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External quality assessment is an evaluation of educational management in which external agencies or individuals examine the quality of educational institutions. The aim of this assessment is to develop and improve the educational quality and standards of these institutions. External quality assessment of educational institutions starts with internal quality assurance so that development and self-improvement plans are made, carried out to improve quality, which is then monitored and tracked, and a system of self-assessment is established. After that, external assessment is conducted through the Office of National Educational Standards and Quality Assurance (ONESQA) by considering and verifying the results of the institution’s internal quality assessment. Thus, internal quality assessment and external quality assessment should be consistent and proceed in the same direction, because both of them aim to improve standards or expected quality for learners. ONESQA has outlined the following objectives for external quality assessment:

1.1 Assessment Objectives

General Objectives

1. To know educational institutions’ level of quality in the performance of their various missions.
2. To stimulate and remind institutions to continuously develop educational quality and administrative efficiency.
3. To know the progress of educational quality development at institutions.
4. To report quality levels, quality development, and institutional standards to the general public and relevant agencies.

Specific Objectives

1. To verify actual operating conditions at educational institutions and assess educational quality according to the educational standards, frameworks, and methods established by ONESQA; and to ensure that these are in harmony with the quality assurance systems of the institution and relevant higher bodies.
2. To obtain data that helps reflect the differences of each educational institution showing their distinctive identities, as well as the success of their operations in accordance with the government’s promotional measures.
3. To raise the level of institutions’ educational quality standards by scrutinizing products, results, and impacts more than processes.
4. To encourage institutions to continuously develop and improve quality and their internal quality assurance systems.
5. To encourage institutions to maintain a consistent direction in regards to external and internal quality assessment.
6. To build cooperation and shared goals between higher bodies and relevant agencies – as well as stakeholders – in order to link operations with joint quality improvement.
7. To report and publicize quality assessment results and institutions’ administrative efficiency in a tangible way to relevant agencies and the general public.
Expected Results
1. The management and use of institutional resources is effective, bringing the greatest benefits in the production of graduates at all levels, the conduct of research, and the offering of academic services, all of which meet the needs of society and the country.
2. Educational institutions, administrative agencies, and the government have correct and systematic data to use in formulating policies, plans, and administering/managing education so that the quality of educational institutions can be developed.
3. Institutions have ongoing quality development leading toward international standards, and academic excellence in accordance with a higher education institution’s distinctive identity.

Principles of Indicator Development
1. Establish indicators that aim to assess products, outcomes, and impacts more than inputs and processes.
2. Place importance on the characteristics and categories of educational institutions (the things that they have, what is possible, and their core features).
3. Emphasize both qualitative and quantitative indicators, those that are positive as well as those that are negative.
4. Realize the importance of factors (essential elements), limitations, including culture, and the quality of being “Thai”.
5. Allow for as many basic indicators as necessary, but retain the right to classify them by adding distinctive identity indicators and advancement measurement indicators.
6. Take into account the connection between internal quality assurance and external quality assessment.

1.2 Objectives of the Assessment Manual

The manual for the third round of the external quality assessment of higher educational institutions has been prepared to provide details about the system, standards, and methods of external quality assessment, so that it may be used as a reference document in the operation of educational institutions. It has the following objectives:

1. To serve as a guideline in establishing performance indicators for higher educational institutions that cover assessment of all aspects of their mission.
2. To serve as a guideline in collecting data for assessment of the indicators in a manner that is systematic, comprehensive, and easily searchable when preparing for external quality assessment.
3. To serve as a guideline in the self-assessment of educational institutions before they undergo external quality assessment; the written format of the self-assessment report needs to be in harmony with the one established by higher bodies.

1.3 The Relationship Between Internal and External Quality Assurance

Article 48 of the National Education Act of 1999, amended in 2002, stipulates that “parent organizations and educational institutions shall have an Internal Quality Assurance
system, and shall consider that Internal Quality Assurance is a part of the educational administrative process that must be conducted on an ongoing basis.” At the same time, Article 49 of the same Act specifies concerning External Quality Assessment that “an Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment is to be set up as a public organization that develops standards, methods of external quality assessment, and evaluates educational management results in order to verify the quality of educational institutions.”

