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Historical Background

Assumption University was initially originated from Assumption Commercial College in 1969 as an autonomous Higher Education Institution under the name of Assumption School of Business. In 1972, with the approval of the Ministry of Education, it was officially established as Assumption Business Administration College or ABAC. In May 1975, it was accredited by the Ministry of University Affairs. In 1990, it was granted new status as “Assumption University” by the Ministry of University Affairs.

The University is a non-profit institution administered by the Brothers of St. Gabriel, a worldwide Catholic Religious Order, founded in France in 1705 by St. Louis Marie de Montfort, devoted to education and philanthropic activities. The Congregation has been operating many educational institutions in Thailand since 1901.

Philosophy of Education

In loyalty to its Christian mission, Assumption University stands for:

- Respect for the three institutions of the Nation: Religion, Country, the King and a democratic way of life;
- Belief that a man justifies himself and his existence by the nobility of his work: LABOR OMNIA VINCIT;
- Commitment to be a light that leads men towards the true source of all knowledge and life.

As a university, it represents an international “academic community which, in a rigorous and critical fashion, assists in the protection and advancement of human dignity”, and devotion to the Thai cultural heritage, “through research, teaching and various services offered to the local, national and international communities.”
Vision 2000

Assumption University of Thailand envisions itself as:

- An international community of scholars;
- Enlivened by Christian inspiration;
- Engaged in the pursuit of Truth and Knowledge;
- Serving human society, especially through the creative use of interdisciplinary approaches and cyber technology.

Vision 2000 for AU Graduates

Assumption University of Thailand envisions its graduates as:

- Healthy and open-minded persons, characterized by personal integrity, an independent mind, and creative thinking;
- Professionally competent, willing to exercise responsible leadership for economic progress in a just society;
- Being able to communicate effectively with people from other nations and to participate in globalization.

Mission

Assumption University exists for the main purpose of serving the nation by providing scientific and humanistic knowledge, particularly in business education and management science, through research and interdisciplinary approaches.

To this end, it aims at forming intellectually competent graduates who:

- are morally sound, committed to acting justly, and open to further growth;
- appreciate freedom of expression, imbued with ethical attitudes and ideologies through a carefully integrated curriculum of Ethics, Science, Languages and Business Management;
- achieve academic excellence through hard work, critical and positive thinking, and effective decision-making.
AU Uniqueness

“An International Catholic University”

- Catholic University
  - Catholic values
  - Catholic symbols
  - Catholic leader
  - Liturgical services

- International University
  - International programs
  - International scholars
  - International students
  - International recognition
  - Learning environment

AU Identity

Identity of Assumption University students

- Ethics
  - Integrity
  - Social consciousness
  - Discipline
    - Self-discipline
    - Social discipline

- English Proficiency

- Entrepreneurial Spirit
  - Leadership
  - Management of knowledge
  - Labor Omnia Vincit
Quality Assurance in Higher Education

The National Education Act of 1999 (2nd Amendment in 2002) has set forth aims and rationale for education management that emphasize quality and standards. The ‘Internal Quality Assurance System’ and ‘External Quality Assurance System’ were set up as mechanisms to maintain the quality and standards of Thai higher education institutions.

Quality Assurance in Higher Education

Education shall aim at the full development of the Thai people in all aspects: physical and mental health; intellect; knowledge; morality; integrity; and desirable way of life so as to be able to live in harmony with other people. According to the National Education Act of 1999, educational provision shall be based on the following principles:

- Lifelong education for all;
- All segments of society participating in the provision of education;
- Continuous development of the bodies of knowledge and learning process;

Higher Education Institutions in Thailand have four main missions:

- Produce graduates,
- Conduct research studies,
- Provide academic services to the society, and
- Preserve art and culture

Education Standards

The 15-Year Long-Term Higher Education Development Plan, 2nd issue (2008-2022), has introduced a development approach and plan to address the problems of Thai higher education, which is considered directionless, overlapping, is deficient in quality, and inefficient, by using education quality and standard assessment as the main operational mechanism.

The National Education Standards are used as a developmental framework when formulating the Higher Education Standards. The Higher Education Standards describe the purposes and principles of education administration in higher education institutions in Thailand. The Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education of 2009 was formulated in accordance with the Higher Education Standards in order to assure the quality of graduates at all educational levels and in all disciplines.
National Education Standards

a) Standard 1: Desirable Characteristics of Thai People as Citizens and Members of the World Community
b) Standard 2: Guidelines for Education Management
c) Standard 3: Guidelines for Creating a Learning/ Knowledge-based Society

Higher Education Standards

a) Standard for Quality of Graduates
b) Standard for Higher Education Administration
c) Standard for Establishing and Developing a Knowledge-based and Learning-based Society

Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF: HEd)
The Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education was formulated in accordance with the Higher Education Standards in order to assure the quality of graduates at all educational levels and in all disciplines. The quality of graduates at all degree levels and in all disciplines must meet the learning outcome standards that cover at least five domains:

a) Morals and Ethics
b) Knowledge
c) Cognitive Skills
d) Interpersonal Skills and Responsibility
e) Numerical Analysis, Communication and Information Technology Skills

Groups of Institutions
The quality of higher education institutions is evaluated based on the missions of each group of institutions including

- Group A: Community colleges
- Group B: Institutions focusing on Bachelor’s degree programs
- Group C: Specialized institutions
- Group D: Institutions focusing on advanced research and production of graduates at the graduate levels, especially doctoral degree level
Education Quality Assurance

Internal Quality Assurance
Internal quality assurance is a system and mechanism for developing, auditing, and assessing the operation of institutions according to the policies, objectives, and quality levels established by the institutions themselves or by their parent organizations. Accordingly, the internal quality assurance is regarded as one of the ongoing education management tasks of the institutions and parent organizations. With this regard, annual internal quality assessment reports must be prepared and presented to institution councils, parent organizations, and other relevant organizations for consideration and announced to the public in order to guarantee education quality and standards.

External Quality Assurance
External quality assurance is an education quality assessment which monitors and verifies the education quality and standards of institutions based on the intentions, rationale, and approaches of education management at each level. The National Education Act of 1999 (2nd Amendment in 2002) requires all institutions to undergo external quality assessment regularly, at least once every 5 years, and present the results to relevant organizations and the public.
Ministerial Regulations
System and Mechanism

In the Ministerial Regulations regarding Systems, Regulations, and Methods for Internal Quality Assurance of 2010, Paragraph 33 directs higher education institutions to develop quality assurance systems, based on the principles of academic freedom and institutional autonomy. The institutions are free to adopt the education quality assurance system that is widely practiced at the national or international level or the institutions may develop an appropriate internal quality assurance system in accordance with the level of development of the institution. Notwithstanding, the system must include plans, operation according to the plans, assessment, and improvement (PDCA).

In academic year 2014, the Office of Higher Education Commission announced a new internal quality assurance system. The internal quality assurance comprises three levels: Program, School and Institution. The internal quality assurance at the Program Level comprises 6 components: (1) standard control, (2) graduates, (3) students, (4) faculty members, (5) program, teaching - learning and student evaluation, and (6) learning support facilities. The internal quality assurance at the School Level comprises 5 components: (1) graduate production, (2) research, (3) academic service, (4) preservation of art and culture, and (5) administration. The internal quality assurance at the Institutional Level comprises 5 components: (1) graduate production, (2) research, (3) academic service, (4) preservation of art and culture, and (5) administration.

Database and Information Systems

Database and information systems are required for efficiency and data accuracy thus ensure the quality of education information. All higher education institutions should develop or acquire their own database and information systems to collect, analyse the data and evaluate the performance of Program, School and Institution. The database and information systems should support the common data set required by the Office of Higher Education Commission.

Higher education institutions are also required to report their internal quality assessment results via the online quality assurance database system (CHE QA Online) developed by the Office of Higher Education Commission. The report includes the annual internal assessment report (SAR), the internal quality assessment results given by internal quality assessment committee, common data set and supporting documents. Higher education institutions must present the
internal quality assessment report to institution councils, parent organizations, relevant organizations, and the public.

**Internal Quality Assessment**

The internal quality assessment will be done in accordance with the components, indicators and standard criteria of Program, School and Institution. The assessment measures are defined by two types of indicators: quantitative and qualitative indicators, as follows:

1. Qualitative indicators - the criteria are listed and the evaluation scheme is divided into 5 levels, from 1 to 5. For non-performance or performance below level 1, a score of 0 is given. The assessment scores are based on "peer review" in which all members of the internal quality assessment committee agree on the scores.

2. Quantitative indicators – a score ranging from 0-5 is given according to the calculated percentage or average.

**Internal Quality Assessment Committee**

**Program Assessment Committee**

Requirements:

- There should be at least 3 members in each program assessment committee. More than half of the members are external assessors from outside the institution and at least one assessor in the field of study.
- The chairman of the committee should be an external assessor from outside the institution.
- All committee members must have their names on OHEC's list of internal quality assessors at the program level.

The qualifications of each committee member depend on the program offered as follows:

- For Bachelor's degree program, all committee members hold a degree not lower than a master’s degree or hold an academic title of at least Assistant Professor.
- For Master's degree program, all committee members hold a doctoral degree or hold an academic title of at least Associate Professor.
- For Doctoral degree program, all committee members hold a doctoral degree or hold an academic title of at least Professor.

**School Assessment Committee**

Requirements:

- There should be at least 3 members in each committee depending on the size of the School.
- The chairman of the committee should be an external assessor from outside the institution and must have his or her name on OHEC's list of internal quality assessment chairmen.

- At least 50% of the committee members must be external assessors from outside the institution and must pass the assessor training program offered by OHEC. For the internal assessors from the institution, they should pass the assessor training program offered by OHEC or the institution’s training program certified by OHEC.

Chair:
- Dean (or former dean) who has experience in school assessment; or
- Hold an academic title of at least Assistant Professor and has experience in school assessment; or
- Other qualified persons recognized by OHEC

Committee Members:
- Full-time lecturers with at least 2-year teaching experience; or
- Administrators with at least 2-year administrative experience

**Institution Assessment Committee**

Requirements:
- There should be at least 5 members in the committee depending on the size of the institution.
- The chairman of the committee should be an external assessor from outside the institution and must have his or her name on OHEC's list of internal quality assessment chairmen.
- At least 50% of the committee members must be external assessors from outside the institution and must pass the assessor training program offered by OHEC. For the internal assessors from the institution, they should pass the assessor training program offered by OHEC or the institution’s training program certified by OHEC.

Chair:
- Dean (or former dean) who has experience in school assessment; or
- Hold an academic title of at least Assistant Professor and has experience in school assessment; or
- Other qualified persons recognized by OHEC

Committee Members:
- Full-time lecturers with at least 2-year teaching experience; or
- Administrators with at least 2-year administrative experience
Assumption University Quality Assurance (AuQS 2000)

Assumption University as a private institution of higher learning is under the supervision of the Commission of Higher Education, Ministry of Education. The University has continued in its efforts to be actively involved in quality development at all levels and in every aspect of the university life. The main concern of the quality assurance is to ensure that the University moves forward to be a top class quality education provider of excellence.

AuQS 2000 Objectives

Assumption University has developed AuQS 2000 system for quality assurance with the following objectives:

- To maintain the highest education standards in all aspects in accordance with the provision of higher education institutions.
- To establish policies and principles in the governance of Assumption University’s Quality Education.
- To audit and assess the performance of all Schools, support units, and the University in accordance with the system and mechanism established by the University.
- To assure stakeholders that the University produces quality educational products and renders educational services according to the established standards.

AuQS 2000 Policy

To fulfill the objectives of AuQS 2000, a set of policies is set up to guide the implementation of rules, regulations and governance of the University relating to QA matters. The policies are defined as follows:

The University shall …

- establish Quality Assurance Framework that includes policies, procedures and process according to:
  - National Education Act 1999 (2nd Amendment in 2002)
  - Ministerial regulations regarding systems and methods for internal quality assurance (2010)
  - National Education Standards of 2004, Office of Education Council
  - Higher Education Standards of 2006, Office of Higher Education Commission
- Higher Education Institution Standards 2008, Office of Higher Education Commission

- set up committees for quality assurance at all levels in the University for the administration of quality assurance and internal audit and assessment.
- develop systems and mechanisms and implement quality assurance in accordance with the framework, and ensure that all Schools, support units and the University follow the policies, systems and mechanisms, processes and procedures as defined in the framework.
- ensure that the quality of services is constantly monitored and that planning, procedures and financial resources are in place to ensure improvement and enhance efficiency and effectiveness of the University and stakeholders.
- maintain standard guidelines, processes and procedures and continuously improve the education quality in all aspects to meet the requirements of higher education institutions.
- create a culture where quality assurance is embedded in institutional operations.
AuQS 2000 Quality Performance Model

The education aspiration of Assumption University is underscored by four key tenets of Education Excellence namely quality of curriculum, faculty, infrastructure and graduates. Underlying these key tenets, the AuQS 2000 Quality Performance Model (Figure 1) is then established to direct the University in resource planning, management and performance monitoring.

