and the staff in English, but nowadays, supportive staffs also need to communicate well in English. An English language need of support staff existed long before the establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community, and is perceived by the supporting staff to be important and require improvement.

Research objective is to profile and analyze the current English Proficiency level of the supporting staff working in the area related to AUN-QA. The result from this study was expected to serve as a situation analysis and serve as an input for future human resource planning. For research methodology, the sample size of 123 supportive staff of Faculty of Science, Mahidol University
(altogether 236 persons) in the following areas: T/L R&S, general services and IT infrastructure. The data of TOEIC score is used for the analysis and descriptive statistics is used as a procedure.

The result of the analysis can be concluded as: the staff in the T/L R&S could be considered more ready for international situations than most staff in the general services and infrastructure group. Although, there were also a few talented persons within the sample population whose scores were higher than 780 and were able to execute good command in English but due to the expanded scope of work for general administration officers, staff development plans were also expected.

Mahidol University strategy (last until 2019) is to set the English language requirement beforehand; the university no longer states direct requirements or needs for English Language or internationalization. However, the strategy indirectly includes the need for English language. Strategy #3 (Excellence in outcome-based education for globally-competent graduates): one of the KPI is the percentage of programs accredited with AUN-QA and Strategy #4 (Excellence in management for sustainable organization): the staff of the university must be able to fulfill their duties whether in terms of quality or quantity.
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The world is currently moving into the digital age. From the industrial revolution to today’s industry 4.0, there has been changes caused by the technological advancement and innovation either it is the supercomputer, artificial intelligence, robotic development or even genetic engineering, they all have certain impact on the global sphere in different aspects. One of the most important aspects that can be related to higher education is the changes in the type of workforce in the global economy.

To underpin the notion and the impact of technological changes and innovations, Dr. Anis had mentioned the 12 disruptive technologies that will transform one’s life as well as the global economy based on the information from McKinsey Global Institute’s research in 2013. These technologies can be listed as follows:

1. Mobile Internet
2. Automation of Knowledge Work
3. The Internet of Things (IoT)
4. Cloud Technology
5. Advanced Robotics
6. Autonomous and near-autonomous vehicles
7. Next-generation Genomics
8. Energy Storage
9. 3D Printing
10. Advanced Materials
11. Advanced Oil and Gas Exploration and Recovery
12. Renewable Energy
These technologies have an impact on jobs; while it created huge impact on employment, history also shows that another significant impact is sector shifts in employment. Digital technologies are predicted to create 3.7 million new jobs in the next 7 years with the majority lies in the service sector and by the year of 2030, 75-375 million people will have to switch their jobs; mostly from manufacturing sector to service sector which can be challenging for many countries. This can also be reflected by the situation in Indonesia and the performance of big companies worldwide even the companies on the Fortune 500, half of which had disappeared since the year of 2000.

Technological advancements are altering the global scape, and the education sector, particularly higher education is facing challenges in preparing students for this industrial revolution 4.0. The higher education is also important to achieve Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This is can also be seen in the current situation of the global education as Irina Bokova, (Director-General of UNESCO) had stated that enrolments in higher education have increased fivefold in less than 40 years and it is also estimated that that demand would expand from less than 100 million students in 2000 to over 250 million students in 2025. One of the main targets in quality education is to ensure that all people regardless of their sex, race, region, disability, nationality, ethnic of origin are entitled to quality education. Especially in the context where technological advancement has an impact on the global level, it is necessary to ensure that everyone can have access to quality education and can continue to learn, adapt and apply relevant technologies to the dynamic learning and work environment as well as re-adjust themselves to cultural, economic, political and social advancements in the ever-changing world in a dynamic learning environment. Many countries are also trying to create peaceful, just, fair and creative society and this can only be achieved with equal access to quality education at every level.