From the information above, we can see that internal educational quality assurance is part of the regular process of educational administration that must be carried out on an ongoing basis. This is done by controlling and overseeing the factors that are related to quality, by conducting inspections, by following up and assessing operational results in order to bring about steady improvements in quality. For this reason, the Internal Quality Assurance system needs to look after the areas of input factors, processes, and outputs/outcomes. This is different from External Quality Assessment, which emphasizes only educational management results. Therefore, it is necessary for there to be a connection between Internal Quality Assurance and External Quality Assessment as illustrated in Figure 1.1.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 1.1: The Relationship Between Internal Quality Assurance and External Quality Assessment**

The figure above illustrates that when a higher educational institution carries out Internal Quality Assurance, it needs to prepare an annual report showing the results of the Internal Quality Assessment. This is called the Self-Assessment Report (SAR), and it is to be submitted to the Institutional Council, higher bodies, related agencies, and disclosed to the general public.

This document will be the connecting link between the institution’s Internal Quality Assurance, monitoring and inspection of higher bodies, and External Quality Assessment by ONESQA. Therefore, institutions of higher education need to prepare in-depth Self-Assessment Reports which reflect the actual picture of the institution regarding all quality components.

The Internal Quality Assurance system emphasizes evaluation of input factors and processes, while External Quality Assessment emphasizes products, outcomes, and impacts. Thus, a connection exists between Internal Quality Assurance and External Quality Assessment. In addition to this, ONESQA has an agreement of cooperation that provides for integration with the higher educational institution’s evaluation system per the details found in Appendix C.
1) Group of Basic Indicators (p. 17)

Basic indicators are indicators assessed as part of the mission of educational institutions by establishing indicators and basic evaluation standards that every educational institution must adhere to and implement. Their outcome or impact can be clearly specified and is connected with internal quality assurance.

The group of basic indicators consists of 6 areas and 15 indicators as follows:

A. Quality of Graduates consisting of 4 indicators
B. Research and Innovative Work consisting of 3 indicators
C. Academic Services to Society consisting of 2 indicators
D. Preservation of Arts and Culture consisting of 2 indicators
E. Institutional Administration and Development consisting of 3 indicators
F. Development and Internal Quality Assurance consisting of 1 indicator
A. Quality of Graduates (p. 18)

Quality of graduates means that educational institutions admit students with qualifications and in the numbers specified in their student admission plans, consistent with the goal of producing quality graduates, and that the institution produces graduates according to the national higher educational standards. These include the dimensions of moral and ethical standards, knowledge, intellectual and interpersonal skills, the shouldering of responsibility, quantitative analytical, communication, and information technology skills, along with relevant professional skills. It also encompasses qualities that are distinctive emphases of the institution, such as the skillful and correct use of language, good behavior, good manners and etiquette, refined taste, genuine reflective thought, cultivating growth based on a thirst for learning that successfully translates thought into action, being renowned for wisdom, capable of learning, possessing the skills and intellectual ability of a scholar and advanced professional practitioner, research skills, and becoming a conscientious and virtuous citizen of Thai society and the world in accordance with the national higher educational standards.

There are 4 indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of Bachelor Graduates with Jobs or who are Self-Employed within 1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quality of Graduates at Bachelor, Master, and PhD Levels in Accordance with National Qualifications Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage of Master Theses that are Published or Disseminated at the National or International Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percentage of Doctoral Dissertations that are Published or Disseminated at the National or International Level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 1: Percentage of Bachelor Graduates Who Secure Jobs or are Self-Employed Within 1 Year

Explanation

Bachelor degree graduates who have completed a regular program of studies, a special program of studies, and a part-time program of studies in a particular academic field who are able to secure jobs or to be self-employed and earn regular incomes within one year, counting from the day they graduated, as compared with the number of graduates in that academic year.

When counting employment, count all kinds of honest professions that enable graduates to earn a regular income and make a living. When counting the number of employed graduates who studied in special or part-time study programs, count only those who changed jobs after graduation.

Method of Calculation

\[
\frac{\text{Number of bachelor graduates who secure jobs or are self-employed within 1 year}}{\text{Total number of graduates who completed the survey forms}} \times 100
\]

Remarks

Do not count graduates who were employed prior to admission or who were self-employed with a regular income, those who continue their studies in graduate programs, those who enter the priesthood, and those who are drafted into military service (deduct them from both the dividend and the divisor).

Scoring Criteria

Use the conversion rule to define 100 percent as a score of 5.