Figure 1: AuQS 2000 Quality Performance Model

The components of the AuQS 2000 Quality Performance Model are divided into six aspects as follows:

1. **Institution and Program Context** – This is the main “umbrella” or supra component that brings strategic directions to tie together the other operational components. Leadership is needed to spearhead the commitment to quality improvements and innovations that affects performance excellence of the whole organization governance and administration, supported by the Institution’s Quality Assurance System and Mechanism. This is done within the framework of the strategic management process that includes the strategic planning and action plans to achieve the mission and objectives of the institution based on its philosophy and identity.
2. **Quality of Learning and Teaching** – This is the core educational value that the institution must create and deliver to the main key stakeholder - the students. Quality teaching and learning and faculty and staff development are intertwined to produce quality graduates as envisioned in the AU 2000 Vision of the graduates who should be a "total and whole" person who can contribute to the well-being of oneself and society. In the teaching-learning aspect, there is a need to design the key work systems and work processes that create and deliver educational value to students. The faculty and staff development aspect entails the development of human resources with a key focus on engaging and empowering the “human capitals” to achieve performance excellence.

3. **Support for Student Learning** – This is the key variable to support student development. This includes support in terms of learning resources and student development services, academic and non-academic student development activities as well as the preservation of art and culture activities. They are critical and central to the success of the student learning experiences.

4. **Support Infrastructure** – Facilities, equipment and financial support are key support infrastructure for teaching and learning, administration and operation.

5. **Knowledge and Societal Engagements** – This represents the heart and soul of an institution of quality teaching and learning utilizing the human capital to spearhead the improvement of teaching, learning, research and societal contributions through knowledge development, creation and sharing for the benefits of the society. The two components under the Knowledge and Societal Engagements are (1) Research (2) Academic Services and Social Responsibility. Research should not only contribute to the development of the individual faculty but should also contribute to the improvement of the teaching process, and utilization of the findings by the society in addition to the basic academic services rendered to society. The desired outcome of research or the creative works should be supportive of teaching-learning, academic services and societal development in addition to the enhancement and development of oneself.

6. **Results** – This is based on the mantra of “management through measurement” which says that measurements of organization performance would contribute to better management of the educational values and commitment to the stakeholders based on the institution’s strategic intent, vision, mission and values.
AuQS 2000 Quality Assurance Framework

The AuQS 2000 Quality Assurance Framework (Figure 2) provides the skeleton of the internal quality assurance system of the Schools, support units and the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Appointment of Committee  
- Strategic Planning Committee  
- Quality Assurance Committee  
- School Committee  
Development/Revision of Strategic Plan  
- AU Strategic Plan  
- School Strategic Plan  
Development of One-Year Plan and Budget  
- AU One-Year Plan and Budget  
- School One-Year Plan and Budget  
Approval of One-Year Plan and Budget  
- Review and endorsement of School’s One-Year Plan  
- Approval of School’s One-Year Plan and Budget by the President | Implementation  
- AU Strategic Plan  
- AU One-Year Plan and Budget  
- School Strategic Plan  
- School One-Year Plan and Budget  
Report on Performance Achievement  
- One-Year Plan and Budget Performance Achievement (twice a year)  
- Strategic Plan Performance Achievement (once a year)  
- Annual Report | Monitoring  
- QA Site Visit  
- TQF: HEd Site Visit  
- Program/School Internal Quality Assessment  
- Program/School Self-Assessment Report  
- CHE QA Online  
- Assessment by IQA Committee  
- Feedback | Development of Improvement Plan  
- AU Improvement Plan  
- Program/School Improvement Plan |

Figure 2 : AuQS 2000 Quality Assurance Framework
AuQS 2000 Internal Quality Assurance Process

According to the National Education Act of 1999 (2\textsuperscript{nd} Amendment in 2002) Section 48 and 49, the internal quality assurance system is one part of the education administration process which should be practiced all the time. There must be a performance control, audit, follow-up, and assessment to regularly improve quality. Figure 3 illustrates the AuQS 2000 internal quality assurance process.

![Figure 3: AuQS2000 Internal Quality Assessment Process](image_url)

It is required by the University that all Programs and Schools collect data and evidence of their operations every year. All Schools must do Program and School self-assessment, accordingly, and prepare Program and School Self-Assessment Reports. The Schools must prepare themselves for the program and school site visits, interview and assessment.

It is required by the University that the University collect data and evidence of its operations every year. The University must do self-assessment and prepare the University Self-Assessment Report. The University must be prepared for institutional site visit, interview and assessment.
AuQS 2000 Quality Assurance Mechanism

A set of quality assurance committees is appointed to ensure the achievement of quality education of the University. The formation and transmission of the quality assurance system including direction, policies, plans, development, administration, implementation, monitoring and control are top-down as shown in Figure 4.

1. All quality assurance direction and policies come from the top administrators in the University Quality Assurance Board which is chaired by the Rector. These quality assurance direction and policies are transmitted to the Quality Assurance Executive Committee, all Schools and support units.
2. The Quality Assurance Executive Committee for Academic Units translates the quality assurance direction and policies into standard guidelines and procedures to ensure quality assurance uniformity of operation of all Schools.
3. The Quality Assurance Executive Committee for Support Units translates the quality assurance direction and policies into standard guidelines and procedures to ensure quality assurance uniformity of operation of all support units.
4. All quality assurance standard guidelines and procedures are then transmitted to all Schools and support units through Quality Assurance Academic Coordinating...
Committee, Quality Assurance Administrative Coordinating Committee and Common Data Set Committee.

5. These committees further transmit all quality assurance standard guidelines and procedures to School/Support Unit Quality Assurance Committee and faculty/staff members for internal quality assurance.

University Quality Assurance Board

Duties and Responsibilities

1. Establish policies and principles in the governance of Assumption University’s Quality Education.
2. Develop quality assurance systems and mechanisms of Assumption University.
3. Follow up, supervise and monitor all units in the implementation of quality assurance.
4. Check and evaluate all units' performance in quality assurance.

Quality Assurance Executive Committee for Academic Units

Duties and Responsibilities

1. Ensure that the quality assurance policies, plans, procedures and systems of Assumption University are implemented effectively and efficiently.
2. Monitor the implementation of quality assurance processes, policies and practices.
3. Ensure that all quality processes are documented and standardized.
4. Support academic and support units in the preparation of internal and external quality assessment.
5. Work in close relationship with Quality Assurance Executive Committee for Support Units, Center for Excellence, academic and support units for the final write-up of the University’s Self-Assessment Report within the deadline set by the University.
Quality Assurance Executive Committee for Support Units

Duties and Responsibilities

1. Ensure that the quality assurance policies, plans, procedures and systems of Support Units are implemented effectively and efficiently.
2. Monitor the implementation of quality assurance processes, policies and practices of Support Units.
3. Ensure that all quality processes are documented and standardized.
4. Support academic and support units in the preparation of internal and external quality assessment.
5. Work in close relationship with Quality Assurance Executive Committee for Academic Units, Center for Excellence, academic and support units for the final write-up of the University’s Self-Assessment Report within the deadline set by the University.

Quality Assurance Academic Coordinating Committee

Duties and Responsibilities

1. Act as a liaison between the School and the Quality Assurance Executive Committee for the implementation of the quality assurance system of Assumption University
2. Follow up the School’s achievements of the internal and external quality assessment indicators.
3. Ensure that the quality assurance data, documents and evidence are properly compiled and the School’s Self-Assessment Report is prepared within the deadline set for the internal and external quality assessment.

QA Administrative Coordinating Committee

Duties and Responsibilities

1. Act as a liaison between the Office and the Quality Assurance Executive Committee for the implementation of the quality assurance system of Assumption University.
2. Follow up the Office’s achievements of the internal and external quality assessment indicators.
3. Ensure that the quality assurance data, documents and evidence are properly compiled and the Office’s Self-Assessment Report is prepared within the deadline set for the internal and external quality assessment.
School/Support Unit Quality Assurance Committee

Duties and Responsibilities

1. Establish policies and objectives of quality assurance of the School/Support Unit in accordance with those of the University’s.
2. Design a system and stages for quality assurance of the School/Support Unit in accordance with the University’s policies and system.
3. Supervise the departments of the School/Unit according to the established process and objectives.
4. Follow up, examine, and assess the performance of the School/Unit.
5. Collect the performance results and prepare the self-assessment report for the internal quality assessment.
6. Utilize the assessment results to improve the unit’s performance.
7. Cooperate in providing the University with all the information for the annual self-assessment report of the University.
8. Prepare the School/Unit for the Internal Quality Assessment and External Quality Assessment of the University.
9. Analyze, identify, and prioritize risk factors which may affect educational objectives according to main strategies and missions.
10. Establish a policy, a plan, mechanisms and means for risk management.
11. Evaluate risk management for continuous improvements.

Common Data Set Committee

Duties and Responsibilities

1. Define the common data set, documents and evidence in accordance with OHEC’s and ONESQA’s indicators and standard criteria.
2. Verify and certify the common data set, documents and evidence of the University in accordance with the OHEC’s and ONESQA’s indicators and standard criteria.
3. Submit the common data set, documents and evidence of the University to the Center for Excellence which will forward them to Schools for writing School Self-Assessment Report.
4. Submit the common data set, documents and evidence of the University to responsible persons/committees for writing AU Self-Assessment Report.
AuQS 2000 Quality Assurance Procedures

Planning for Quality Assurance Operation

- Distribution of the Quality Assurance Manual
  - CFE prepares and distributes the Quality Assurance Manual to Schools and support units. The manual includes policies, processes and procedures, indicators and standard criteria, required documents and templates for One-year Plan and Budget and Self-Assessment Report.

- Appointment of Quality Assurance Committees
  - CFE prepares the proposal for the appointment of quality assurance committees of all levels and presents it to the President for approval.

- Announcement of Internal Quality Assessment Schedule
  - CFE announces the internal quality assessment schedule for the academic year.

- Quality Assurance Trainings
  - CFE organizes quality assurance trainings for Schools and support units. The trainings aim to create awareness of quality assurance among new faculty members and staff as well as increase understandings of quality assurance processes and procedures, indicators and standard criteria.

Development and Implementation of Strategic Plan and Operational Plan

University

- The University develops the AU Strategic Plan.
- The AU Strategic Plan is approved by the University Council before implementation.
- The AU Strategic Plan is disseminated to Schools and support units.

School/Support Unit

- Each School/Support Unit develops its strategic plan and operational plan (One-Year Plan and Budget). The plans must be aligned with the AU Strategic Plan and include targets and achievement indicators.
- Faculty members and staff are involved in the development and implementation of the strategic plan and operational plan.
- The strategic plan and operational plan is approved by the President before implementation.
- The strategic plan and operational plan are disseminated to faculty members and staff.
- All activities have to be carried out as defined in the operational plan.
Report on Performance Achievement

School/Support Unit

- Each School/Support Unit should report the performance outcomes to their supervisors (Deans/Directors) twice a year.
- Each School/Support Unit writes the annual report and submits the annual report to CFE on the due date specified in the internal quality assessment schedule.

University

- The President reports the University’s performance outcomes to the University Council twice a year.

Program Internal Quality Assessment

- Each Program prepares its self-assessment report (SAR TQF7) and submits it to the Dean.
- The Program proposes the appointment of Internal Quality Assessment Committee for the academic year to the President for approval.
  - At least 3 assessors consisting of at least 50% external assessors
  - Chaired by an external assessor.
- The Program contacts the Internal Quality Assessment Committee to arrange the schedule for site visit and internal quality assessment.
- The Program submits the Program’s SAR (TQF7) to the Internal Quality Assessment Committee for review.
- Each Program will be informed of the date, time and venue of their internal quality assessment.
- All data and documents should be arranged in proper files and folders or input on-line for reference. For each program, the common data set and the self-assessment report must be input into the CHE QA Online system at least one week before the date of internal quality assessment.
- Each Program prepares students, faculty members, alumni and employers for the interview and the site visit. The documents must be ready for checking.
- On the assessment date, the Internal Quality Assessment Committee visits and assesses the performance of the Program based on the indicators and criteria defined in the Quality Assurance Manual.
- On completion of the assessment, the Internal Quality Assessment Committee prepares the Internal Quality Assessment Report and submits it to CFE.
- Upon receiving the Internal Quality Assessment Report from the Program, CFE submits the Report to OHEC.
School Internal Quality Assessment

- Each School prepares its self-assessment report and submits it to CFE.
- CFE proposes the appointment of Internal Quality Assessment Committee to the President for approval.
  - At least 3 assessors consisting of at least 1 external assessor
  - Chaired by an internal or external assessor
- CFE contacts the Internal Quality Assessment Committee to arrange the schedule for site visit and internal quality assessment.
- CFE submits the School’s SAR to the Internal Quality Assessment Committee for review.
- Each School will be informed of the date, time and venue of their internal quality assessment.
- All data and documents should be arranged in proper files and folders or input on-line for reference. For Schools, the common data set and the self-assessment report must be input into CHE QA Online system at least one week before the date of internal quality assessment.
- Each School prepares students, faculty members, alumni and employers for the interview and the site visit. The documents must be ready for checking.
- On the assessment date, the Internal Quality Assessment Committee visits and assesses the performance of the School based on the indicators and criteria defined in the Quality Assurance Manual.
- On completion of the assessment, the Internal Quality Assessment Committee prepares the Internal Quality Assessment Report and submits it to CFE.
- Upon receiving the Internal Quality Assessment Report from the School, CFE submits the Report to OHEC.