However, the social infrastructure has failed to adapt quickly to the technological advances and their influence on work and social life. This would certainly trigger a variety of new problems related to the nation’s competitiveness at global level. Since 1980s until today, innovation and quality learning play important roles in dealing with those changes. Innovative technologies have been enabling education for more than 80 years in improvement of skills and effectiveness between learners and teachers. In addition, innovations and quality learning will have to assure that everyone has the basic rights in developing himself/herself through education, acquiring benefits from science, technology, arts and culture to improve their quality of life.

To be able to carry out innovation and to implement programs of quality learning, some related initiatives to higher education should be made. Therefore, it is essential to re-work the present education systems to create an adaptable and flexible system that promotes education for the 4.0 industrial revolution and beyond. For Indonesia, itself, the government has set some policies to promote the quality of higher education to cope with this industrial revolution 4.0. The policy focuses on curriculum reorientation, hybrid/blended learning & online learning, lifelong learning development through universities and promotion of internationalization and connectivity.

As technologies have become an important part of our daily life, the increasing need of big data and the emergence of the Internet of Things (IoT) boosts up the demand for hybrid jobs. As the technologies drive us to become even more connected, there will be a need for professional in almost every job to apply certain technological knowledge to their jobs. This brings us to an even higher demand for the new literacy and subject such as coding, big data analysis and management as well as those concerned with the artificial intelligence. Therefore, the higher education should anticipate the students for the needs of data literacy, technology literacy and human literacy. The human literacy integration in the new literacy and subjects can be referred to in case of Apple when Steve Jobs stated that technology, alone, is not enough, Apple seeks something that is “technology married with the liberal arts, married with the humanities” the result of which can make “our hearts sing”. 
It is important to focus on Information and Communication Technology (ICT) and future technologies. Phenomenal transformation in information and communication technologies have enabled people to connect with each other around the world from anywhere at any time. This has contributed to an intensified perception and reality of being interconnected and living beyond local sphere.

The rapid development of ICT can also be leveraged in the education sector; it offers an opportunity for quality learning with high connectivity and accessibility. An adaptable and flexible education system can also be developed to ensure lifelong affordable quality learning. In case of Indonesia, the potential to apply ICT-based learning in higher education is very high. More than half of the total populations are already connected to the internet and the time spent on the internet is very high; almost twice of those in the United States. Most of the populations probably have more than one mobile device.

It is obvious that people spend more and more of their time on the internet and this is a strong message that should be taken into consideration to integrate ICT into higher education system. ICT can make teaching and learning more effective; it provides different opportunities to make learning more fun and enjoyable. It can improve engagement, knowledge attention and create collaboration. The key benefits for the main stakeholders; students, employers and governments can also be referred to in the presentation of Dr. Anis.

ICT has, undoubtedly, changed and would continue to change the learning process of higher education. ICT-based learning has become a catalyst for innovation and quality learning; many ICT products have already been used to serve in the current education system such as teleconference, email, audio conference, television lessons, radio-broadcast, interactive radio conference etc. The process of education using ICT can be classified into E-learning, instant learning, blended learning and online learning. These processes can solve issues like affordability of tuition fee, limited teaching staffs and the increasing number of students. They are also the most convenient way to pursue a degree in higher education. The ICT-based learning can be categorized by its online portion into 3 types; web-enhanced learning, blended or hybrid learning and online learning.

Dr. Anis also shares a couple of examples of the latest innovations which have been getting a lot of attention lately; Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC) and Virtual Reality (VR) & Augmented Reality (AR). While MOOC allows participants a free access to any course of their interest, VR & AR offers an opportunity to finally connect both teachers and learners which make the class with these elements more transformational and engaging. The former played as a facilitator in the transitioning of education from the traditional courses to online learning arena which also increases learners’ access to an equal lifelong learning. The latter, on the other hand, offers changes in the learning process since VR & AR are equipped with the ability to connect reality and digital content which means students and teaching staffs have more options to pursue their roles in higher education.

As the final part of Dr. Anis’ lecture, an example of Universitas Indonesia had been mentioned to give a clearer picture and share an experience in the application of ICT based learning.