Information for Consideration

Quantitative survey data must be representative of at least 70% of graduates, and qualitative data must represent all Faculties. If the number of graduates who respond is less than 70%, then follow-up survey work must be conducted. Survey results must contain the following information:

1. Number of survey respondents
2. Number of graduates from both regular and special (part-time) study programs
3. Number of graduates who secure jobs
4. Number of graduates who are self-employed
5. Number of graduates who were employed prior to admission
6. Number of graduates who pursue further studies
7. Salaries or monthly incomes of graduates who secure jobs or are self-employed
Indicator 2: Quality of Graduates at Bachelor, Master, and Doctoral Levels According To the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education

Explanation

Graduate quality according to the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education (TQF: H Ed) refers to the characteristics of bachelor, master, and doctoral graduates enumerated in the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education as specified by the Commission on Higher Education (CHE). Preferred characteristics of graduates as specified by the institution should at least include these following five areas: 1) Morality and ethics; 2) Knowledge; 3) Intellectual skills; 4) Interpersonal skills and the shouldering of responsibility; and 5) Quantitative analytical, communication, and information technology skills. This includes TQF H Ed standards established by professional fields, the preferred characteristics of graduates added by professional bodies or organizations or desired by employers who hire the graduates.

In cases where a professional field adds desired characteristics to the 5 areas specified by the TQF standards, then all of these must be evaluated.

Method of Calculation

\[
\text{Sum of evaluation scores attained by graduates who were evaluated} / \text{Total number of graduates evaluated}
\]

Scoring Criteria

Use the average score of the graduates who were evaluated (full score of 5)

Information for Consideration

Both quantitative and qualitative survey data must be representative of and cover graduates from all Faculties, with a response rate of at least 35% of graduates at each level. The data presented for consideration must include the following information:

1. Information showing graduate quality in various dimensions according to the Thai Qualifications Framework for Higher Education that is collected by the institution of higher education, using the survey forms stipulated by the Office of National Educational Standards for Quality Assurance (ONESQA); or collected by an intermediary agency designated by ONESQA.

2. Information showing the quality of graduates from employing organizations that hire them, or institutions that accept them for further studies.

3. Information regarding the production of graduates from the CHE Quality Assurance Online System that is operated by the Office of the Commission on Higher Education.
Indicator 3: Percentage of Master Theses that are Published or Disseminated at the National or International Level within the Past 3 Years

Explanation

The academic output of Master program graduates that is published or disseminated is an important factor indicative of the quality of the program’s graduates, demonstrating leadership in thought, critical thinking capabilities, presentation of findings, research skills, intellectual skills, and representing the wisdom of scholars and advanced professional practitioners.

The academic work of Master program graduates refers to research reports contained in theses, published articles, or literary compositions that are disseminated. The academic achievements of Master program graduates cannot be counted as the academic output of their faculty advisors.

Method of Calculation

\[
\text{Weighted sum of published or disseminated academic work of Master graduates} \times 100
\]
\[
\text{Total number of Master program graduates}
\]

Evaluation Criteria

The following quality levels for publication of research articles have been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Level of Research Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Publication in the proceedings of a national academic conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Publication in the proceedings of an international academic conference, or in a nationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the TCI database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Publication in a nationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in ONESQA pronouncements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the SJR database (SCImago Journal Rank: <a href="http://www.scimagojr.com">www.scimagojr.com</a>) that ranks academic journals, and during the most recent year, the journal was listed in the 3rd or 4th quartiles for the article’s subject category; or publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in ONESQA pronouncements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the SJR database (SCImago Journal Rank: <a href="http://www.scimagojr.com">www.scimagojr.com</a>) that ranks academic journals, and during the most recent year, the journal was listed in the 1st or 2nd quartiles for the article’s subject category; or publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that appears in the ISI global database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following quality levels for innovative work have been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Quality Levels of Innovative Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Dissemination at the institutional or provincial level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Dissemination at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Disseminated through international cooperative efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Disseminated at the regional level (ASEAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Dissemination at the international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASEAN means the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, which consists of 10 countries: Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Dissemination through international cooperative efforts are specific projects between countries; for example, cooperation between Thailand and Laos to organize a classical Thai masked drama.

Dissemination at the regional level (ASEAN) means within all of the ASEAN countries (to at least 5 countries).

Dissemination at the international level means a wide-ranging distribution to all countries (to at least 5 countries that are not ASEAN members).

**Scoring Criteria**

Use the conversion rule to define 25 percent as a score of 5.

**Information for Consideration**

1. The number and titles of research articles from Master degree theses and independent research papers (secondary research, Plan B Master programs) that are published annually at the national or international level, per the academic year or calendar year which corresponds to the academic year, along with the authors’ names, the titles of the theses, the years of publication, the names of the journals or academic conferences where they were published, and the weightings of each research article.

2. The number and titles of innovations and artistic creations from Master degree theses that are disseminated annually at the national or international level, along with the authors’ names, the years of dissemination, the names of the organizations or agencies, provinces, and countries where they have been disseminated, the form of dissemination with suitable documentation, and the weighting for each item that was disseminated.