University Internal Quality Assessment

- The University prepares its self-assessment report.
- CFE proposes the appointment of Internal Quality Assessment Committee to the President for approval.
  - At least 5 assessors consisting of 3 external and 2 internal assessors
  - Chaired by an external assessor
- CFE contacts the Internal Quality Assessment Committee to arrange the schedule for site visit and internal quality assessment.
- CFE submits the AU Self-Assessment Report to the Internal Quality Assessment Committee for review.
- The CFE informs the University of the date, time and venue of the internal quality assessment.
All data and documents should be arranged in proper files and folders or input on-line for reference. The common data set and the self-assessment report must be input into the CHE QA Online system at least one week before the date of internal quality assessment.

The University prepares students, faculty members, alumni and employers for the interview and the site visit. The documents must be ready for checking.

On the assessment date, the Internal Quality Assessment Committee visits and assesses the performance of the University.

On completion of the assessment, the Internal Quality Assessment Committee prepares the AU Internal Quality Assessment Report of the University and submits it to CFE.

Upon receiving the AU Internal Quality Assessment Report from the Internal Quality Assessment Committee, CFE submits the Report to OHEC.

Report on Performance Achievements to the University Council

After the assessment of all levels, CFE prepares the AU Performance Report (PMR) and AU Internal Quality Assessment Report.

The President reports the university performance and the internal quality assessment results to the University Council.

The comments of the University Council are distributed by CFE to all concerned for developing improvement plans.

Development of Improvement Plan

The University prepares the improvement plan for the next academic year.

Each School prepares its improvement plan for the next academic year.
## Master Timeframe

### Internal Quality Assurance and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
<th>Prior to Beginning of Academic Year</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>After End of Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jan, Feb, Mar, Apr, May, Jun, Jul</td>
<td>Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan</td>
<td>Aug, Sep, Oct, Nov, Dec, Jan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Development/Revision of AU/School/Support Unit Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Development of AU/School/Support Unit One-Year Plan and Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Approval of AU/School/Support Unit One-Year Plan and Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Implementation of AU/School/Program One-Year Plan and Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Report on Program/School’s achievements according to OYPB indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program/School Internal Quality Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University Internal Quality Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Report on Program/School/University Internal Quality Assessments to Commission on Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Development of AU/School/Support Unit Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Follow-up of Program/School Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Internal Quality Assurance Components and Indicators

### Program Quality Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance Result or Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Standard Control</td>
<td>1.1 Program administration in compliance with the higher education program standard criteria specified by OHEC</td>
<td>Results of program administration in compliance with Program Standard Criteria specified by OHEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Program 4 criteria Graduate Program 12 criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Graduates</td>
<td>2.1 Graduate quality in accordance with TQF: HEd</td>
<td>Evaluation results of graduate quality in accordance with TQF: HEd (from employers, stakeholders, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Graduates’ employment status or research</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s degree students’/ Doctoral degree students’ published and/ or disseminated works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students</td>
<td>3.1 Student admission</td>
<td>Student admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student preparation before entering university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Student development</td>
<td>Supervision of academic advising and counseling for bachelor’s degree students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervision of thesis/ dissertation and independent study advising for graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities for the development of students’ capabilities and learning skills for the 21st century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Effects on students</td>
<td>Retention rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduation rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students’ satisfaction and results of students’ complaint management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Performance Result or Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Faculty Members | 4.1 Management and development of faculty members | - Recruitment and appointment of program faculty members  
- Management of faculty members  
- Faculty development |
| | 4.2 Faculty members’ quality | - Per cent of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree  
- Per cent of program faculty members holding an academic title  
- Program faculty members’ academic works  
- (Doctoral degree program) Ratio of program faculty members’ cited articles in TCI and Scopus to the number of program faculty members |
| | 4.3 Effects on faculty members | - Per cent of faculty members remaining in the university  
- Faculty members’ satisfaction |
| 5. Program, Teaching - Learning and Student Evaluation | 5.1 Course content | - Program design and course content  
- Program update in line with the development in the field of study |
| | 5.2 Lecturers’ working assignment management system and teaching- learning process | - Selection of lecturers for teaching assignment  
- Monitoring and following up of TQF 3 and TQF 4 preparation and teaching-learning process  
- Integration of research, academic service and preservation of art and culture with teaching-learning in bachelor’s degree program  
- Supervising the selection of thesis/dissertation titles and independent study topics in graduate program to ensure that they are within the scope of the field of study and go along with the development in the field of study |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Performance Result or Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Appointment of thesis/ dissertation and independent study advisors in graduate program whose specialization is related to the thesis/ dissertation titles and independent study topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assisting, monitoring and following up of the thesis/ dissertation and independent study progress including the publication of thesis/ dissertation and independent study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Students’ evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Students’ learning outcome evaluation in accordance with TQF: HEd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Checking of evaluation of students’ learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Supervision of the teaching - learning evaluation and program evaluation (TQF 5, 6 and 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Thesis/ dissertation and independent study evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Program performance in compliance with the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF:HEd)</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Achievement of TQF: HEd Performance Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Learning Support Facilities</td>
<td>6.1 Learning support facilities</td>
<td>- Department/ School/ Institution system of acquiring learning support facilities with the participation of program faculty members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Appropriateness and sufficiency of learning support facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Process for facility improvement based on the evaluation results of faculty members’ and students’ satisfaction with learning support facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 1 Standard Control

Program administration must be in compliance with the Higher Education Program Standard Criteria (Bachelor’s Degree Program Standard Criteria B.E. 2548 and Graduate Program Standard Criteria B.E. 2548), the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF : HEd) B.E.2552 and other relevant criteria.

Bachelor’s degree Program : 4 criteria
Graduate Program : 12 criteria
Component 1 Standard Control
Indicator 1.1 Program administration in compliance with the Higher Education Program Standard Criteria specified by Office of Higher Education Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criterion</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Master’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree Program</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Number of program faculty members | The number of program faculty members must not be less than 5. They cannot be program faculty members for more than 1 program and they must work throughout the program implementation. | The number of program faculty members must not be less than 5. They cannot be program faculty members for more than 1 program and they must work throughout the program implementation. | The number of program faculty members must not be less than 5. They cannot be program faculty members for more than 1 program and they must work throughout the program implementation. | With reference to OHEC Letter dated 18 April 2549, it is specified that:  
- Program faculty members may also be program faculty members of another multidisciplinary program on condition that it is the same field of study or related field.  
- Program faculty members at the graduate level can also be program faculty members of another doctoral degree or master’s degree program of the same major.  
With reference to OHEC Letter dated 11 March 2557, it is specified that: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criterion</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Master’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree Program</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Qualifications of program faculty members</td>
<td>At least 2 faculty members hold a degree not lower than master’s degree or the equivalent or hold an academic title of at least Assistant Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>Qualified as faculty members responsible for the program or thesis advisors or thesis examiners or lecturers</td>
<td>Qualified as faculty members responsible for the program or dissertation advisors or dissertation examiners or lecturers</td>
<td>- For bachelor’s degree programs with sub-majors, each sub-major must have at least 3 program faculty members who are qualified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Qualifications of faculty members responsible for the program</td>
<td>At least 3 faculty members hold a degree not lower than doctoral degree or the equivalent or hold an academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>At least 3 faculty members hold a degree not lower than doctoral degree or the equivalent or hold an academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criterion</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Program</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study or related field.</td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members or external experts hold a master’s degree or academic title of at least Assistant Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members or external experts hold a doctoral degree or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>For master’s degree program, with reference to OHEC Letter dated 18 July 2555, it is specified that: Faculty members holding a doctoral degree with no research work after graduation can be lecturers of a master’s degree program; however, the faculty members must have research work within 2 years after the first day of teaching to be qualified as lecturers of a doctoral degree program as well as program faculty members, thesis/dissertation advisors and thesis/dissertation examiners of master’s degree and doctoral degree programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criterion</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Program</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Have teaching experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have experience doing research which is not part of graduation requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Have experience doing research which is not part of graduation requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Qualifications of thesis/ dissertation advisors and independent study advisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Master’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree Program</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members hold a doctoral degree or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members hold a doctoral degree or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members hold a doctoral degree or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>Criteria for consideration in case faculty members retire or resign are as follows: 1) Program can hire retired faculty members who have qualifications in compliance with the Higher Education Program Standard Criteria to be full-time faculty members by following the University’s Personnel Administrative System, with the monthly contract remuneration for specified responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criterion</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Qualifications of thesis/ dissertation co-advisors (if any)</td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members or external experts hold a doctoral degree or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members or external experts hold a doctoral degree or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field.</td>
<td>Implementation Guidelines for Higher Education Program Standard Criteria B. E. 2548, No. 7.6 : Specialists refer to University personnel who have expertise in the field of study. They may be non-academic personnel or external experts with no academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These faculty members can be program faculty members, thesis/ dissertation advisors, thesis/ dissertation co-advisors, thesis/ dissertation examiners and lecturers.

2) Retired faculty members can continue to be thesis/ dissertation advisors till students graduate if the students’ thesis proposal was approved before their retirement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criterion</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Master’s Degree Program</th>
<th>Doctoral Degree Program</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Have experience doing research which is not part of graduation requirement</td>
<td>2. Have experience doing research which is not part of graduation requirement</td>
<td>qualifications and academic titles. Only full-time personnel could be thesis/dissertation major advisors. Thesis/ dissertation co-advisors may be full-time personnel or external experts who have expertise and experience in the field of study and who are recognized at the organization or ministry levels or in the professional field. In case doctoral degree program lacks co-dissertation advisors or lecturers holding a doctoral degree or holding academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study, the University may appoint experts case by case with the University Council’s approval and it must be reported to the Higher Education Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criterion</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Program</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Qualifications of thesis/ dissertation examiners</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members and external experts hold a doctoral degree or the equivalent or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field. 2. Have experience doing research which is not part of graduation requirement</td>
<td>1. Full-time faculty members and external experts hold a doctoral degree or the equivalent or academic title of at least Associate Professor in the field of study or related field. 2. Have experience doing research which is not part of graduation requirement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Publication and dissemination of graduates’ academic works</td>
<td></td>
<td>(for Plan A) Proceedings of academic conferences or journals or academic publications in the form of hardcopy or soft file</td>
<td>Journals or academic publications in the form of hardcopy or soft file, which have peer review</td>
<td>Thesis/ dissertation related to invention, patent or petty patent registration can substitute for publication in journals or academic publications, considering the year of patent or petty patent registration, not the year of request.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criterion</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Program</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervision load of thesis/ dissertation advisors and independent study advisors at the graduate level</td>
<td><strong>Thesis</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 advisor per 5 students&lt;br&gt;Independent study&lt;br&gt;1 advisor per 15 students&lt;br&gt;For advisor of both thesis and independent study,&lt;br&gt;1 thesis advisee = 3 independent study advisees</td>
<td><strong>Dissertation</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 advisor per 5 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Program Standard Criteria B. E. 2548 No.10:&lt;br&gt;1 full-time faculty member can be an advisor of not more than 5 advisees. In case the program has a full-time faculty member with capability to advise more than 5 students, the University can assign the faculty member to have more than 5 advisees but not more than 10. This is to support full-time faculty members in doing research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Thesis/ dissertation advisors and independent study advisors at the graduate level do research regularly.</td>
<td>Advisors should have at least 1 research publication within 5 academic years including the year of assessment.</td>
<td>Advisors should have at least 1 research publication within 5 academic years including the year of assessment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is to ensure regular research outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criterion</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Master’s Degree Program</td>
<td>Doctoral Degree Program</td>
<td>Remark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Program modification according to time-frame specified</td>
<td>Within 5 years (The program modification must be done anytime within 5 years and approved by the University Council for its implementation in the following year.) Remarks: For a 5-year program, the modification takes place in the 6th year and implementation in the 7th year.</td>
<td>Within 5 years (The program modification must be done anytime within 5 years and approved by the University Council for its implementation in the following year.)</td>
<td>Within 5 years (The program modification must be done anytime within 5 years and approved by the University Council for its implementation in the following year.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Program performance in compliance with TQF:HEd</td>
<td>TQF indicators 1-5 are achieved.</td>
<td>TQF indicators 1-5 are achieved.</td>
<td>TQF indicators 1-5 are achieved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4 criteria</td>
<td>12 criteria</td>
<td>12 criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment criteria: Pass and Not Pass

If the Program does not pass any of the specified criteria, the assessment result is “Not Pass” (The score = 0)

Required documents apart from documents related to each indicator:

1. Program Specification (TQF 2) with the stamp of the Office of Higher Education Commission
2. OHEC Acknowledgement Letter (if any)
3. In case the Program is in the process of acknowledgement, the University letter to OHEC and the University Council Meeting Minutes are required.
Component 2 Graduates

The quality of graduates of each program reflects the quality of graduates in accordance with the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education. This is assessed through the learning outcomes, graduates securing jobs and quality of students’/ graduates’ research works at the graduate level in an academic year.

Two indicators

2.1 Graduate quality according to the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education

2.2 (Bachelor’s degree) Per cent of bachelor’s degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed within one year
(Master’s Degree) Master’s degree graduates’ published/ disseminated academic works
(Doctoral degree) Doctoral degree graduates’ published/ disseminated academic works

Indicator 2.1 Graduate quality in accordance with Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education

Type of indicator Output

The Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF:HEd) specifies the expected characteristics of graduates in TQF 2 comprising at least 5 domains of learning outcomes: 1) morals and ethics 2) knowledge 3) cognitive skills 4) interpersonal skills and responsibility 5) numerical analysis, communicative and information technology skills. This indicator concerns the assessment of graduate quality based on the perception of stakeholders.

