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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Initiation of ASEAN University Network at the 4th ASEAN Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Establishment of the ASEAN University Network Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Became one of the ASEAN Sectoral Ministerial Bodies responsible for higher education cooperation and development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>Universiti Brunei Darussalam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Royal University of Phnom Penh, Royal University of Law and Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Universitas Gadjah Mada, Universitas Indonesia, Institut Teknologi Bandung, Universitas Airlangga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>National University of Laos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>University of Malaya, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Universiti Utara Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Institute of Economics, Yangon, University of Yangon, University of Mandalay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Philippines</td>
<td>University of the Philippines, De La Salle University, Ateneo de Manila University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>National University of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore Management University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Chulalongkorn University, Burapha University, Mahidol University, Chiang Mai University, Prince of Songkla University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>Vietnam National University, Hanoi, Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Can Tho University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QA Development in ASEAN_09 Dec 2014
ASEAN University Network (AUN)

AUN Mandate

**Strengthen** the existing network of cooperation among universities in ASEAN and beyond;

**Promote** collaborative study, research and educational programmes in the priority areas identified by ASEAN;

**Promote** cooperation and solidarity among scholars, academicians and researchers in the ASEAN Member States; and

**Serve** as the policy-oriented body in higher education in the ASEAN region.

*Source: QA Development in ASEAN_09 Dec 2014*
ASEAN University Network (AUN)

Source: QA Development in ASEAN_09 Dec 2014
AUN-QA Network

- AUN-QA was established in 1998
- Bangkok Accord in 2000
- Network of Chief Quality Officers (CQOs)
- 30 AUN Members and 31 AUN-QA Associate Members
AUN-QA Network

1. (U-U)
   • Strengthen QA Professionals in ASEAN
   • Uplift quality of education at institutional and programme level through AUN-QA Assessment

2. (G-G)
   • Engage with the international/national QA networks for system development and recognition

3. (R-R)
   • Expand AUN-QA Cooperation with dialogue partners (ASEAN+3)
   • Jointly developed “Institutional Assessment” with ASEAN and EU partners under “EU-SHARE Programme”

Source: QA Development in ASEAN_09 Dec 2014
AUN-QA Network
AUN-QA Model

Programme QA Assessment since 2007

Institutional QA Assessment commencing Oct 2016
AUN-QA Model

AUN-QA Assessment (for the purpose of improving the effectiveness of QA system)

- De facto QA framework in ASEAN
- Non-prescriptive
- Focus on improvement
- Principles-based framework
## AUN-QA Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Principles-Based</th>
<th>Rules-Based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>View of Quality System</td>
<td>Integrated &amp; Systemic</td>
<td>Standalone &amp; Ad-hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>Formative</td>
<td>Summative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Objective</td>
<td>Continuous &amp; Contextualisation</td>
<td>Static &amp; Standardisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Framework &amp; Non-Prescriptive</td>
<td>Standards &amp; Prescriptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessors</td>
<td>Skilled Peers</td>
<td>Technical Experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Climate</td>
<td>Mutual Respect &amp; Trust</td>
<td>Fearful and Suspicious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation for Assessment</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Assessment or Evaluation</td>
<td>Audit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from source: “Principles-based accreditation: the way forward?” by Lindsay H Heywood
2 Rates of quality improvement with principles-based versus rules-based approaches

Schematic representation of the slower onset but potentially more enduring gains in quality improvement arising from principles-based approaches, compared with the more rapid but plateauing (or even declining) gains from rules-based approaches.

Source: “Principles-based accreditation: the way forward?” by Lindsay H Heywood
AUN-QA Programme Assessment

223 Programmes Assessed (150 Programme Assessed by AUN-QA, 22 Programmes Assessed under ASEAN-QA Project, 51 Upcoming programmes to be assessed)
AUN-QA Programme Assessment

No. of Programmes assessed arranged by Country

Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Orange</th>
<th>Red</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orange: Round of Programmes Assessment
Red: No. of Programmes Assessed
AUN-QA at Programme Level

Version 0
Asean University Network Quality Assurance
Guidelines

Version 1
2007 – 2010
18 Criteria

Version 2
2011 – 2016
15 Criteria

Version 3
2016/17 onwards
11 Criteria
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results