The university has an ultimate goal to provide equal access to quality teaching and learning to the people of Indonesia to achieve global compatibility which is quite a daunting task for the university and the county; especially when considering the fact that the limited resources and financial difficulty of people in getting quality education are still the country’s major issues. In this regard, the university has set some strategies to broaden access to the community to achieve lifelong learning and education. These strategies put an emphasis on the initiatives for implementing ICT in learning process.

The strategies are two-fold; outward and inward strategies. For the outward strategy, the key is to extend learning access to the people of Indonesia. For this strategy, Online Distance Learning (ODL)
or MOOC are proven to be the most realistic options in extending learning access across all the regions. This strategy is also initiated partly because of the increased interest in learning and higher education. For the inward strategy, ICT is used to implement Flipped Classes, which are considered as a suitable mixed learning approach which can be considered the first full student-centered learning where more students engage in active learning in comparison with the traditional class. With flipped class strategy, students can enquire about the lecture content as well as apply such knowledge and interact with one another to conduct hands-on activities during the workshop which is the class time in traditional context. The students can watch, rewind, fast-forward the lecture as per their desire and they will also get a chance to improve their IT literacy as well.

Universitas Indonesia does not use the outward strategy only with the university students, but the university also extends such learning access in both domestic and international level as Online Education Resources (OER) in the form of MOOCs for public audiences, Online Credit Earning Programs for international students and Online Distance Learning (ODL) for both domestic and international students in accordance with the university’s ultimate goal to provide equal access to quality learning and teaching for the Indonesians and the world.
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Speaker 1:

Continual Monitoring & Evaluation of QA Practices at University of Malaya

By Prof. Dr. Fauza Ab. Ghaffar
Director, Academic Enhancement and Leadership Development Centre,
University of Malaya, Malaysia

Abstract:

The framework for QA practices at the University of Malaya amongst others is the Quality Management System based on the MS ISO 9001:2015 and the Malaysian Qualification Framework. The implementation of the QMS covers the holistic scope of the university functions covering the core business of education, research, services and other support services. The MQF is implemented for the QA of all its academic programs. Both frameworks however is strongly guided by the principles of PDCA and the process approach. Under the PDCA approach, continuous monitoring and evaluation as part of QA processes whereby Monitoring follows the Planning and Doing and the result to Monitoring and Evaluation shall be the basis of Actions for Improvement. On the other hand, the Process approach ensures that monitoring is done at all levels- Input-Process and Output.

This presentation shall provide glimpses of monitoring, evaluation and improvement activities of the QA practices of UM in particular in the education or teaching and learning process. Amongst others are formulation of quality objectives and quality indicators, procedures and work processes, as well as formulation, monitoring and evaluation of program and course outcomes. Amongst the monitoring activities are audits, analysis of quality objectives, and monitoring and evaluation of course and program outcomes. The findings of these activities are usually table at Management Review Meetings where the effectiveness of improvement actions is being reviewed. The cycle is ongoing.

Dr. Ghaffar started her talk with the glimpse of the University of Malaya (UM), Malaysia, followed by the glimpses of monitoring, evaluation and improvement activities of the QA practices of the UM in particular in the education or teaching and learning process and she mentioned slightly on higher level practices at the University of Malaya (UM), which consist of QA framework and its structures.
History and background of UM

The University of Malaya is the oldest university in Malaysia. Its history and evolution began in 1905. It was established at the first time as the King Edward VII College of Medicine to train the first Malaysian doctor. Moreover, it also has and shares the common evolution roots with the National University of Singapore (NUS). In 1928, the Raffles College was established and later become merged with the King Edward VII College of Medicine. In 1962, the newly-merged college was split up into two major universities: University of Singapore or currently known as National University of Singapore and University of Malaya in Malaysia.