Assessment criteria: Use the average score of evaluation out of 5
Remark: The number of graduates who are evaluated by employers must not be lower than 20% of the total number of graduates.

Calculation

Score obtained = \[
\frac{\text{Sum of graduate evaluation scores}}{\text{Total number of graduates who are evaluated}}
\]
Indicator 2.2 (Bachelor’s degree program) Per cent of bachelor’s degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed within one year

Type of indicator Output

Assessment criteria: Convert the per cent of bachelor’s degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed within one year to a score ranging from 0-5. The total score of 5 = 100%
Remarks: The number of graduates who answer the questionnaires must not be lower than 70% of the total number of graduates.

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of bachelor’s degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed within one year by...

\[
\text{Per cent of bachelor's degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed within one year} = \frac{\text{Total number of bachelor's degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed within one year}}{\text{Total number of graduates who answer the questionnaires}} \times 100
\]

This does not include graduates who further their studies, go for military service, enter the monkhood and are employed during their study and do not change their jobs.

2. Convert the per cent in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Per cent of bachelor’s degree graduates who can secure jobs or who can be self-employed within one year}}{100} \times 5
\]
Indicator 2.2 (Master’s degree program) Master’s degree graduates’ published/disseminated academic works

Type of indicator  Output

Assessment criteria: Convert the per cent of the sum of weight scores of published/disseminated academic works per graduate to a score ranging from 0-5. The total score of 5 = 40 % or higher.

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of the sum of weight scores of published/disseminated academic works per graduate

Per cent of academic works =

\[
\frac{\text{Sum of weight scores of master’s degree graduates’ published/disseminated academic works}}{\text{Total number of master’s degree graduates}} \times 100
\]

2. Convert the per cent in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Per cent of the sum of weight scores of published/disseminated academic works per graduate}}{40} \times 5
\]

Weight Score of Academic Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>- Full articles published in any form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>- Full articles published in the proceedings of national conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>- Full articles published in the proceedings of international conferences or in national journals not listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556 but the University proposes them to the University Council for acceptance and informs the Higher Education Commission within 30 days after the official announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works with petty patent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Score Quality Level
---
0.60 - Articles published in journals listed in the TCI database (Tier 2)

0.80 - Articles published in international journals not listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556 but the University proposes them to the University Council for acceptance and informs the Higher Education Commission within 30 days after the official announcement (not listed on Beall’s list) or published in journals listed in the TCI database (Tier 1)

1.00 - Articles published in international journals listed in international databases listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556
- Academic works with patent
- Academic works submitted for presentation must be the full paper. After acceptance, the full paper must be published in the form of hard copy or soft file.

Weight Score of Creative Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated to the public in any form or online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the international joint project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the ASEAN/ international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Creative works submitted for presentation must be reviewed by a committee comprising at least 3 members including an external member.

Remarks:
1. Research work produced by a student together with a faculty member which is calculated in this indicator can be calculated as part of the faculty member’s academic works.
2. This indicator includes all research work of students and graduates published/disseminated in the year of assessment.
3. In case there are no graduates, this indicator is not considered.
Indicator 2.2 (Doctoral degree program) Doctoral degree graduates’ published/disseminated academic works

Type of indicator  Output

Assessment criteria: Convert the per cent of the sum of weight scores of published/disseminated academic works per graduate to a score ranging from 0-5. The total score of 5 = 80 % or higher.

Calculation
1. Calculate the per cent of the sum of weight scores of published/disseminated academic works per graduate

\[
\text{Per cent of the sum of weight scores of published/disseminated academic works per graduate} = \frac{\text{Sum of weight scores of doctoral degree graduates’ published/disseminated academic works}}{\text{Total number of doctoral degree graduates}} \times 100
\]

2. Convert the per cent in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.
Score obtained =

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Per cent of the sum of weight scores of published/disseminated academic works per graduate}}{80} \times 5
\]

Weight Score of Academic Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>- Full articles published in the proceedings of national conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>- Full articles published in the proceedings of international conferences or in national journals not listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556 but the University proposes them to the University Council for acceptance and informs the Higher Education Commission within 30 days after the official announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works with petty patent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic works submitted for presentation must be the full paper. After acceptance, the full paper must be published in the form of hard copy or soft file.

### Weight Score of Creative Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated to the public in any form or online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the international joint project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the ASEAN/ international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Creative works submitted for presentation must be reviewed by a committee comprising at least 3 members including an external member.

**Remarks:**

1. Research work produced by a student together with a faculty member which is calculated in this indicator can be calculated as part of the faculty member’s academic works.

2. All research work of students and graduates published/ disseminated in the year of evaluation must be included.

3. In case there are no graduates, this indicator is not considered.
Component 3 Students

Student quality assurance focuses on student admission, which requires (1) a system to select and screen students to ensure that students are qualified and ready to study so that they can graduate within the specified time frame, (2) student development, so that students are academically ready and (3) various types of activities for the development of students’ knowledge, capability and learning skills for the 21st century. For the graduate program, students are required to have research skills so that they can create a new body of knowledge.

Learning skills for the 21st century comprise:

1. Core subjects
2. Learning and innovation skills which include: (1) critical thinking and problem solving (2) innovation and creativity (3) communication and collaboration
3. Information, media and technology skills which include: (1) information literacy (2) media literacy and (3) ICT literacy
4. Life and career skills which include: (1) adaptability and flexibility (2) initiative and self-direction (3) social and cross-cultural interaction (4) accountability and productivity and (5) leadership and social responsibility

Three indicators

3.1 Student admission
3.2 Student development
3.3 Effects on students
Indicator 3.1 Student admission

Type of indicator  Process

Student qualifications for each program are specified in accordance with the nature of the program. Selection criteria must be transparent, clear and based on the student qualifications specified by the program. It requires tools for selection, data or methodology for screening students who are intellectually qualified, physically and mentally healthy, determined to study and have adequate study time so that they can graduate within the specified time frame.

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:
- Student admission
- Students’ preparation before entering university

The assessment score is based on the overall performance result which indicates that students are ready and qualified to study in the program.

Assessment criteria

0 score  - No system
- No mechanism
- No conception of monitoring, following up and improvement
- No data

1 score  - Have a system and a mechanism
- No implementation of the system and the mechanism

2 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- No improvement/ development of processes

3 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results

4 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/
development of processes

**5 scores**

- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/
development of processes
- Have good practices supported by evidence and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as good practices
Indicator 3.2 Student development

Type of indicator Process

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:
- Supervision of academic advising and counseling for bachelor’s degree students
- Supervision of thesis and independent study advising for graduate students
- Activities for the development of students’ capabilities and learning skills for the 21st century which include: (1) core subjects (2) learning and innovation skills (3) information, media and technology skills and (4) life and career skills

The assessment score is based on the overall performance result which indicates that students study happily and develop skills essential for their future career/ profession.

Assessment criteria

0 score  - No system
- No mechanism
- No conception of monitoring, following up and improvement
- No data

1 score  - Have a system and a mechanism
- No implementation of the system and the mechanism

2 scores - Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- No improvement/ development of processes

3 scores - Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results

4 scores - Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes
5 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes
- Have good practices supported by evidence and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as good practices
Indicator 3.3 Effects on students

Type of indicator  Output

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:
- Retention rate
- Graduation rate
- Students’ satisfaction and results of students’ complaint management

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No report on the performance results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of some items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a positive tendency for improvement in some items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a positive tendency for improvement in all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a positive tendency for improvement in all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have outstanding performance results supported by evidence when benchmarking itself with the same program of other institutions in the same category and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as outstanding performance results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 4 Faculty Members

Three indicators

4.1 Management and development of program faculty members
4.2 Faculty members’ quality
4.3 Effects on faculty members
Indicator 4.1 Management and development of faculty members

Type of indicator Process

Faculty member development starts from the new faculty member recruitment system. Criteria for faculty member qualifications in compliance with the University’s and the program’s context, philosophy, vision must be specified. There must be a proper and transparent mechanism for selecting faculty members. Moreover, a system for faculty member administration must be set up by specifying policies, long-term plans, activities as well as monitoring and development so as to ensure that faculty members comply with the OHEC’s Program Standard Criteria in terms of quality and quantity. Moreover, planning, investing, budgeting and resourcing must be done to ensure that the number of faculty members with qualifications, expertise and experience in the field of the program is sufficient.

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:
- Recruitment and appointment of program faculty members
- Management of faculty members
- Faculty development

The assessment score is based on the overall performance result which indicates that the program faculty members possess the required academic qualifications in terms of degrees or academic titles specified in OHEC’s Program Standard Criteria and are encouraged to develop themselves academically to help strengthen the program.
Assessment criteria

0 score
- No system
- No mechanism
- No conception of monitoring, following up and improvement
- No data

1 score
- Have a system and a mechanism
- No implementation of the system and the mechanism

2 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- No improvement/ development of processes

3 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results

4 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes

5 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes
- Have good practices supported by evidence and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as good practices
Indicator 4.2 Faculty members’ quality

Type of indicator  Input

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:
- Per cent of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree
- Per cent of program faculty members holding an academic title
- Program faculty members’ academic works
- (Doctoral degree program) Ratio of program faculty members’ cited articles in the TCI database and Scopus to the number of program faculty members

Per cent of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree

Assessment criteria
Convert the per cent of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree to a score ranging from 0-5.

Bachelor’s degree program
20% or higher of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree = 5 scores

Master’s degree program
60% or higher of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree = 5 scores

Doctoral degree program
100% of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree = 5 scores

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree

\[
\text{Total number of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree} \div \text{Total number of program faculty members} \times 100
\]
2. Convert the per cent obtained in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5
Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Per cent of program faculty members holding a doctoral degree}}{20\% \text{ (BD)}, 60\% \text{ (MD)} \text{ or } 100\% \text{ (DD)}} \times 5
\]

Remarks:
Doctoral degree is the doctoral degree received or its equivalent in compliance with the degree criteria of the Ministry of Education. If there is a degree adjustment, the transcript issued within the year of assessment is required. However, in case of some professions, other degrees equivalent to the doctoral degree may be considered on condition that they are approved by the Higher Education Commission.

**Per cent of program faculty members holding an academic title**

**Assessment criteria**
Convert the per cent of program faculty members holding an academic title to a score ranging from 0-5.

Bachelor’s degree program
60 % or higher of program faculty members holding the academic title of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor = 5 scores

Master’s degree program
80 % or higher of program faculty members holding the academic title of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor = 5 scores

Doctoral degree program
100% of program faculty members holding the academic title of Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor = 5 scores
Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of program faculty members holding an academic title

   \[
   \text{Per cent of program faculty members holding an academic title} = \left( \frac{\text{Total number of program faculty members holding an academic title}}{\text{Total number of program faculty members}} \right) \times 100
   \]

2. Convert the per cent obtained in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5

   Score obtained =

   \[
   \text{Score obtained} = \left( \frac{\text{Per cent of program faculty members holding an academic title}}{60\% \text{ (BD), } 80\% \text{ (MD) or } 100\% \text{ (DD)}} \right) \times 5
   \]

Program faculty members’ academic works

Assessment criteria

Bachelor’s degree program

   20 % or higher of the sum of weight scores of program faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores

Master’s degree program

   40 % or higher of the sum of weight scores of program faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores

Doctoral degree program

   60 % or higher of the sum of weight scores of program faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores
Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of the sum of weight scores of program faculty members’ academic works

\[
\text{Sum of weight scores of program faculty members’ academic works} \times \frac{100}{\text{Total number of program faculty members}}
\]

2. Convert the per cent obtained in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Per cent of the sum of weight scores of program faculty members’ academic works}}{20\% \text{ (BD), 40\% (MD) or 60\% (DD)}} \times 5
\]

Weight Score of Academic Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>- Full research or academic articles published in the proceedings of national conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>- Full research or academic articles published in the proceedings of international conferences or in national journals not listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556 but the University proposes them to the University Council for acceptance and informs the Higher Education Commission within 30 days after the official announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works with petty patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>- Research or academic articles published in journals listed in the TCI database (Tier 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>- Research or academic articles published in international journals not listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556 but the University proposes them to the University Council for acceptance and informs the Higher Education Commission within 30 days after the official announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Quality Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Research or academic articles published in international journals listed in the international databases listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works with patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works for social service which pass the evaluation for academic title application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Research works of other units or organizations at the national level done by the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Discovery of new plants, animals which are registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Textbooks, books or translation which pass the evaluation for academic title application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Textbooks, books or translation which are evaluated according to the criteria for academic title application but are not used for academic title application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Academic works submitted for presentation must be the full paper. After acceptance, the full paper must be published in the form of hard copy or soft file.

Weight Score of Creative Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated to the public in any form or online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the international joint project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the ASEAN/ international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Creative works submitted for presentation must be reviewed by a committee comprising at least 3 members including an external member.
(Doctoral degree program) Ratio of program faculty members’ cited articles in the TCI database and Scopus to the number of program faculty members

Assessment criteria

Include the cited articles during the past 5 years (including the year of assessment).