1st AUN-QA Assessment Analysis
2007 – 2012
4 Countries, 7 universities, 37 Programmes
AUN-QA at Programme Level (1st Version)

1. Expected Learning Outcomes
   - Program Specification
   - Programme Content
   - Programme Organisation
   - Didactic Concept
   - Student Assessment
   - Staff Quality
   - Quality of the Support Staff
   - Quality of the Students
   - Student Advice
   - Facilities
   - Quality Assurance Teaching/Learning
   - Student Evaluation
   - Curriculum Design
   - Staff Development Activities
   - Feedback Stakeholders
   - Graduate Profile
   - Pass Rates
   - Drop Out Rates
   - Graduation Time
   - Employability

18. Stakeholder Satisfaction

17. Quality Assurance and (Inter)national benchmarking
AUN-QA at Programme Level (2nd Version)

1. Expected Learning Outcomes
   - Programme Specification
   - Programme Structure & Content
   - Teaching & Learning Strategy
   - Student Assessment
   - Academic Staff Quality
   - Support Staff Quality
   - Student Quality
   - Student Advice & Support
   - Quality Assurance of Teaching & Learning
   - Staff Development Activities
   - Stakeholders Feedback
   - Pass Rates
   - Drop Out Rates
   - Graduation Time
   - Employability
   - Research

2. Stakeholders Satisfaction

3. Quality Assurance and (Inter)national benchmarking

4. Achievements
## AUN-QA Assessment Rating Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Absolutely inadequate; immediate improvements must be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inadequate, improvements necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inadequate, but minor improvements will make it adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adequate as expected (meeting the AUN-QA guidelines and criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Better than adequate (exceeding the AUN-QA guidelines and criteria)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Example of best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excellent (world-class or leading practices)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results (2007 – 2012, N = 37)
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results (2007 – 2012, N = 37)

AUN-QA Assessment Results (by Ratings)

- **Adequate as Expected**
  - 2007: 60%
  - 2008: 36%
  - 2009: 56%
  - 2010: 44%
  - 2011: 56%
  - 2012: 43%

- **Better than Adequate**
  - 2007: 33%
  - 2008: 48%
  - 2009: 40%
  - 2010: 50%
  - 2011: 38%
  - 2012: 51%

- **Inadequate needs Minor Improvement**
  - 2007: 7%
  - 2008: 12%
  - 2009: 3%
  - 2010: 4%
  - 2011: 2%
  - 2012: 1%

- **Best Practice**
  - 2012: 5%

Legend:
- Inadequate needs Minor Improvement
- Adequate as Expected
- Better than Adequate
- Best Practice
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results (2007 – 2012, N = 16)

Programme Quality Improvement Trend (Indonesia)

- 2008: Inadequate needs Minor Improvement 15%, Adequate as Expected 48%, Better than Adequate 35%
- 2009: Inadequate needs Minor Improvement 0%, Adequate as Expected 64%
- 2010: Inadequate needs Minor Improvement 3%, Adequate as Expected 38%
- 2011: Inadequate needs Minor Improvement 0%, Adequate as Expected 60%
- 2012: Inadequate needs Minor Improvement 0%, Adequate as Expected 40%, Better than Adequate 53%

Legend:
- Inadequate needs Minor Improvement
- Adequate as Expected
- Better than Adequate
- Best Practice
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results (2007 – 2012, N = 8)

Programme Quality Improvement Trend (Philippines)

- **2008**
  - Inadequate needs Minor Improvement: 10%
  - Adequate as Expected: 73%
  - Better than Adequate: 17%

- **2010**
  - Inadequate needs Minor Improvement: 7%
  - Adequate as Expected: 49%
  - Better than Adequate: 44%

- **2011**
  - Inadequate needs Minor Improvement: 0%
  - Adequate as Expected: 40%
  - Better than Adequate: 51%
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results

Programme Quality Improvement Trend
(Vietnam)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Inadequate needs</th>
<th>Minor Improvement</th>
<th>Adequate as Expected</th>
<th>Better than Adequate</th>
<th>Best Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results