3. The total number of Master degree program graduates
Indicator 4: Percentage of Doctoral Dissertations that are Published or Disseminated at the National or International Level within the Past 3 Years

Explanation

The academic output of Doctoral program graduates that is published or disseminated is an important factor indicative of the quality of the program’s graduates, demonstrating leadership in thought, critical thinking capabilities, presentation of findings, research skills, intellectual skills, and representing the wisdom of scholars and advanced professional practitioners.

The academic work of Doctoral program graduates refers to research reports contained in theses, published articles, or literary compositions that are disseminated. The academic achievements of Doctoral program graduates cannot be counted as the academic output of their faculty advisors.

Method of Calculation

\[
\text{Weighted sum of published or disseminated academic work of Doctoral graduates} \times 100 \\
\text{Total number of Doctoral program graduates}
\]

Evaluation Criteria

The following quality levels for publication of research articles have been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Level of Research Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Publication in the proceedings of a national academic conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Publication in the proceedings of an international academic conference, or in a nationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the TCI database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Publication in a nationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in ONESQQA pronouncements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the SJR database (SCImago Journal Rank: <a href="http://www.scimagojr.com">www.scimagojr.com</a>) that ranks academic journals, and during the most recent year, the journal was listed in the 3(^{rd}) or 4(^{th}) quartiles for the article’s subject category; or publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in ONESQQA pronouncements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the SJR database (SCImago Journal Rank: <a href="http://www.scimagojr.com">www.scimagojr.com</a>) that ranks academic journals, and during the most recent year, the journal was listed in the 1(^{st}) or 2(^{nd}) quartiles for the article’s subject category; or publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that appears in the ISI global database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following quality levels for innovative work have been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Quality Levels of Innovative Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Dissemination at the institutional or provincial level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Dissemination at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Disseminated through international cooperative efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Disseminated at the regional level (ASEAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Dissemination at the international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASEAN means the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, which consists of 10 countries: Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Dissemination through international cooperative efforts are specific projects between countries; for example, cooperation between Thailand and Laos to organize a classical Thai masked drama.

Dissemination at the regional level (ASEAN) means within all of the ASEAN countries (to at least 5 countries).

Dissemination at the international level means a wide-ranging distribution to all countries (to at least 5 countries that are not ASEAN members).

**Scoring Criteria**

Use the conversion rule to define 50 percent as a score of 5.

**Information for Consideration**

1. The number and titles of research articles from Doctoral degree dissertations that are published annually at the national or international level, per the academic year or calendar year which corresponds to the academic year, along with the authors’ names, the titles of the dissertations, the years of publication, the names of the journals or academic conferences where they were published, and the weightings of each research article.

2. The total number of Doctoral degree program graduates
B. Research and Innovative Work

Research and innovative work means that an institution of higher education is fulfilling its mission to efficiently conduct quality research per its specific areas of emphasis. These operations are conducted according to its policies, plans, and budgets. Administrative and managerial processes promote and support the development of research capabilities among faculty, researchers, and staff members; they promote and build research networks with outside agencies in order to produce research output, inventions, and quality innovations. This innovative activity will lead to the creation and development of knowledgeable, virtuous, and skillful graduates. The creation and development of new forms of knowledge opens the way to new worldviews, and pushes back the boundaries of knowledge and intellectual property and allows for practical applications and uses in the academic, public sector, policy development, and commercial realms.

If an institution of higher education wishes to construct a dynamic academic base, create high quality achievements, and build up recognition in academic circles, it should engage in academic research so that the findings can be published in international journals. If it engages in research work and development, the results of the research must be used to meet the needs of real users, the researchers must learn new things about how to use of knowledge in development, and it must add to the collective store of knowledge as well as be communicated to others. The main point is that no matter whether it is basic research or applied research, it needs to be genuine research: it must lead to learning, add to the store of knowledge, and be transmitted to others. Research and innovative work are the main factors in developing the quality, efficiency, and capabilities of Thai people in response to the national development plan. This includes transforming the country into a learning society, a knowledge-based society, and a wisdom-based society. It will bring about a culture of lifelong learning and love of knowledge, and a culture that uses knowledge to determine the direction and tactics of development, including enhancing the competitive potential of the country.