Science and Technology: 2.5 or higher of the ratio of cited articles to the number of program faculty members = 5 scores

Health Science: 3.0 or higher of the ratio of cited articles to the number of program faculty members = 5 scores

Humanities and Social Sciences: 0.25 or higher of the ratio of cited articles to the number of program faculty members = 5 scores

Calculation

1. Ratio of cited articles to the number of program faculty members

\[
\frac{\text{Total number of cited articles}}{\text{Total number of program faculty members}}
\]

2. Convert the ratio obtained in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Ratio of cited articles to the number of program faculty members}}{2.5 \ (S+T), \ 3.0 \ (HS), \ 0.25 \ H+SC} \times 5
\]
Indicator 4.3 Effects on faculty members

Type of indicator  Output

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:
- Per cent of program faculty members remaining in the program
- Faculty members’ satisfaction

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 score</td>
<td>No report on the performance results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 score</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of some items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 scores</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 scores</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a positive tendency for improvement in some items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 scores</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a positive tendency for improvement in all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 scores</td>
<td>Have a report on the performance results of all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a positive tendency for improvement in all items specified in the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have outstanding performance results supported by evidence when benchmarking itself with the same program of other institutions in the same category and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as outstanding performance results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 5 Program, Teaching - Learning and Student Evaluation

The program administrators have responsibility for controlling and monitoring program administration for efficient and effective management. The program administrative committee should be responsible for management of 3 main areas: (1) course content, (2) faculty members’ working assignment system and teaching- learning process, (3) students’ evaluation.

The program quality assurance system comprises the program, teaching-learning and students’ evaluation in compliance with the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education. The indicators focus on designing courses with up-to-date content to cope up with the changes in the field of study and setting up faculty members’ working assignment system and advising in order to assign suitable faculty members with knowledge, skills, experience and qualifications in developing students and providing activities for the development of students’ capabilities and learning skills for the 21st century.

Four indicators

5.1 Course content
5.2 Faculty members’ working assignment system and teaching- learning process
5.3 Students’ evaluation
5.4 Program performance in compliance with Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF:HEd)

Indicator 5.1 Course content

Type of indicator Process

Although all Programs the University offers must be acknowledged by the Office of Higher Education Commission and modified every 5 years, the administrators are responsible for the supervision and monitoring of course planning so that the content is up-to-date and relevant to cope up with the changes in the field of study. There must be a management system for opening core courses and free elective courses which are student-centered to serve the need of students and labor market. The graduate program must focus on developing students’ research and self-learning skills.

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:

- Program design and course content
- Program update in line with the development in the field of study
The assessment score is based on the overall performance result which indicates that the program is up-to-date and meets the need of labour market and the country.

### Assessment criteria

**0 score**
- No system
- No mechanism
- No conception of monitoring, following up and improvement
- No data

**1 score**
- Have a system and a mechanism
- No implementation of the system and the mechanism

**2 scores**
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- No improvement/ development of processes

**3 scores**
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results

**4 scores**
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes

**5 scores**
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes
- Have good practices supported by evidence and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as good practices
Indicator 5.2 Lecturers’ working assignment management system and teaching-learning process

Type of indicator Process

The program must focus on faculty members’ working assignment for each course by considering their knowledge, capability and skills in the field of study. Moreover, their knowledge must be up-to-date so that students can receive knowledge as well as experience and develop their capacity by learning from real experts.

The graduate program focuses on assigning thesis/ dissertation/ independent study advisors to ensure that students have an opportunity to develop their capability. Advisors must be able to give advice about title/ topic development, thesis/ dissertation/ independent study development, thesis/ dissertation/ independent study defense, and research publication/ dissemination till graduation.

Teaching-learning process in the 21st century must focus on student development to ensure that students acquire the knowledge specified in the program structure and develop qualifications in compliance with the Thai Qualification Framework for Higher Education, morals and ethics, cognitive skills in the 21st century, especially self-learning skills, Thai and foreign language skills, interpersonal skills, technology skills, health care skills, etc. Modern teaching-learning requires technological media and encourages students to pursue knowledge anytime and anywhere. Moreover, faculty members must be facilitators. For the graduate program, teaching techniques at this level must be research-based, problem-based, etc.

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:

- Selection of lecturers for teaching assignment
- Monitoring and following up of TQF 3 and TQF 4 preparation and teaching-learning process
- Integration of research, academic service and preservation of art and culture with teaching-learning in bachelor’s degree program
- Supervising the selection of thesis/ dissertation titles and independent study topics in graduate program to ensure that they are within the scope of the field of study and go along with the development in the field of study
- Appointment of thesis/ dissertation and independent study advisors in graduate program whose specialization is related to the thesis/ dissertation titles and independent study topics
Assisting, monitoring and following up of the thesis/ dissertation and independent study progress including the publication of thesis/ dissertation and independent study

The assessment score is based on the overall performance result which indicates that the teaching-learning processes are student-centered, respond to the diversity of students and achieve the expected learning outcomes.

Assessment criteria

0 score
- No system
- No mechanism
- No conception of monitoring, following up and improvement
- No data

1 score
- Have a system and a mechanism
- No implementation of the system and the mechanism

2 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- No improvement/ development of processes

3 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results

4 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes

5 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes
- Have good practices supported by evidence and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as good practices
**Indicator 5.3 Students’ evaluation**

**Type of indicator**  Process

The objectives of students’ evaluation are (1) to give information beneficial to faculty members’ teaching-learning development, which may result in students’ learning development (assessment for learning), (2) to make students able to evaluate/assess themselves and the evaluation results can be used for their learning development to achieve learning outcomes (assessment as learning) and (3) to assess learning outcomes which reflect learning expected by the program (assessment of learning).

The assessment system should focus on assessment criteria, methods of assessment, grading system tools which reflect learning outcomes, authentic assessment, and various assessment methods which reflect students’ capability to work in the real world, feedback to improve students’ weaknesses or strengthen themselves, and assessment results which show students’ real capability. For the graduate program, the focus must also be put on the thesis/dissertation/independent study assessment system.

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:

- Students’ learning outcome evaluation in accordance with the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF: HEd)
- Checking of evaluation of students’ learning outcomes
- Supervision of the teaching-learning evaluation and program assessment (TQF 5, 6 and 7)
- Thesis/dissertation and independent study evaluation

The assessment score is based on the overall performance result which reflects the students’ actual achievement and reliability of the assessment methods and tools and the information derived assists faculty members and students to improve teaching-learning.
Assessment criteria

0 score
- No system
- No mechanism
- No conception of monitoring, following up and improvement
- No data

1 score
- Have a system and a mechanism
- No implementation of the system and the mechanism

2 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- No improvement/ development of processes

3 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results

4 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes

5 scores
- Have a system and a mechanism
- Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
- Have process assessment
- Have improvement/ development of processes based on assessment results
- Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/ development of processes
- Have good practices supported by evidence and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as good practices
Indicator 5.4 Program performance in compliance with the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF: HEd)

Type of indicator  Output

Program performance refers to per cent of performance indicators in compliance with the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF: HEd) specified in TQF 2: Section 7, No. 7 which each Program has achieved in each academic year.

Assessment criteria

Achievement of less than 80% of performance indicators required for the academic year = 0 score

Achievement of 80% of performance indicators required for the academic year = 3.50 scores

Achievement of 80.01-89.99% of performance indicators required for the academic year = 4.00 scores

Achievement of 90.00-94.99% of performance indicators required for the academic year = 4.50 scores

Achievement of 95.00-99.99% of performance indicators required for the academic year = 4.75 scores

Achievement of 100% of performance indicators required for the academic year = 5.00 scores
Component 6 Learning Support Facilities

Learning support facilities consist of physical readiness, equipment readiness, technology readiness, service readiness such as classrooms, laboratories, research rooms, teaching-learning equipment, libraries, information technology service, computers, wifi, etc. including maintenance which supports students’ learning in compliance with the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF:HEd). The evaluation results of students’ and faculty members’ satisfaction are used for improvement.

One indicator

6.1 Learning support facilities

Indicator 6.1 Learning support facilities

Type of indicator Process

Explain the process or present the outcome of the following items:

- Department/ School/ Institution system of acquiring learning support facilities with the participation of program faculty members
- Appropriateness and sufficiency of learning support facilities
- Process for facility improvement based on the evaluation results of faculty members’ and students’ satisfaction with learning support facilities

The assessment score is based on the overall performance result which indicates adequate preparation of learning support facilities essential for teaching-learning that enable students to study effectively.
Assessment criteria

0 score  - No system
          - No mechanism
          - No conception of monitoring, following up and improvement
          - No data

1 score   - Have a system and a mechanism
          - No implementation of the system and the mechanism

2 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
          - Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
          - Have process assessment
          - No improvement/development of processes

3 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
          - Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
          - Have process assessment
          - Have improvement/development of processes based on assessment results

4 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
          - Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
          - Have process assessment
          - Have improvement/development of processes based on assessment results
          - Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/development of processes

5 scores  - Have a system and a mechanism
          - Have implementation of the system and the mechanism
          - Have process assessment
          - Have improvement/development of processes based on assessment results
          - Have clear and concrete outcome resulting from the improvement/development of processes
          - Have good practices supported by evidence and assessors can explain clearly and explicitly the reasons for considering them as good practices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate Production</td>
<td>1.1 Results of program administration</td>
<td>Average score of assessment results of all programs offered by the School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree</td>
<td>Per cent of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Full-time faculty members holding an academic title</td>
<td>Per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) per full-time faculty member</td>
<td>Ratio of full-time equivalent students (FTES) per full-time faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Bachelor’s degree student service</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Bachelor’s degree student activities</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research</td>
<td>2.1 System and mechanism for research or creative work administration and development</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Research and creative work funds</td>
<td>Internal and external research and creative work funds per full-time faculty member and researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works</td>
<td>Ratio of all academic works per full-time faculty member and researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic Service</td>
<td>3.1 Academic service to society</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preservation of Art and Culture</td>
<td>4.1 System and mechanism for preservation of art and culture</td>
<td>7 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administration</td>
<td>5.1 School’s monitoring and following up of performance in compliance with the University’s mission, the category of the institution and the School’s uniqueness</td>
<td>7 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 System for monitoring Program and School quality assurance</td>
<td>5 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institution’s Identity</td>
<td>6.1 System and mechanism for ethics development</td>
<td>5 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 System and mechanism for the enhancement of students’ English proficiency</td>
<td>5 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 System and mechanism for the development of students’ entrepreneurial spirit</td>
<td>5 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 1 Graduate Production

The most important mission of higher education institutions is graduate production or provision of teaching-learning activities to make students have academic as well as professional knowledge and qualifications specified by the program. The current teaching-learning is student-centered; therefore, the mission deals with program and teaching-learning administration starting from designing the standard input comprising of quality faculty members required by the program standard, and the teaching-learning administrative process based on cooperation of all concerned inside and outside the University.

Six indicators

1.1 Results of program administration
1.2 Full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree
1.3 Full-time faculty members holding an academic title
1.4 Number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) per full-time faculty member
1.5 Bachelor’s degree student service
1.6 Bachelor’s degree student activities
Indicator 1.1 Results of Program administration

Type of indicator  Output

Assessment criteria

Average score of assessment results of all programs offered by the School.

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Sum of assessment scores of all programs}}{\text{Number of programs offered by the School}}
\]

Remarks: Any program accredited by other systems and accepted by the Higher Education Internal Quality Assurance Committee will not be assessed and no assessment score will be calculated for this indicator but the accreditation must be reported.
Indicator 1.2 Full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree

Type of indicator Input

Assessment criteria

Convert the per cent of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree to a score ranging from 0-5.

1. Criteria for Group B and Group C2 institutions
   40% or higher of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree = 5 scores

2. Criteria for Group C1 and Group D institutions
   80% or higher of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree = 5 scores

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of the School’s full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree.

   \[
   \text{Total number of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree} \div \text{Total number of full-time faculty members} \times 100
   \]

2. Convert the per cent in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

   Score obtained =

   \[
   \text{Per cent of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree} \div 40\% \text{ (Group B+C2), } 80\% \text{ (Group C1+D)} \times 5
   \]
Remarks:

1. Doctoral degree is the doctoral degree received or its equivalent in compliance with the degree criteria of the Ministry of Education. In case of degree adjustment, the transcript issued within the year of assessment is required. However, in some professions, other degrees may be considered equivalent to the doctoral degree on condition that they are approved by the Higher Education Commission.

2. Count the number of full-time faculty members in the academic year, including faculty members who are actually working and those who take leave for further study. In case of new recruitment, count the number of full-time faculty members by the criteria specified in the announcement on the counting of the number of full-time faculty members and researchers.
Indicator 1.3 Full-time faculty members holding an academic title

Type of indicator Input

Assessment criteria

Convert the per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title to a score ranging from 0-5.

1. Criteria for Group B and Group C2 institutions
60% or higher of full-time faculty members holding an academic title: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor = 5 scores

2. Criteria for Group C1 and Group D institutions
80% or higher of full-time faculty members holding an academic title: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor = 5 scores

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title.