2nd AUN-QA Assessment Analysis
2007 – 2014
8 Countries, 27 Universities, 107 Programmes
AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results (2007 – 2014, N = 107)
## AUN-QA Programme Assessment Results

(2007 – 2014, N = 107, Mean Scores)

| Criteria                                                                 | No. of Programmes | 🌟 Expected Learning Outcomes | 🌟 Programme Specification | 🌟 Programme Structure & Content | 🌟 Teaching and Learning Strategy | 🌟 Student Assessment | 🌟 Academic Staff Quality | 🌟 Support Staff Quality | 🌟 Student Quality | 🌟 Student Advice and Support | 🌟 Facilities and Infrastructure | 🌟 Quality Assurance of Teaching and Learning Process | 🌟 Staff Development Activities | 🌟 Stakeholders Feedback | 🌟 Output | 🌟 Stakeholders Satisfaction | Overall Verdict |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| No. of Programmes                                                       | 107               | 2                           | 45                        | 1                             | 5                               | 1                   | 19                  | 4                   | 30             |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.6              |
| Expected Learning Outcomes                                              | 4.5               | 3.1                        | 4.6                       | 2.5                           | 4.3                             | 5.0                 | 4.7                 | 4.1                 | 4.4            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.6              |
| Programme Specification                                                 | 4.4               | 3.8                        | 4.4                       | 3.3                           | 4.4                             | 5.0                 | 4.5                 | 4.0                 | 4.4            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.6              |
| Programme Structure & Content                                           | 4.5               | 3.5                        | 4.5                       | 3.6                           | 4.6                             | 4.0                 | 4.8                 | 4.0                 | 4.6            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.6              |
| Teaching and Learning Strategy                                          | 4.6               | 3.5                        | 4.7                       | 3.3                           | 4.1                             | 4.0                 | 4.8                 | 4.1                 | 4.6            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.6              |
| Student Assessment                                                       | 4.4               | 3.0                        | 4.4                       | 3.6                           | 4.4                             | 4.0                 | 4.7                 | 4.2                 | 4.5            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.5              |
| Academic Staff Quality                                                  | 4.8               | 3.3                        | 4.8                       | 3.1                           | 5.0                             | 4.0                 | 5.0                 | 4.5                 | 4.7            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.7              |
| Support Staff Quality                                                   | 4.3               | 3.4                        | 4.2                       | 4.3                           | 4.5                             | 4.0                 | 4.7                 | 4.3                 | 4.3            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.3              |
| Student Quality                                                         | 4.9               | 4.1                        | 4.9                       | 4.0                           | 4.8                             | 5.0                 | 5.0                 | 4.5                 | 4.9            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.9              |
| Student Advice and Support                                               | 4.6               | 3.3                        | 4.8                       | 2.5                           | 4.8                             | 4.0                 | 5.0                 | 4.8                 | 4.4            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.4              |
| Facilities and Infrastructure                                           | 4.3               | 3.8                        | 4.3                       | 3.0                           | 5.0                             | 3.0                 | 4.5                 | 4.5                 | 4.1            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.1              |
| Quality Assurance of Teaching and Learning Process                       | 4.4               | 3.1                        | 4.5                       | 3.0                           | 4.6                             | 4.0                 | 4.5                 | 3.8                 | 4.4            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.4              |
| Staff Development Activities                                             | 4.3               | 3.0                        | 4.3                       | 4.5                           | 4.7                             | 3.0                 | 4.5                 | 4.6                 | 4.4            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.4              |
| Stakeholders Feedback                                                   | 4.2               | 3.2                        | 4.1                       | 2.3                           | 4.2                             | 3.0                 | 4.2                 | 4.1                 | 4.4            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.4              |
| Output                                                                  | 4.7               | 2.9                        | 4.8                       | 4.0                           | 5.0                             | 5.0                 | 5.1                 | 4.6                 | 4.6            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.6              |
| Stakeholders Satisfaction                                               | 4.8               | 3.1                        | 4.7                       | 5.0                           | 4.6                             | 4.0                 | 5.1                 | 5.0                 | 5.0            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 5.0              |
| Overall Verdict                                                         | 4.6               | 3.5                        | 4.5                       | 3.5                           | 4.7                             | 4.1                 | 4.8                 | 4.4                 | 4.5            |                             |                                  |                             |                                |                      |                             | 4.5              |
Closing the Gaps – Constructive Alignment
Constructive Alignment