The glimpse of the University of Malaya has begun since 1962. The University of Malaya is well-known as the first and top university in Malaysia. It is a broad-based (provided all fields of disciplines/ programs), research-intensive and government-supported university located in 820-acre campus in the Southwest of Kuala Lumpur. In terms of population, there are around 2,000 faculty members which are 250-300 international staffs and 2,000 students with 3,000 international students and the rests of undergraduate and postgraduate students with the ratio of 1 UG: 1 PG; where UG stands for undergraduate students and PG stands for postgraduate students. There is a medical center which is Malaysia’s largest and best teaching hospital. There are more than 50 research centers in 6 research clusters.

The Quality Journey

The glimpses of monitoring, evaluation and improvement activities of the QA practices of UM are shown in the above picture.

Before 2001, the university did not have a quality system but isolated quality mechanisms that are conventional like in other universities.

From 2001 to 2006, UM started building a systemic and holistic comprehensive system in a form of a quality management but based on ISO. Like many other universities in Malaysia at that time, there are ISO in Human Resource, Library, Teaching Learning or research operated by faculty for faculty. It still exists until now.

From 2007 to 2010, the Malaysian Government started to implement the quality system for academic programs. At That time, they enforced the Malaysian Qualification Framework (MQF) under the Malaysian qualification agency and they are in need of requirements in the form of NQF.
which is the major requirement supported by the course of practices for accreditation, program accreditation and also the course of practice of institutions and institutional audit for institutional accreditation. In the beginning of 2007 and 2010, UM had a dual system and the university was also in the slight state of confusion. It was a time that people started complaining that too many systems, works, forms and audits.

After 2010, the government through Malaysian Quality Assurance (MQA) organized the first institutional audit called the academic performance audit. As a result of that audit, the UM was given a self-accreditation status. With that status, it means that they can set accredited on their own programs using their own system in the most idealistic way by making that come out with their own standard.

However, it must be at least the same or even better than the MQF and the courses of practices. At this time, they still using MQF-related requirements, but the advantages of having that status is that they can come out with their system called the integrated system. When integrating, they maintain the QMS with the MQF and the streamline of the requirements of the tool frameworks.

The quality framework that they use is QMS based on ISO. At the moment, they reach ISO 2001: 2015. But there are currently other types of ISO. Every time they move, there are always different requirements and the system has to be adapted itself. Therefore, they have other professional requirements and a lot of professional programs which are professionally accredited.

After that, they have become a member of AUN and was the first university to be tested on the AUN-QA Manual in 2007 with two programs undergone with the program assessment at that time. They also have five more programs in this year officially going to the International Assessment of AUN-QA in next MAY. Therefore, AUN-QA is another framework used at the UM.

When they combine or unify any factors together in any framework, they use the PDCA approach. The PDCA consists of PLAN, DO, CHECK and ACT. Under the PDCA, there is the check step, the monitoring, the evaluation and the approach in the system. For their quality system, they are both quality and institutional assurance at institutional level and systematic level. At institutional level, they serve in teaching and learning and also in the laboratories and ICT monitoring and so on.

There are also other frameworks that are either national or international. ISO is international; whereas, MQF is national. At the UM, they use both of the IQA and the EQA system.

Dr. Ghaffar mentioned that there are always two sides of coin. There is a check balance which the IQA taking care of international level and the EQA is to check what the IQA system by the monitoring system. As a result of better in approach that they use with their quality assurance, input and process. They finally know that their focus is on the output.
Speaker 2:

International Accreditation Bodies: A Comparison between AUN-QA and ABET

By Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tan Kay Chuan
Chief Quality Officer, AUN-QA Trainer and Assessor, National University of Singapore, Singapore

Abstract:

Parallel Session B on “Share and Learn 2: Science and Technology: Quality Development at Faculty Level (ABET’s Experience)” on 26 March 2018. This talk will compare the AUN-QA and the ABET models of academic program assessment. Issues to be raised include organizational structure requirements, the approach to quality improvement, aspects of preparing for the site visit or certification process, and assessment and evaluation requirements. Panel Discussion on “How do we continually monitor/follow up/evaluate the outcomes and impacts of QA practices in the universities?” on 27 March 2018.