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Total number of full-time faculty members holding an academic title}}{\text{Total number of full-time faculty members}} \times 100
\]

2. Convert the per cent in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title}}{60\% \, (\text{Group B+C2}), \ 80\% \, (\text{Group C1+D})} \times 5
\]
Indicator 1.4 Number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) per full-time faculty member

Type of indicator  Input

Assessment criteria

Calculate the difference between the number of full-time equivalent students per full-time faculty member and the FTES specified for each discipline as follows:

Calculation

1. Calculate Student Credit Hours (SCH)

\[ \text{SCH} = \sum n_1 c_1 \]

\[ n_1 = \text{number of students enrolling in Subject 1} \]

\[ c_1 = \text{number of credits of Subject 1} \]

2. Calculate FTES

\[ \text{FTES} = \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Credit Hours (SCH) for the whole year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of credits /academic year according to the standard registration at each degree level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjustment of the graduate program FTES to the bachelor’s degree program FTES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree Program FTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Health Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Humanities/ Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| =FTES (bachelor’s degree) + FTES (graduate program) |}
| =FTES (bachelor’s degree) + (2 x FTES graduate program) |
| =FTES (bachelor’s degree) + (1.8 x FTES graduate program) |
FTES specified for each discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Ratio of FTES per full-time faculty member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Health Science</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical Science</td>
<td>20:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Engineering</td>
<td>20:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Architecture and City Planning</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing</td>
<td>20:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Business Administration, Commerce,</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Management, Tourism, Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Law</td>
<td>50:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education</td>
<td>30:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Liberal Arts, Fine and Applied Arts</td>
<td>8:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Social Sciences/ Humanities</td>
<td>25:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Calculate the difference between the actual FTES and the FTES specified for each discipline and convert it to per cent

\[
\text{Actual FTES per full-time faculty member} - \text{FTES per full-time faculty member specified for each discipline} \times 100
\]

2. Convert the per cent in no. 1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

2.1) Less or equal to 10% = 5 scores
2.2) More than or equal to 20% = 0 score
2.3) More than 10% but less than 20% = (20 - per cent in no.1) x 5
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Indicator 1.5 Bachelor’s degree student service

Type of indicator    Process

Standard criteria
1. Students are provided with academic advising and counseling about how to spend their life in university.
2. Students are provided with information about service units, extra-curricular activities, full-time and part-time work placements.
3. Activities are organized to prepare students for work.
4. The quality of activities and services in no.1-3 is evaluated. Each item must score more than 3.51 out of the total score of 5.
5. The evaluation results of no.4 are used for developing the service and information provision to improve the performance or meet students’ expectation.
6. Information and knowledge beneficial to careers are provided to alumni.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 1.6 Bachelor’s degree student activities

Type of indicator Process

Standard criteria
1. Student development activities of the School are planned. Students are encouraged to participate in planning and organizing activities.
2. Student development activities must cover the 5 domains of learning specified in the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education:
   - morals and ethics
   - knowledge
   - cognitive skills
   - interpersonal skills and responsibility
   - numerical analysis, communicative and information technology skills
3. Activities to provide students with knowledge and skills in quality assurance are organized.
4. Achievement of the objectives of all activities is evaluated and the evaluation results are used for further development.
5. Achievement of the objectives of the plan for student development activities is evaluated.
6. The evaluation results are used for the development of the plan or student development activities.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 2 Research

Conducting research will be successful and beneficial if
1) the University sets up a plan for research. A system, a mechanism, and resource support are provided.
2) faculty members cooperate in conducting research and integrate research works into teaching-learning and other missions of the University.
3) research works which are of quality, beneficial and aligned with the national strategy are disseminated widely.

Three indicators

2.1 System and mechanism for research or creative work administration and development
2.2 Research and creative work funds
2.3 Full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works
Indicator 2.1 System and mechanism for research and creative work administration and development

Type of indicator  Process

Standard criteria
1. There is an information system for research and creative work administration which can be utilized for the benefit of research and creative work administration.
2. Research and creative work mission is supported at least in the following areas:
   - laboratories or research units or equipment centers or counseling and research promotion centers
   - libraries or sources of research support data
   - facilities or safety while conducting research e.g. information technology system, security system in research laboratories, etc.
   - academic activities to promote research e.g. academic conferences, creative work exhibitions, visiting professors, etc.
3. The School allocates budgets for research and creative work funds.
4. The School allocates budgets to promote the dissemination of research and creative works in conferences or the publication of research and creative works in national or international journals.
5. The capability of faculty members and researchers is developed. The School supports and appreciates researchers/ faculty members who produce excellent research and creative works.
6. There are a system and a mechanism to protect the rights of research or creative works and they are implemented accordingly.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 2.2 Research and creative work funds

Type of indicator Input

Assessment criteria
Convert the sum of funds per full-time faculty member and researcher to a score ranging from 0-5.

1. Criteria for Group B and Group C2 institutions according to disciplines:
   Science and Technology
   The research or creative work funds from internal and external sources amounting to 60,000 baht or more per faculty member and researcher = 5 scores
   Health Science
   The research or creative work funds from internal and external sources amounting to 50,000 baht or more per faculty member and researcher = 5 scores
   Humanities and Social Sciences
   The research or creative work funds from internal and external sources amounting to 25,000 baht or more per faculty member and researcher = 5 scores

2. Criteria for Group C1 and Group D institutions according to disciplines:
   Science and Technology
   The research or creative work funds from internal and external sources amounting to 220,000 baht or more per faculty member and researcher = 5 scores
   Health Science
   The research or creative work funds from internal and external sources amounting to 180,000 baht or more per faculty member and researcher = 5 scores
   Humanities and Social Sciences
   The research or creative work funds from internal and external sources amounting to 100,000 baht or more per faculty member and researcher = 5 scores

Calculation
1. Calculate the sum of research or creative work funds from internal and external sources per full-time faculty member and researcher.

   \[
   \text{Sum of research or creative work funds from internal and external sources} \div \text{Total number of full-time faculty members and researchers}
   \]
2. Convert the sum of research or creative work funds in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Sum of research or creative work funds from internal and external sources}}{\text{Sum of research or creative work funds specified for 5 scores}} \times 5
\]

Score obtained at the School level = Average score obtained from all disciplines of the School

**Remarks:**

1. Count the number of faculty members and researchers in the academic year and count only full-time faculty members and researchers who are working, excluding those who take leave for further study.
2. Count the sum of money according to the contracts in the academic year or fiscal year or calendar year, not the sum of money actually spent.
3. In case there is evidence concerning the division of research funds which may be set by the fund sources or according to agreement of the institutions in charge, allocate the money as indicated. In case there is no evidence, allocate the money in proportion to the number of faculty members/researchers of each School.
4. The institutional research funds can be counted on condition that the contracts are signed by faculty members or researchers, not by support staff.
Indicator 2.3 Full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works

Type of indicator  Output

Assessment criteria

1. Criteria for Group B and Group C2 institutions
   Science and Technology
   30% or higher of the sum of weight scores of faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores
   Health Science
   30% or higher of the sum of weight scores of faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores
   Humanities and Social Sciences
   20% or higher of the sum of weight scores of faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores

2. Criteria for Group C and Group D institutions
   Science and Technology
   60% or higher of the sum of weight scores of faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores
   Health Science
   60% or higher of the sum of weight scores of faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores
   Humanities and Social Sciences
   40% or higher of the sum of weight scores of faculty members’ academic works = 5 scores

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of the sum of weight scores of full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works.

\[
\text{Sum of weight scores of full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works} \times 100
\]

\[
\frac{\text{Sum of weight scores of full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works}}{\text{Total number of full-time faculty members and researchers}} \times 100
\]
2. Convert the per cent obtained in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Per cent of the sum of weight scores of full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works}}{\text{Per cent of the sum of weight scores of full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works specified for 5 scores}} \times 5
\]

Weight score of Academic Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>- Full research or academic articles published in the proceedings of national conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>- Full research or academic articles published in the proceedings of international conferences or in national journals not listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556 but the University proposes them to the University Council for acceptance and informs the Higher Education Commission within 30 days after the official announcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works with petty patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>- Full research or academic articles published in journals listed in the TCI database (Tier 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>- Full research or academic articles published in international journals not listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556 but the University proposes them to the University Council for acceptance and informs the Higher Education Commission within 30 days after the official announcement (not listed on Beall’s list) or published in journals listed in the TCI database (Tier 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>- Full research or academic articles published in international journals listed in the international databases listed in OHEC’s Regulations on Criteria for Selection of Academic Journals for Publication of Academic Works B.E. 2556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works with patent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Academic works for social service which pass the evaluation for academic title application</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Research works of other units or organizations at the national level done by the University
- Discovery of new plants, animals which are registered
- Textbooks, books or translation which pass the evaluation for academic title application
- Textbooks, books or translation which are evaluated according to the criteria for academic title application but are not used for academic title application

- Academic works submitted for presentation must be the full paper. After acceptance, the full paper must be published in the form of hard copy or soft file.

Weight score of Creative Works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated to the public in any form or online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the institutional level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the international joint project level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Creative works disseminated at the ASEAN/ international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Creative works submitted for presentation must be reviewed by a committee comprising at least 3 members including an external member.
Component 3 Academic Service

Academic service is one of the missions of the University. It can be provided in any form, depending on the institution’s skills. It may be free of charge or charged accordingly and it should be provided to government and private sectors, independent organizations, public organizations, communities and society. Types of service may include permission to use the University’s resources, being an academic reference source, giving counseling, organizing workshops, meetings or seminars, doing research, etc. These benefit society as well as the University; for example, faculty members can increase their knowledge and experience, which may result in program development, integration of research into teaching-learning, faculty members’ academic titles, creating a network with organizations as future work contacts for students, and creating income for the University.

One indicator

3.1 Academic service to society

Indicator 3.1 Academic service to society

Type of indicator  Process

Standard criteria

1. An academic service plan is formulated in response to social needs. Achievement indicators of the plan and projects are specified and presented to the School Committee for approval.
2. The academic service project plan must include a plan of utilizing academic service for the development of students, communities and society.
3. The academic service in no.1 must include at least 1 project provided free of charge.
4. The achievement indicators of the plan and projects in no.1 are assessed and presented to the School Committee for consideration.
5. The evaluation results in no. 4 are used for developing the plan or academic service to society.
6. The School takes part in providing academic service to society at the institutional level.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 4 Preservation of Art and Culture

Higher education institutions must set up a system and a mechanism for efficient preservation of art and culture. The emphasis can vary, depending on the institution’s philosophy and nature. This should be integrated into other missions, especially graduate production. Moreover, activities to restore, maintain, develop, disseminate art and culture, create as well as promote local wisdom in order to develop a new body of knowledge should be organized.

One indicator

4.1 System and mechanism for preservation of art and culture
Indicator 4.1 System and mechanism for preservation of art and culture

**Type of indicator**  
Process

**Standard criteria**

1. The School assigns persons to be in charge of art and culture preservation.
2. The School makes a plan to preserve art and culture, specifies achievement indicators according to the plan’s objectives and allocates budgets for the implementation of the plan.
3. The School monitors and follows up the art and culture preservation plan.
4. The achievement indicators of the plan for art and culture preservation are evaluated.
5. The evaluation results are used for developing the plan or activities concerning art and culture preservation.
6. The art and culture preservation service or activities are disseminated to the public.
7. Quality standard for art and culture is specified and accepted at the national level.

**Assessment criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 items</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6-7 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 5 Administration

Higher education institutions must have quality administration under the supervision of the University Council. For example, there should be human resources administration, database systems, risk management, resources administration, etc. in order to achieve the specified objectives by applying the 10 principles of Good Governance in administration.

The 10 principles of Good Governance include (1) effectiveness (2) efficiency (3) responsiveness (4) accountability (5) transparency (6) participation (7) decentralization (8) rule of law (9) equity and (10) consensus oriented.

Two indicators

5.1 School’s monitoring and following up of performance in compliance with the University’s mission, the category of the institution and the School’s uniqueness

5.2 System for monitoring Program and School quality assurance
Indicator 5.1 School’s monitoring and following up of performance in compliance with the University’s mission, the category of the institution and the School’s uniqueness

Type of indicator      Process

Standard criteria
1. A strategic plan based on SWOT analysis is set and is in alignment with the vision of the School, the University, the category of the institution and the School’s uniqueness. It must also be developed into a financial strategic plan and an annual action plan within the time frame so as to achieve the indicators as well as the objectives of the strategic plan and be presented to the University administrators for consideration.
2. Financial information which include the cost per unit of each program, cost for the development of students, faculty members, staff, and teaching-learning is continuously analyzed so as to determine the cost-effectiveness of program administration, efficiency and effectiveness of graduate production as well as competitive advantage.
3. The School manages risks to reduce risks according to the risk management plan which results from the analysis and the identification of external risk factors or uncontrollable risk factors which affect the School’s administration. The degree of risk should be lowered.
4. The School applies the 10 principles of Good Governance in administration.
5. The School searches for good practice emanating from tacit knowledge, experts’ skills, and other sources of knowledge for graduate production and research. The School systematically files the good practice data and puts them in writing as well as applies them to real work.
6. The School supervises and monitors the plan for administration and development of faculty members and support staff.
7. The School develops an internal quality assurance system which is appropriate and relevant to the mission as well as the development of the School which includes quality assurance as part of the School’s administration comprising quality control, quality audit and quality assessment.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5-6 items</td>
<td>7 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5.2 System for monitoring Program and School quality assurance

Type of indicator  Process

Standard criteria
1. A system and a mechanism for monitoring program quality assurance in accordance with the components of program quality assurance are set up.
2. A committee for monitoring and following up the performance specified in no. 1 is set up and the performance results are reported to the School Committee for consideration every academic semester.
3. Resources for supporting the program performance to achieve outcomes based on the components of program quality assurance are allocated.
4. Quality of all programs is assessed by the time specified and the assessment results are reported to the School Committee for consideration.
5. The assessment results and the suggestions of the School Committee are used for developing the program continuously.
6. All programs pass all the standard control criteria specified in Component 1.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 6 Institution’s Identity

Three indicators

6.1 System and mechanism for ethics development
6.2 System and mechanism for the enhancement of students’ English proficiency
6.3 System and mechanism for the development of students’ entrepreneurial spirit
**Indicator 6.1 System and mechanism for ethics development**

**Type of indicator**  Process

Ethics

1. Integrity
2. Social consciousness
3. Discipline
   - Self-discipline
   - Social discipline

**Standard criteria**

1. A system and a mechanism for ethics development are in place and they are implemented accordingly.
2. A course in ethics development is included in all programs of study.
3. There are students’ projects or activities that support ethics development.
4. There is performance evaluation of projects or activities that support ethics development.
5. The results of performance evaluation are used for the improvement of teaching and learning and projects or activities that support ethics development.