The OBE Framework

Source: Dr. Andres Winston C. Oreta, Professor in Civil Engineering, De La Salle University-Manila at http://digitalstructures.blogspot.sg/2012/01/outcomes-based-education-as-i-see-it.html
Constructive Alignment
Constructive Alignment

Vertical Alignment of Learning Outcomes and Stakeholders’ Needs

© Living Better

AUN-QA
A Touch of Quality
Constructive Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Requirements</th>
<th>Study Programme Design</th>
<th>Qualifications of study programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What kind of knowledge and/or which qualifications are the students expected to bring along?</td>
<td>CU 1, CU 2, CU 3, CU 4, CU 5, CU 6, CU 7, CU 8, CU 9, CU 10, CU 11, CU 12, CU 13</td>
<td>Which qualifications is the programme aiming at? What are the students be able to know and to do after completing the programme? What is our unique selling proposition?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© Reis/Ruschin 2008

S. Ruschin | Center for Higher Education and Quality Assurance (ZfH)
Conctructive Alignment

**Teaching and Learning**
- Culture Ready
  - Educational Philosophy
  - Articulation & Communication
  - Rewards & Recognition
  - Quality Enhancement & Benchmarking

- People Ready
  - Classroom Engagement
  - Assessment & Feedback
  - Coaching & Mentoring
  - Teaching & Learning Competences
  - Pedagogical Research & Development

- System Ready
  - Facilities & Infrastructure
  - Technology
  - Constructive Alignment in Curriculum
  - Monitoring & Evaluation

**Learning Outcomes**
Constructive Alignment

Expected Learning Outcomes

Teaching & Learning
- Educational Philosophy
  - Instructional Methods
  - Learning Environment & Resources

Student Assessment
- Diagnostic, Formative & Summative
- Assessment Methods
- Assessment Criteria
- Grading, Feedback & Appeal

Validity, Reliability & Fairness
Constructive Alignment

©Living Better
## 1. Expected Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expected Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>The expected learning outcomes have been clearly formulated and aligned with the vision and mission of the university [1,2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>The expected learning outcomes cover both subject specific and generic (i.e. transferable) learning outcomes [3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>The expected learning outcomes clearly reflect the requirements of the stakeholders [4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall opinion
### 3. Programme Structure & Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Programme Structure and Content</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>The curriculum is designed based on constructive alignment with the expected learning outcomes [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>The contribution made by each course to achieve the expected learning outcomes is clear [2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>The curriculum is logically structured, sequenced, integrated and up-to-date [3, 4, 5, 6]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall opinion
4. Teaching and Learning Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4 Teaching and Learning Approach</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>The educational philosophy is well articulated and communicated to all stakeholders [1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Teaching and learning activities are constructively aligned to the achievement of the expected learning outcomes [2, 3, 4, 5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Teaching and learning activities enhance life-long learning [6]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall opinion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5. Student Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Assessment</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>The student assessment is constructively aligned to the achievement of the expected learning outcomes [1, 2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>The student assessments including timelines, methods, regulations, weight distribution, rubrics and grading are explicit and communicated to students [4, 5]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Methods including assessment rubrics and marking schemes are used to ensure validity, reliability and fairness of student assessment [6, 7]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>Feedback of student assessment is timely and helps to improve learning [3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Students have ready access to appeal procedure [8]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall opinion
Institutional QA
Institutional QA

• Limitations of QA at programme level
• Greater emphasis of holistic and sustainable QA
• Meeting the challenges of ASEAN Economic Community (AEC)
• Align to the Principles of IQA (Principle 3) of the ASEAN QA Reference Framework (AQAF) and other QA models
• A need to stay ahead and remain relevant to the rapidly evolving environment and quality assurance development in higher education
# Limitations of QA at Programme Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>India</th>
<th>Indonesia</th>
<th>Malaysia</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>Thailand</th>
<th>Vietnam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Programmes</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Expected Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Programme Specification</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Programme Structure &amp; Content</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching and Learning Strategy</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Student Assessment</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Academic Staff Quality</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Support Staff Quality</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student Quality</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Student Advice and Support</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Facilities and Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Quality Assurance of Teaching and Learning Process</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Staff Development Activities</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Stakeholders Feedback</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Output</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Stakeholders Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Verdict</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AUN-QA Model