This presentation will look at changes to the AUN-QA assessment model from version 2.0 to version 3.0. Summarized results of the assessments made will be presented, with comparisons made across country and field of study. Comparison among the assessment criteria and how well they have been achieved will also be presented. Issues on how v3.0 can be further improved will then be raised to the audience and fellow assessors.

Dr. Chuan pointed out about International Accreditation Bodies, specifically focused on A Comparison between AUN-QA and ABET.

Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)

ABET stands for Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology based on the US non-profit and non-governmental organization that accredits university programs worldwide. It has four commissions that has committed to the AUN. These four commissions are in Applied and Natural Sciences, Computer, Engineering and Engineering Technology programs which have slightly different criteria of performances. They are different from other foreign commissions.
ASEAN University Network – Quality Assurance (AUN-QA)

These commissions are responsible for taking up the assessment which is voluntary; whereas, the AUN-QA is only a regional body in the ASEAN region. They are responsible for accrediting bachelor and master’s degrees in all disciplines including Sciences, Engineering or Laws. It is similar to ABET as the certification process is voluntary. Some of details in comparison between ABET and AUN-QA.

Comparison between ABET & AUN-QA

Organization

ABET was established in 1932. It is a non-profit and non-governmental organization based on the global scale or worldwide, which has its organizational structure divided into 4 accreditation commissions as Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tan Kay Chuan has mentioned before.

Each commission responsible of accrediting respective programs; whereas, AUN-QA was established later in 2007, which was around 11 years ago. It is a part of quality assurance organization under AUN based in only Southeast Asia. The organizational structure is also different from ABET because there is no internal sub-division of programmatic responsibility.

Thus, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tan Kay Chuan recommended that AUN-QA should include an internal sub-division of programmatic responsibility into its network system similar to that of ABET. This will allow AUN-QA to divide their responsibilities more efficiently, such that assessors with similar expertise will be grouped together and assess programs within their strong field, which will improve the overall assessment results.

Accreditation Process

In terms of accreditation process, each commission from ABET is responsible for its own specific criteria, although certain criteria are common to all programs with the emphasis lies on students’ learning outcomes. Moreover, it is a self-study report required before a site visit is conducted with fixed dates for submission and inspection. It takes a total of 18 months proceeded from application to notification of result. Whereas, all programs of AUN-QA are evaluated with the same set of accreditation criteria, irrespective of their discipline in which the emphasis lies on feedback from stakeholders. It is a self-assessment report needed to be submitted before a site visit is conducted. Moreover, there is no fixed duration from beginning of application to notification of result, but typically takes around one year for the whole process.

For accreditation criteria, ABET commissions have their own specific criteria common crossed for all programs, but AUN-QA has the same setting up for accreditation criteria eligible for all of the programs.

In terms of accreditation documents, ABET is s self-study report conducted before the site visit; whereas, AUN-QA is a self-submitted report submitted before a site visit is conducted. ABET requires self-study, but AUN-QA requires self-assessment.

Accreditation Site Visit

Duration for submission, AUN-QA requires around typically 2 months, longer or shorter than that; whereas, ABET provides a fix date, usually, one year before you get assessed. ABET staffs work on Sunday to Tuesday, where the assessment takes action to do 3 days a week from Sunday to Tuesday. AUN-QA staffs work also 3 days a week but based on weekdays only. ABET uses three members of assessors; whereas AUN-QA uses 2 members teams from different universities which are appointed based on background, experience, and language ability. ABET has one member usually from foreign
countries, the US; whereas, AUN-QA has two members which are not from a country that is being assessed.

For procedure, both of them have a similar procedure which provides Interviews, meetings with faculty, students, administrators, staff and other stakeholders, site tours, assessments, opening and closing meetings and so on to examine documents and facilities and exit meeting.

Accreditation Outcome

For criterion rating scale, ABET has no rating scale and does not use numbers which its accreditation result based on the site visit, the programs accredited or not accredited, interviews for reports and so on. It has different results possible starting from accredited, next general review, interim report to not accredited and so on. It has a validity period of 6 years. Unlike, AUN-QA uses number which is 7-point rating scale. It has only two accreditation results which are accredited or not accredited. The programs failed for accreditation will be given one year to rectify shortcomings. The accreditation is valid only 4 years.