**Assessment criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 6.2 System and mechanism for the enhancement of students’ English proficiency

Type of indicator Process

English Proficiency

Standard criteria
1. A system and a mechanism for the enhancement of students’ English proficiency are in place and they are implemented accordingly
2. There is students’ development or enhancement of English proficiency incorporated in all courses.
3. There are students’ projects or activities that support the enhancement of English proficiency.
4. There is performance evaluation of projects or activities that support the enhancement of students’ English proficiency.
5. The results of performance evaluation are used for the improvement of teaching and learning and projects or activities for the enhancement of students’ English proficiency.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 6.3 System and mechanism for the development of students’ entrepreneurial spirit

Type of indicator    Process

Entrepreneurial Spirit
1. Leadership
2. Management Knowledge
3. Labor Omnia Vincit

Standard criteria
1. A system and a mechanism for the development of students’ entrepreneurial spirit are in place and they are implemented accordingly.
2. There are entrepreneurial spirit development activities incorporated in all programs of study.
3. There are students’ projects or activities that support the development of entrepreneurial spirit.
4. There is performance evaluation of projects or activities that support the development of students’ entrepreneurial spirit.
5. The results of performance evaluation are used for the improvement of teaching and learning and projects or activities for entrepreneurial spirit development.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## University Quality Assurance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Graduate Production</td>
<td>1. Results of program administration</td>
<td>Average score of assessment results of all programs offered by the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Results of program administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree</td>
<td>Per cent of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Full-time faculty members holding an academic title</td>
<td>Per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Bachelor’s degree student service</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Bachelor’s degree student activities</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Research</td>
<td>2.1 System and mechanism for research or creative work</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research or creative work administration and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Research and creative work funds</td>
<td>Average score of assessment results of all Schools and research units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average score of assessment results of all Schools and research units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works</td>
<td>Average score of assessment results of all Schools and research units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic Service</td>
<td>3.1 Academic service to society</td>
<td>6 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preservation of Art and Culture</td>
<td>4.1 System and mechanism for preservation of art and culture</td>
<td>7 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Administration</td>
<td>5.1 University’s monitoring and following up of performance in compliance with the University’s mission, the category of the institution and the University’s uniqueness</td>
<td>7 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Results of School administration</td>
<td>Average score of assessment results of all Schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 System for monitoring Program and School quality assurance</td>
<td>5 Standard criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Institution’s Identity</td>
<td>6.1 Achievements in the development of institution’s identity</td>
<td>5 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Institution’s Uniqueness</td>
<td>7.1 Achievements in the development of institution’s uniqueness</td>
<td>5 Standard criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 1 Graduate Production

The most important mission of higher education is graduate production or provision of teaching-learning activities to make students have academic as well as professional knowledge and qualifications specified by the program. The current teaching-learning is student-based; therefore, the mission deals with program and teaching-learning administration starting from designing the standard input comprising of quality faculty members according to program standard, and the teaching-learning administrative process based on cooperation of all concerned inside and outside the University.

Five indicators

1.1 Results of program administration
1.2 Full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree
1.3 Full-time faculty members holding an academic title
1.4 Bachelor’s degree student service
1.5 Bachelor’s degree student activities
**Indicator 1.1 Results of Program administration**

**Type of indicator** Output

**Assessment criteria**

Average score of assessment results of all programs offered by the University

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Sum of assessment scores of all programs}}{\text{Number of programs offered by the University}}
\]

**Remark:** Any program accredited by other systems and accepted by the Higher Education Internal Quality Assessment Committee will not be assessed and no assessment score will be calculated for this indicator but the accreditation must be reported.
Indicator 1.2 Full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree

Type of indicator Input

Assessment criteria
Convert the per cent of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree to a score ranging from 0-5.

1. Criteria for Group B and Group C2 institutions
40% or higher of faculty members holding a doctoral degree = 5 scores

2. Criteria for Group C1 and Group D institutions
80% or higher of faculty members holding a doctoral degree = 5 scores

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree.

\[
\text{Total number of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree} \times 100
\]

Total number of full-time faculty members

2. Convert the per cent in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Per cent of full-time faculty members holding a doctoral degree}}{40\% \text{ (Group B+C2), 80\% (Group C1+D)}} \times 5
\]
Remarks:

1. Doctoral degree is the doctoral degree received or its equivalent in compliance with the degree criteria of the Ministry of Education. In case of degree adjustment, the transcript issued within the year of assessment is required. However, in some professions, other degrees may be considered equivalent to the doctoral degree on condition that they are approved by the Higher Education Commission.

2. Count the number of full-time faculty members in the academic year, including faculty members who are actually working and those who take leave for further study. In case of new recruitment, count the number of full-time faculty members by the criteria specified in the announcement on the counting of the number of full-time faculty members and researchers.
Indicator 1.3 Full-time faculty members holding an academic title

Type of indicator     Input

Assessment criteria
Convert the per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title to a score ranging from 0-5.

1. Criteria for Group B and Group C2 institutions
60% or higher of faculty members holding an academic title: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor = 5 scores

2. Criteria for Group C1 and Group D institutions
80% or higher of faculty members holding an academic title: Assistant Professor, Associate Professor and Professor = 5 scores

Calculation

1. Calculate the per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title.

\[
\text{Per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title} = \frac{\text{Total number of full-time faculty members holding an academic title}}{\text{Total number of full-time faculty members}} \times 100
\]

2. Convert the per cent in no.1 to a score ranging from 0-5.

Score obtained =

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Per cent of full-time faculty members holding an academic title}}{\text{60\% (Group B+C2), 80\% (Group C1+D)}} \times 5
\]
Indicator 1.4 Bachelor’s degree student service

Type of indicator  Process

Standard criteria
1. Students are provided with academic advising and counseling about how to spend their life in university and how to work
2. Students are provided with information about service units, extra-curricular activities, full-time and part-time work placements.
3. Activities are organized to prepare students for work.
4. The quality of activities and services in no.1-3 is assessed. Each item must score more than 3.51 out of the total score of 5.
5. The evaluation results of no.4 are used for developing the service and information provision to improve the performance or meet students’ expectation.
6. Information and knowledge beneficial to careers are provided to alumni.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 1.5 Bachelor’s degree student activities

Type of indicator  Process

Standard criteria

1. Student development activities of the University are planned. Students are encouraged to participate in planning and organizing activities.

2. For bachelor’s degree students, student development activities must include
   - activities to enhance graduates’ characteristics specified by the University
   - sports or health activities
   - activities for social benefits or environmental preservation
   - moral and ethical development activities
   - art and culture promotion activities

3. Activities to provide students with knowledge and skills in quality assurance are organized.

4. Achievement of the objectives of all activities is evaluated and the evaluation results are used for further development.

5. Achievement of the objectives of the plan for student development activities is evaluated.

6. The evaluation results are used for the development of the plan or student development activities.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Component 2 Research**

Conducting research will be successful and beneficial if

1) the University sets up a plan for research. A system, a mechanism, and resource support are available.

2) faculty members cooperate in conducting research and integrate research works into teaching-learning and other missions of the University.

3) research works which are of quality, beneficial and aligned with the national strategy are disseminated widely.

**Three indicators**

2.1 System and mechanism for research or creative work administration and development

2.2 Research and creative work funds

2.3 Full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works
Indicator 2.1 System and mechanism for research and creative work administration and development

Type of indicator Process

Standard criteria

1. There is an information system for research and creative work administration which can be utilized for the benefit of research and creative work administration.
2. Research and creative work mission is supported at least in the following aspects:
   - laboratories or research units or equipment centers or counseling and research promotion centers
   - libraries or sources of research support data
   - facilities or safety while conducting research e.g. information technology system, security system in research laboratories, etc.
   - academic activities to promote research e.g. academic conferences, creative work exhibitions, visiting professors, etc.
3. The University allocates budgets for research and creative work funds.
4. The University allocates budgets to promote the dissemination of research and creative works in conferences or the publication of research and creative works in national or international journals.
5. The capability of researchers is developed. The University supports and appreciates researchers/faculty members who produce excellent research and creative works.
6. There are a system and a mechanism to protect the rights of research or creative works and they are implemented accordingly.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 2.2 Research and creative work funds

Type of indicator  Input

Assessment criteria
Score obtained at the University level is the average score of assessment results (research or creative work funds from internal and external sources) of all Schools and research units of the University.

Calculation
Score obtained =

\[
\text{Score obtained} = \frac{\text{Sum of assessment scores of research or creative work funds of all Schools and research units}}{\text{Total number of Schools and research units}}
\]
Indicator 2.3 Full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works

**Type of indicator**  Output

**Assessment criteria**
Score obtained at the University level is the average score of assessment results of all full-time faculty members’ and researchers’ academic works.

**Calculation**

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Sum of assessment scores of research or creative works of all Schools and research units}}{\text{Total number of Schools and research units}}
\]
Component 3 Academic Service

Academic service is one of the missions of the University. It can be provided in any form, depending on the institution’s skills. It may be free of charge or charged accordingly and it should be provided to both government and private sectors, independent organizations, public organizations, communities and society. Types of service may include permission to use the University’s resources, being an academic reference source, giving counseling, organizing workshops, meetings or seminars, doing research, etc. These benefit society as well as the University; for example, faculty members can increase their knowledge and experience, which may result in program development, integration of research into teaching-learning, faculty members’ academic titles, creating a network with organizations as future work contacts for students, and creating income for the University.

One indicator

3.1 Academic service to society

Indicator 3.1 Academic service to society

Type of indicator Process

Standard criteria

1. The University identifies target communities or organizations for academic service with the participation of Schools.
2. The target communities or organizations identified in no.1 participate in developing an academic service plan.
3. There is a clear evidence to prove that the target communities or organizations are developed and strengthened.
4. The target communities or organizations develop themselves continuously.
5. The University establishes a network of cooperation with external units/organizations in developing the target communities or organizations.
6. At least 5% of the faculty members representing all Schools participate in the implementation of the University’s academic service plan.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 4 Preservation of Art and Culture

Higher education institutions must set up a system and a mechanism for efficient preservation of art and culture. The emphasis can vary, depending on the institution’s philosophy and nature. This should be integrated into other missions, especially graduate production. Moreover, activities to restore, maintain, develop, disseminate art and culture, create as well as promote local wisdom in order to develop a new body of knowledge should be organized.

One indicator

4.1 System and mechanism for preservation of art and culture
Indicator 4.1 System and mechanism for preservation of art and culture

Type of indicator Process

Standard criteria
1. The University assigns persons to be in charge of art and culture preservation.
2. The University formulates a plan to preserve art and culture, specifies achievement indicators according to the plan’s objectives and allocates budgets for the plan implementation.
3. The University monitors and follows up the art and culture preservation as planned.
4. The achievement indicators of the plan for art and culture preservation are evaluated.
5. The evaluation results are used for developing the plan or activities concerning art and culture preservation.
6. The art and culture preservation service or activities are disseminated to the public.
7. Quality standard for art and culture is specified and accepted at the national level.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6-7 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 5 Administration

Higher education institutions must have quality administration under the supervision of the University Council. For example, there should be human resources administration, database systems, risk management, resources administration, etc. in order to achieve the specified objectives by applying the 10 principles of Good Governance in administration.

Three indicators

5.1 University’s monitoring and following up of performance in compliance with the University’s mission, the category of the institution and the University’s uniqueness

5.2 Results of School administration

5.3 System for monitoring Program and School quality assurance
Indicator 5.1 University’s monitoring and following up of performance in compliance with the University’s mission, the category of the institution and the University’s uniqueness

Type of indicator  Process

Standard criteria

1. A strategic plan based on SWOT analysis is set and is in alignment with the University’s vision. It must also be developed into a financial strategic plan and annual action plan within the time frame so as to achieve the indicators as well as the objectives of the strategic plan.

2. Financial information which include the cost per unit of each program, cost for the development of students, faculty members, staff, and teaching-learning management is continuously analyzed so as to determine the cost-effectiveness of program administration, efficiency and effectiveness of graduate production as well as competitive advantage.

3. The University manages risks to reduce risks according to the risk management plan which results from the analysis and the identification of external risk factors or uncontrollable risk factors which affect the University’s administration according to mission. The degree of risk should be lowered.