Strategic QA (Institutional)

Systemic QA (IQA System)

Functional QA (Education, Research & Service)
ASEAN Economic Community

- ASEAN Qualification Framework (AQRF)
- ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework (AQAF)
- Credit Transfer System (CTS)
- Mutual Recognition Agreements (MRA)
Qualification Framework

A Qualifications Framework is a formal system of classifying qualifications of education or competences.

A National Qualifications Framework is a formal system of classifying qualifications of education or competences within a country.
Qualification Framework

THE PHL QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>BASIC EDUCATION</th>
<th>TECHNICAL EDUCATION AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>HIGHER EDUCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L8</td>
<td></td>
<td>DIPLOMA</td>
<td>DOCTORAL AND POST DOCTORAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td></td>
<td>NC IV</td>
<td>POST BACCALAUREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td></td>
<td>NC III</td>
<td>BACCALAUREATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: TERESITA R. MANZALA CHAIRPERSON PROFESSIONAL REGULATION COMMISSION
AQRF

Source: Megawati Santoso, Vice Chair of the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework Task Force
MRAs

Mutual Recognition Arrangements (MRAs) are framework arrangements established in support of liberalising and facilitating trade in services. MRAs aim to facilitate mobility of professionals/skilled labour in ASEAN.

MRAs

ASEAN Mutual Recognition Agreements

As of March 2015, existing MRAs enable professionals to work in other ASEAN countries in the 8 following professions:

- Doctor
- Dentist
- Nurse
- Architect
- Engineer
- Accountant
- Surveyor
- Tour Guide

Source: http://aseanup.com/overview-of-the-asean-skilled-labor-market/
CTS

Credit Transfer System (CTS) is a mechanism for comparing and recognising the educational attainment and performance of students between educational institutions and/or between collaborating countries with the objective of facilitating student mobility.

Transfer of academic credits is the process of evaluating recognising student’s academic work and achievements using credits as comparable units between educational institutions.
AQAF

1. External QA Agency
2. External QA Standards & Processes
3. Internal QA
4. National Qualification Framework
AUN-QA at Institutional Level (2nd Version)

Stakeholders’ Needs

Strategic QA
1. Vision, Mission and Culture
2. Governance
3. Leadership and Management
4. Strategic Management
5. Policies for Education, Research and Service
6. Human Resources Management
7. Financial & Physical Resources Management
8. External Relations & Networks

Systemic QA
9. Internal Quality Assurance System
10. Internal and External QA Assessment
11. IQA Information Management
12. Quality Enhancement

Functional QA
Education
13. Student Recruitment and Admission
14. Curriculum Design and Review
15. Teaching and Learning
16. Student Assessment
17. Student Services and Support
Research
18. Research Management
20. Research Collaboration and Partnerships
Service
21. Community Engagement and Service

Results
22. Educational Results
23. Research Results
24. Service Results
25. Financial & Market Results

Quality Assurance and (Inter)national Benchmarking
Alignment of AUN-QA at Institutional Level with Other QA Models

A Transnational QA Framework

Baldrige
America

ESG
Europe

AQAF
Asia

AUN-QA
A Transnational QA Framework
### AQAF (Principle 3 - IQA)