Approach to Improving Program Quality

ABET has its main approach focuses on learning (not teaching), students (not faculty) and outcomes (not input and capacity). It has a quality process that is prescriptive; it requires that a program’s student outcomes be mapped to the criteria. Evaluation process uses peer-review from that disciplinary viewpoint. Hence, an evaluator from a relevant technical society will assess the program which differs from the process of AUN-QA.

AUN-QA is focused on how to improve the entire system -- the effectiveness of the quality assurance system. What do the stakeholders, alumni, employers think and say looking closely with the employment outcomes? We should focus on program learning and student outcomes. Its quality process is non-prescriptive since it does not include criteria specifying student outcomes, in other words, it means that you do not tell the programs what you should do or should not do. AUN assessors are process experts, not required for assessors to have disciplinary expertise in the program being evaluated. Assessors chosen by AUN based on availability and so on; whereas, ABET is prescriptive which means that the assessors are the content experts. For example, if programs are in Chemical Engineering or Physics, it will be assessed by the experts who will guide you how to do or not to do things from that related field.

AUN-QA cannot do the same because the assessors are not experts in specific fields but in the process: how to do things but not to do things. Evaluation of process is similar because both use peer-review process from disciplinary points of view from a relevant technical society.

ABET uses their own accreditation body, like other countries that have their own bodies. There will be assessors from their own accreditation body working together with another assessor from another foreign country, usually, the US. AUN-QA, if we do assessment in Indonesia, we cannot have the Indonesian assessors. This is called conflict of interest, which also assessing programs of their own countries. Thus, there must be one assessor from their home country and another one from the foreign country.

Constituency Input

In terms of stakeholder involvement and input, ABET is much focused on the evaluation of students learning outcomes and staffs within the country: what the students should know.

But AUN-QA looks beyond that; it is not only focused on the students and the staffs but also the alumni, the employers from the society. In the other hand, the employers play a very important role in this step. It is very valuable and crucial to get feedback on how they think about the graduates.
This will help AUN know more if our quality assurance system applied to assess on HEIs in the country, is effective.

**The big challenge: How do we move forward?**

As Dr. Karen has mentioned about TEQSA from Australia including the topic of risk management that there is some tendency that AUN-QA can include that to our current system. Elements of the self-accreditation from the University of Malaya in practices that AUN-QA can borrow self-accreditation. That will be very good move of AUN-QA if it also applies other types of self-accreditation process to the current one.

Therefore, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tan Kay Chuan finally closed his talk by pointing out that ABET is much focused on student learning and program learning outcomes, but AUN-QA looks further at the alumni and employers. He then raised up the questions; what are the challenges of AUN-QA and how can we move forward? How the AUN-QA can improve itself? to the audiences and everyone in the conference to think about questions.
Discussions

Micro-view comments

By Prof. Dr. Wyona C. Patalinghug
AUN-QA Expert, De La Salle University, the Philippines

To monitor, follow up and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of QA practices in the universities, it is necessary to go back to the very basic of our learning outcome because it is the key to both internal and external quality assurance in order to check whether or not they are correct practices, correct meanings, well-defined and well-formulated. The majority of outcomes of the quality assurance offices are a very huge task. Therefore, you need to make sure that you are still in the evaluation process by keeping on doing the PDCA. Moreover, our outcomes need to be relevant and formulated in context of the time, the university and the country as there is no one side fit for all the formula. There are also disruptive and new technology issues involved; therefore, we need to adopt into different situations and the learning outcomes are required to be monitored, evaluated and adapted all the time to make us stay relevant.