4. The University applies the 10 principles of Good Governance in administration.

5. The University monitors and supports all units to manage knowledge according to knowledge management system.

6. The University monitors the plan for administration and development of faculty members and support staff.

7. The University monitors and supports all units in implementing the quality assurance system in compliance with the University’s system and mechanism comprising quality control, quality audit and quality assessment.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5-6 items</td>
<td>7 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5.2 Results of School administration

Type of indicator: Output

Assessment criteria:
Average score of assessment results of all Schools

Score obtained =

\[
\frac{\text{Sum of assessment scores of all Schools}}{\text{Total numbers of Schools}}
\]
Indicator 5.3 System for monitoring Program and School quality assurance

**Type of indicator**  Process

**Standard criteria**

1. A system and a mechanism for monitoring Program and School quality assurance in accordance with the components of Program and School quality assurance are set up.
2. A committee for monitoring and following up the performance specified in no. 1 is set up and the performance results are reported to the committee at the University level for consideration.
3. Resources for supporting the Program’s and School’s performance to achieve outcomes based on the components of Program and School quality assurance are allocated.
4. The Program and School assessment results are reported to the committee at the University level for consideration.
5. The assessment results and the University Council’s suggestions are used for developing the Schools continuously.
6. All programs pass all the standard control criteria specified in Component 1.

**Assessment criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3-4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
<td>6 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 6 Institution’s Identity

One indicator

6.1 Achievements in the development of institution’s identity

Indicator 6.1 Achievements in the development of institution’s identity

Type of indicator Process

Identity of Assumption University students

- Ethics
  - Integrity
  - Social consciousness
  - Discipline
    - Self-discipline
    - Social discipline

- English Proficiency

- Entrepreneurial Spirit
  - Leadership
  - Management of knowledge
  - Labor Omnia Vincit

Standard criteria

1. There is a proper and practical rationale in identifying student identity.
2. Appropriate indicators and levels of achievement are specified.
3. A system and a mechanism for continuous enhancement of the student identity are specified.
4. Students, faculty members and support staff participate fully.
5. There is an evaluation of satisfaction. The evaluation result is not less than 80%.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Component 7 Institution’s Uniqueness

One indicator

7.1 Achievements in the development of institution’s uniqueness

Indicator 7.1 Achievements in the development of institution’s uniqueness

Type of indicator Process

Uniqueness

“An International Catholic University”

1. Catholic University
   1.1 Catholic values
   1.2 Catholic symbols
   1.3 Catholic leader
   1.4 Liturgical servicers

2. International University
   2.1 International programs
   2.2 International scholars
   2.3 International students
   2.4 International recognition
   2.5 Learning environment

Standard criteria

1. There is a proper and practical rationale in identifying the University uniqueness.
2. Appropriate indicators and levels of achievement are specified.
3. A system and a mechanism for continuous development of the University’s uniqueness are specified.
4. Students, faculty members and support staff participate fully.
5. There is an evaluation of satisfaction. The evaluation result is not less than 80%.

Assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 score</th>
<th>2 scores</th>
<th>3 scores</th>
<th>4 scores</th>
<th>5 scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 item</td>
<td>2 items</td>
<td>3 items</td>
<td>4 items</td>
<td>5 items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5.1 School’s/University’s monitoring and following up of performance in compliance with the University’s mission, the category of the institution and the University’s uniqueness (School and University)

1. Planning Development Process (School and University)
   1. There is a strategic plan that is aligned with the University Council’s policy with the participation of the University’s or the School’s personnel. The strategic plan must be approved by the University Council or the School’s Committee and in alignment with the University’s philosophy and the Private Higher Education Institutions Act. The strategic plan must be in accordance with the university category, the 15 - year Long-Term Higher Education Plan (2nd issue 2008-2022) and the Higher Education Development Plan (11th issue 2012-2016).
   2. The University’s strategic plan is transmitted to all internal units.
   3. There is a process to translate the strategic plan into an annual action plan which covers the four missions: teaching - learning, research, academic services and preservation of art and culture.
   4. The key performance indicators (KPI) and targets to measure achievements indicated in the strategic plan and the annual action plan are set.
   5. The implementation of the annual action plan covers the four missions of the University.
   6. The performance results based on the indicators in the annual action plan are followed up at least twice a year and the results are reported to the Dean/the President for consideration.
   7. The performance results based on the indicators in the strategic plan are assessed at least once a year and the results are reported to the School Administrative Committee /the University Council for consideration.
   8. The School Administrative Committee’s or the University Council’s comments and suggestions are adopted to improve the strategic plan and the annual action plan

2. Risk Management System
   1. There is a committee or working group appointed to manage risks. The committee must consist of high-level administrators and representatives of all units responsible for the School’s or the University’s core mission.
2. There are analyses and identification of risks and risk factors that cause risks according to the School’s or the University’s context, e.g.

- Risk in resources (finance, budget, information technology systems, buildings)
- Risk in strategies or the University’s strategies
- Risk in policies, rules, and regulations
- Risk in operation, such as risk in program management process, research management, work system, quality assurance system
- Risk in personnel and good governance, especially ethics of lecturers and staff
- External risk
- Other risks within the University’s context

3. There is a process to assess the opportunities and impact of risks and to prioritize risks as analyzed in Item 2.

4. There is a management plan for high-level risks and the plan is implemented.

5. The implementation of the plan is followed up, assessed and reported to the School Administrative Committee or the University Council at least once a year.

6. The results of assessment and recommendations from the School Administrative Committee or the University Council are used for adjusting the plan or analyzing risks in the following year.

3. Principles of Good Governance

Good governance refers to governance, administration, management, control and supervision of works in the right way so as to minimize corrupt practice. Moreover, it can refer to good management applicable to both governmental/public and private sectors. The moral principles or Dhamma for administration has various meanings. That is they are not only moral principles or Dhamma in Buddhism but also all morals, ethics and righteousness which good people should have and practice such as transparency, no interference from external organizations, etc.

The 10 principles of good governance are as follows:

1. Effectiveness means that performance results meet the objectives and the goals specified in the action plan and make the best use of allocated budget. The work requires clear strategies and goals, work processes and standard systems as well as following up of outcome evaluation and development which are improved continuously and systematically.
2. Efficiency means that work is managed by following the methods of good monitoring comprising work process design by using appropriate management techniques and tools so that the organization can make the best use of resources such as cost, labor and time frame to ensure the best possible results for the development of work capability in response to the need of all groups of stakeholders.

3. Responsiveness means giving services within a specified time-frame and creating confidence, trust as well as meeting the expectation and need of service users and all stakeholders.

4. Accountability means being responsible for work as planned to achieve specified goals. The responsibility must include being accountable to the expectation of the public and being aware of social problems.

5. Transparency means that all processes are done in an open and straightforward manner. Information which is not against the law is available and freely accessible to people. All processes of work are known to the public and are verifiable.

6. Participation means that all stakeholders have an opportunity to take part in processes of acknowledgement, learning and understanding, expressing ideas, raising problems or major relevant issues, planning, solving problems, decision-making and development.

7. Decentralization means transferring decision-making power, resources and some mission from the center to other units so that they can work as freely as possible. This includes delegating power and responsibility for decision-making as well as administration to personnel, emphasizing the satisfaction of service users and stakeholders, process development and increase in productivity.

8. Rule of law means using law, codes of conduct, regulations in administration with fairness, no bias and considering stakeholders’ rights and freedom.

9. Equity means that all people, men and women, have an opportunity to receive service equally. No bias is shown with regard to their birth places, races, languages, genders, ages, disability, health, personal status, economic and social status, faith in religions, education, trainings, etc.

10. Consensus Oriented means finding out general consensus within groups of relevant stakeholders. This is the stakeholders ‘consensus that arises from the consensus-making process, especially of those directly affected. There must not be any unsettled disputes over major issues and the consensus need not be a unanimous agreement of the whole community.
4. Knowledge Management

Knowledge management includes the following steps:
1. Identify the knowledge essential for work or activities of a unit or the University.
2. Search for required knowledge.
3. Develop, adjust or create knowledge applicable for one’s work.
4. Apply knowledge to one’s work.
5. Share work experience and application of knowledge for learning and extracting “the knowledge asset”.
6. Record the knowledge asset for work and modify it to a complete set of profound, complete and relevant knowledge which is more practical for work.

These 6 steps must be integrated into one and the acquired knowledge is Explicit Knowledge which is documented or coded and understood by all as well as Tacit Knowledge which is embedded in the person’s entirety. Knowledge management is a collective activity of a group, not an individual’s activity.

5. Management and Development of Faculty Members and Support Staff

1. There is a plan for lecturer management and development in terms of academic, teaching and evaluation techniques. There is a plan for support staff management and development which is based on analysis of empirical data.
2. The management and development of lecturers and support staff are carried out according to the set plan.
3. Employment benefits to promote health and boost morale of lecturers and support staff are in place so they can work efficiently.
4. A monitoring system is in place to ensure that knowledge and skills that lecturers and support staff acquire from development activities are applied to improve teaching and learning, evaluation of student learning outcomes and other related work.
5. Ethical standards are conveyed to lecturers and support staff and practices according to standards are monitored.
6. The achievement of the management and development plan for lecturers and support staff is assessed.
7. The results of assessment are used for improving the plan or improving the management and development of lecturers and support staff.
6. System and Mechanism for Internal Quality Assurance

1. An internal quality assurance system and mechanism that are appropriate and aligned with the University’s mission and development are in place and they are implemented accordingly.

2. The School/University committee and top administrators formulate policies for internal quality assurance.

3. The internal quality assurance system is implemented in all the following areas:
   1) quality control, monitoring and assessment 2) annual quality assessment report submitted to the University Council and the Office of Higher Education Commission according to the schedule set. The quality assessment report includes all the required data as specified by the Office of Higher Education Commission via CHE QA Online 3) utilization of quality assessment results for formulating the School’s/University’s quality development plan.

4. The internal quality assessment results are used for improving the School’s/University’s performance, thus leading to the improvement of all indicators listed in the strategic plan.

5. There is participation of all parties concerned in the quality assurance particularly students, employers and service users in accordance with the University’s mission.

6. There are inter-school/university networks and activities to exchange quality assurance knowledge among institutions.
Assumption University’s Uniqueness and Identity
(An International Catholic University inculcating 3Es- Ethics, English, Entrepreneurial Spirit)

**Catholic leader** refers to the President of the University who is a member of Montfort Brothers of St. Gabriel.

**Catholic symbols** refer to the use of symbols invested with an inner meaning expressing Christian beliefs:
- Crucifix, statute of Christ (“I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life”), Our Lady (Sedes Sapientia – the Seat of Wisdom), St. Louis Marie Grignon de Montfort, St. Peter, St. Paul, St. John Paul II, St. John XXIII, St. Gabriel, St. Rafael, St. Michael, St. Martin de Tours, St. Vincent Mary, Bernadette de Lourdes, Assumption, St. Philip & St. Bernard, St. Albert, St. Laurence, King David, King Solomon, Queen of Sheba.
- “You are the salt of the earth…You are the light of the world…”(Matthew 5:13-14, on the Gate of Wisdom)

**Catholic university** is defined as a Catholic institution of higher learning characterized by shared Christian vision and goals, reflection in the light of faith, fidelity to tradition and commitment to service. *(Association of Catholic Universities and Colleges)*

**Catholic values** refer to Gospel values expressed in the New Testament. The university emphasizes the core value of Christianity which is love.

**Discipline** refers to mastery of self-discipline and social discipline.

**English proficiency** refers to the acquisition of the four skills of English usage.

**Entrepreneurial spirit** refers to the mindset to exercise responsible leadership and take initiatives based on management knowledge through the motto: LABOR OMNIA VINCIT.

**Ethics** refers to acquired moral values and character of students and graduates through the formation process based on Catholic values.

**Integrity** refers to personal character adherent to honesty, reliability, credibility and accountability.
**International programs** refer to programs designed in line with the international curricula, using English as a medium of instruction, accessible to students worldwide, and recognized by overseas universities and organizations.

**International recognition** refers to overseas collaboration through memoranda of understanding with universities and organizations as well as acceptance of students and graduates worldwide.

**International scholars** refer to faculty members and researchers of diverse nationalities and cultures.

**International students** refer to students of diverse nationalities and cultures.

**International university** refers to an international learning community, with international recognition, composed of international programs, international scholars and students.

**LABOR OMNIA VINCIT** (Labor conquers all things) refers to the belief that a man justifies himself and his existence by the nobility of his work which includes industrious effort, commitment, determination, and courage to face adversity.

**Leadership** refers to personal attributes that cover positive thinking, passion for success, critical and creative thinking.

**Learning environment** refers to the integration of architectural design, facilities, and atmosphere conducive to learning among students of diverse nationalities and cultures.

**Liturgical services** refer to liturgical and sacramental rites. (Mass celebrated on different occasions, i.e., the beginning of the new academic year, Assumption Day, the feast of St. Louis Marie Grignon de Montfort, Christmas, Holy Week, Easter, Sundays, weekdays.)

**Management knowledge** refers to knowledge concerning managerial functions in organization.

**Self-discipline** refers to the ability to control oneself to do things that should be done.
Social consciousness refers to awareness of communal life with moral obligation to care, share and sacrifice for others.

Social discipline refers to conformity to social norms and respect for the rights of others.