#### Principles of Internal Quality Assurance (ASEAN-QA Framework)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>The institution has primary responsibility for quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Quality assurance promotes the balance between institutional autonomy and accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Quality assurance is a participatory and cooperative process across all levels incorporating involvement of academic staff, students, and other stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>A quality culture underpins all institutional activities including teaching, learning, research, services and management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>A structured and functional internal quality assurance system with clearly defined responsibilities is established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>The quality system is promulgated and supported by the top management to ensure effective implementation and sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Sufficient resources for establishing and maintaining an effective quality system within the institution should be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>The institution should have formal mechanisms for approval, periodical reviews and monitoring of programmes and awards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Quality is regularly monitored and reviewed for purposes of continuous improvement at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>Relevant and current information about the institution, its programmes, achievements, and quality processes is accessible to public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment of AUN-QA at Institutional Level with Principle 3 (IQA) of AQAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Internal QA (AQAF)</th>
<th>AUN-QA Criteria at Institutional Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P/C 1: 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AUN-QA Assessment
Alignment of AUN-QA at Institutional Level with ESG 2015 (Part 1 - IQA)

ESG 2015 (Part 1 - IQA)
1.1  Policy for quality assurance
1.2  Design and approval of programmes
1.3  Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment
1.4  Student admission, progression, recognition and certification
1.5  Teaching staff
1.6  Learning resources and student support
1.7  Information management
1.8  Public information
1.9  On-going monitoring and periodic review of programmes
1.10 Cyclical external quality assurance
# Alignment of AUN-QA at Institutional Level with ESG 2015 (Part 1 - IQA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part 1 of ESG 2015 (IQA)</th>
<th>AUN-QA Criteria at Institutional Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment of AUN-QA at Institutional Level with Baldrige Performance Excellence Framework (Education – 2015/16)

Alignment of AUN-QA at Institutional Level with Baldrige Performance Excellence Framework (Education – 2015/16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Baldrige Performance Excellence Framework (Education)</th>
<th>AUN-QA Criteria at Institutional Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C/ C 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 1 0 1 2 1 3 1 4 1 5 1 6 1 7 1 8 1 9 2 0 2 1 2 2 2 3 2 4 2 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PDCA Principle

- Improve QA plan/system
- Establish QA plan/system
- Monitor and evaluate QA plan/system
- Implement QA plan/system

Act
Plan
Check
Do
Strategic QA (Institutional)

1. Vision, Mission and Culture
2. Governance
3. Leadership and Management
4. Strategic Management
5. Policies for Education, Research and Service
6. Human Resources Management
7. Financial and Physical Resources Management
8. External Relations and Networks
Systemic QA (IQA System)

9. Internal Quality Assurance (IQA) System
10. Internal and External QA Assessment
11. IQA Information Management
12. Quality Enhancement
Functional QA (Education)

13. Student Recruitment and Admission
14. Curriculum Design and Review
15. Teaching and Learning
16. Student Assessment
17. Student Services and Support
Functional QA (Research)

18. Research Management
20. Research Collaboration and Partnerships
Functional QA (Service)

21. Community Engagement and Service
Results

22. Educational Results
23. Research Results
24. Service Results
25. Financial and Market Results
Eligibility for AUN-QA Institutional Assessment

• An AUN member university or associate member of AUN-QA Network;

• Has at least 5 of study programmes assessed, certified and valid by AUN at the time of application; and at least 5 study programmes assessed by AUN must remain valid during the validity of the certificate.

• For renewal, the certified institution must fulfil the requirement for the submission of the interim report

• Eligibility for AUN-QA Institutional Assessment is subject to the approval of the AUN-QA Council
Requirements for SAR

Content of SAR

• Part 1: Organisation Profile
• Part 2: AUN-QA Criteria and Requirements
• Part 3: Strengths and Weaknesses Analysis
• Part 4: Appendices (separate volume)
Assessment Process for AUN-QA at Institutional Level

Institutional QA Assessment Panel

- Strategic QA Panel
  - Strategic
    - Criterion 6
    - Criterion 7
    - Criterion 8

- Systemic QA Panel
  - IQA System
    - Criterion 9
    - Criterion 10
    - Criterion 11
    - Criterion 12

- Functional QA Panel
  - Education
    - Criterion 13 to 17
    - Research
    - Criterion 18 - 20
    - Service
    - Criterion 21

AUN-QA Criterion 1 to 5 (Strategic)

AUN-QA Criterion 22 to 25 (Results)
Implementation

• Guide to AUN-QA Assessment at Institutional Level (Endorsement by BOT) – Aug 2016
• Pilot assessment – Oct 2016
• Actual assessment - 2017