As we have known that quality is a journey and the journey of a thousand miles begins with the first step. Therefore, focusing on the first step on AUN-QA assessment is the most important thing to do. The next one is attitude and value. We need to pay attention all the time to use skills and knowledge to deal with the disruptive technology with a very sure attitude and value as it tends to rapidly change. Another important thing for improving and monitoring during our follow-up of outcomes and impacts is Data. Because it can make QA exciting and boring. It will be exciting for those who know how to use it but boring for those who do not understand how to use it. Therefore, one big challenge is gathering the data. To give the definition of data is most important because data is never dynamic but static. Thus, we have to make sure that its definition is well-explained. To make the manipulation of data disappeared and reduced, ethics of data management must be taken into account and awareness of everyone. The manipulation of data is a very big issue happened in not only AUN-QA but also in other assessments. Thus, it is very crucial that we have to be sure of our ethics and values all the time including the ethics of data management. The last thing that we need to focus is to ensure to keep the trust among the members and make them continue having the awareness about the QA. With this trust building, you can identify QA champions that will be the powerful brains to improve and fast forward the QA in your university.
Macro-view comments

By Assoc. Prof. Chavalit Wongse-ek
AUN-QA Expert, Mahidol University, Thailand

To monitor and evaluate the outcomes and impacts of QA practices in the universities in terms of macro view. We have to define the terms of monitor and assess “the outcome” and “the input” for the QA practices in the universities first.

To define “monitor and assess the outcome” for the QA practices in your universities. First thing that you have to do is to look at the mechanism for the whole university to define monitor and evaluation for the input of the QA practices through three key visions of universities: education, research and services. It is always true that every university has its own vision; hence, it is important to start to define monitor and assess the outcome with your university vision and identify the expectation level of your university whether it is at the regional or international level of achievement.

The AUN-QA staffs are needed to lift up the level every year which depends on the level of expectation you define at the first place. You have to elaborate your three key missions and find out what is your expectation for your education, for your research mission and also your service mission?

All the three key missions are like the three circles that have to merge together. Education has to serve for research. The research has to serve for services and also education. The merging area of three cycles is very different. If you can define quality of each mission to achieve your expectation level; then, you may set the outcomes from your expectation and define what your outcomes and missions should be by elaborating from the faculty outcomes, the program outcomes down to the learning and student outcomes.

Any level of the expectation outcomes needs to use the input and have a tool for monitoring. QA is a tool to improve the outcomes and your quality achievement of your expectation. IQA and EQA are tools for you to monitor and evaluate your quality of management and see how far you are to achieve the outcome you have defined. If you use both IQA and EQA together, you will not find any gap of the improvement. You will see a wrong implementation that this framework or IQA might not be suitable for your system. Whatever your tool is, it needs to depend on the level of your outcomes. If IQA is the right tool, you can know and identify how far you are from your expectation in each level. This is called a PDCA process.

In conclusion, quality is not an accident because it always comes from intelligent platforms. Therefore, no matter what you want to do, monitor your outcome and make it improved. Firstly, taking a look at the input, the PDCA process and the IQA and EQA as they are the tools to make your expectation of the input accomplished in terms of the quality and management.

Q&A

1) We believe that quality is the most important thing in our university, but in fact we have some urgent problems. How can you create trust among the stakeholders? What is the learning outcome in your university in your region?

2) When will the AUN-QA focus on the outcome-based education in comparison with the ABET?

3) Can you explain how to assess the achievement of learning outcomes and student outcomes?
4) What extent do we need to take into account when we do the QA assessment? Because as you mentioned that one side doesn’t fit all. For the university itself there are differences between each faculty. We cannot apply the quality system into the universities that have differences among their faculties. What extent do we need to take into account when we apply the QA assessment?

5) What benefits can be given to the faculty as it is them that the university has to rely on the really achieve the whole process? Yesterday, we all learned about the implementation of the QA system. We try to avoid burden and make it beneficial. What kind of benefits that we can give to our faculty as it is them that the university has to rely on for the whole process?

This panel raised up the first question on how to create trust among the stakeholders. From Dr. Patalinghug’s opinions, the first step for building trust with stakeholders is to identify your stakeholders and keep in your mind that the major core is still your stakeholders.

Dr. Patalinghug stated that it is impossible to create 100% of trust but if you can get 70% of trust, you are successful. Trust is gained by showing the things that you do which can give the stakeholders some positive benefits and impacts. For example, the QS ranking is considered to be one of the reliable product that can make your brand known in the international level. Therefore, it is important to gain and build your reputation not only in your own country but also in the international level. If your program is accredited; you will have partners globally. People benchmark your QA system because it improves university’s visibility.

AUN-QA has an important role in the ranking exercise. The most important things mean to gain trust and belief through communication and increase on installation of awareness. Therefore, training must be provided for university staffs and teams. It is also very important to show your colleagues the impact on the significant roles of the QA. The most important thing is the employers and the QA of programs is also very important. The first one is the marketability of your programs and another one is the marketability of your output. If the employers see your efforts, trust, visibility, marketability and student outcomes. They will believe in you that you are the trusted brand because trusted brand will be trusted by the employers.

Related to the second question that the audience asked about the learning outcome, Dr. Patalinghug answered that the learning outcome in her country is related to the efforts and visibility. They have improved the marketability of their programs, graduates and also engaged the trust both internally and externally.

Dr. Chuan stated that AUN-QA accreditation is mainly focused on an outcome-based assessment and pointed out that there are two major ways to do it to assess the achievement of learning outcomes and student outcomes. The first thing is to directly ask the students about the feedback after they have any course. Another crucial way is by getting the feedback from the employers is very important. Dr. Patalinghug explained that there are two ways of measuring the achievement: direct and indirect ways. The direct way is by giving the students examinations and practices which are the direct assessment of learning outcomes to assess whether or not the students have achieved the learning outcomes as you expected. This is called performance-based. The indirect way is to ask the feedback from the employers as Dr. Chuan mentioned.

There are a lot of things that we have to take into account when applying the QA assessment into the system. Dr. Chuan firstly suggested that tools and more help are crucially required to make AUN-QA move to a system where universities can do self-assessment and move by themselves.
Dr. Patalinghug thinks that there are two things to focus on. The first one is a center of the university level which plays a major role as a facilitator in reducing the gap between the faculty and department. The second one is to focus on giving your colleagues the power and autonomy to the faculty for the suitable level that they are to their own programs. As there is no one side fit for all. Therefore, you have to pick and choose the appropriate ones that fit with your own situation and give your colleagues your suggestions.

To make to the faculty staffs see the benefits that they will get after doing their hard-working tasks on the whole process, Dr. Patalinghug thinks that the main thing to do is to make them feel that they are a part of the system since the beginning of the thinking process. Make them feel that they belong to it and involve with it. Therefore, they cannot complain because they are a part of the thinking process: regulations and documentations.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nantana Gajaseni also suggested that keeping communication with colleagues in different levels can help them to feel that what they are doing is beneficial. The role of the president is very important. If the president believes in the QA and authorizes one group of QA champions to do the QA because the president has direct authority to support the QA: policy and resources. Then, the champion group can deliver your policy into different levels. We need to convince them to make the resistance reduced as much as we can.
Next host

AUN-QA International Conference 2019 will be held back-to-back with the AUN-QA Assessors Workshop and the AUN-QA Chief Quality Officers’ Meeting (CQOs) in the Philippines and will be co-hosted by De La Salle University (DLSU) and the University of the Philippines (UP) tentatively in March 2019.
Lessons learned

The AUN-QA International Conference 2018 provided us with a better understanding of the ‘common problems and obstacles’ that different QA practitioners (i.e. IQA, EQA, international QA agencies) have shared. However, without a sharing platform in the past, these QA practitioners had to come up with their own solutions to tackle these common problems. With this conference bringing together these QA practitioners, the solutions have been shared, exchanged, and further discussed, for the newcomers to learn of these common problems. As such, it would assist those that struggle, to be able to develop and come up with a better, fine-tuned, catch-up strategy and in the end, it would foster a more equal pace of QA development in ASEAN region.