There are 3 indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Research or Innovative Work that is Published or Disseminated at National or International Level in Proportion to Number of Regular Faculty Members/Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Practical Applications of Research or Innovative Work Utilized at National or International Level in Proportion to Number of Regular Faculty Members/Researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Academic Output that Receives Quality Certification at the National or International Level in Proportion to Number of Regular Faculty Members and Researchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5: Research or Innovative Work that is Published or Disseminated at National or International Level in Proportion to Number of Regular Faculty Members/Researchers

Explanation
Research is an important mission of institutions of higher education. The execution of this mission may be effectively and successfully investigated by examining the research findings and good quality innovations that have been broadly disseminated and comparing the number of published research articles and innovations disseminated at the national or international levels with the number of regular faculty members and researchers.

Evaluation Criteria
The following quality levels for publication of research articles have been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Level of Research Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Publication in the proceedings of a national academic conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Publication in the proceedings of an international academic conference, or in a nationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the TCI database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Publication in a nationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in ONESQA pronouncements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the SJR database (SCImago Journal Rank: <a href="http://www.scimagojr.com">www.scimagojr.com</a>) that ranks academic journals, and during the most recent year, the journal was listed in the 3rd or 4th quartiles for the article’s subject category; or publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in ONESQA pronouncements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that is listed in the SJR database (SCImago Journal Rank: <a href="http://www.scimagojr.com">www.scimagojr.com</a>) that ranks academic journals, and during the most recent year, the journal was listed in the 1st or 2nd quartiles for the article’s subject category; or publication in an internationally-renowned academic journal that appears in the ISI global database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following quality levels for innovative work have been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Quality Levels of Innovative Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>Dissemination at the institutional or provincial level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Dissemination at the national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Disseminated through international cooperative efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Disseminated at the regional level (ASEAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Dissemination at the international level</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASEAN means the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, which consists of 10 countries: Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Dissemination through international cooperative efforts are specific projects between countries; for example, cooperation between Thailand and Laos to organize a classical Thai masked drama.

Dissemination at the regional level (ASEAN) means within all of the ASEAN countries (to at least 5 countries).

Dissemination at the international level means a wide-ranging distribution to all countries (to at least 5 countries that are not ASEAN members).

**Method of Calculation**

\[
\text{Weighted sum of published or disseminated research work and innovations} \times 100 \\
\text{Total number of regular faculty members and researchers}
\]

**Scoring Criteria**

Use the rule of three to define the following percentages as a score of 5, divided by academic discipline as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Disciplines</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science and Technology</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine the score at the faculty level, calculate the average of the scores obtained at the departmental level. To determine the score at the institutional level, calculate the average of the scores obtained at the faculty level.

**Information for Consideration**

1. The total number and titles of research articles by regular faculty members and researchers, both those who teach and those who are on educational upgrading leave, that are published at the national or international level, per the academic year or calendar year which corresponds to the academic year. Include the authors’ names, the years of publication, the names of the journals or academic conferences where they were published, and the weighting of each research article.

2. The total number and titles of innovations by regular faculty members and researchers, both those who teach and those who are on educational upgrading leave, that are disseminated at the national or international level. Include the innovators’ names, the years of dissemination, the names of the places, provinces, or countries where they were disseminated, stipulating the format of distribution with supporting documentation, along with the weighting of each innovation.
Indicator 6: Practical Applications of Research or Innovative Work Utilized at National or International Level in Proportion to Number of Regular Faculty Members/Researchers

Explanation

Research is an important mission of institutions of higher education. The execution of this mission may be effectively and successfully investigated by examining the research findings and good quality innovations that have been used in practical ways. The number of research projects and innovations conducted by regular faculty members and researchers that were used to solve the problems specified by the project objectives and research reports, the usefulness of which has been verified by the relevant agencies, is then compared with the number of regular faculty members and researchers.

Method of Calculation

\[
\text{Total number of practical applications of research output or innovations} \times 100 \quad \text{Total number of regular faculty members and researchers}
\]

Scoring Criteria

Use the conversion rule to define 20 percent as a score of 5 for all academic disciplines.

Information for Consideration

1. The total number and titles of applied research or innovations by regular faculty members and researchers, both those who teach and are on educational upgrading leave. Include the innovators’ names, the years that the research or innovation was completed and utilized, the names of the agencies that were benefited with documentation certifying the benefits received from the agency or relevant organization, with detailed and clear information about the benefits according to the following guidelines:

   - Information that concretely shows the benefits from using the invention which resulted from research or innovative work according to the research project objectives.
   - Information that concretely shows benefits from using the policy, law, or measure which resulted from the policy-related research.
   - Information that concretely shows the benefits from applying research results that were conducted to further public development.

2. The total number of regular faculty members and researchers for each academic year, counting both those who teach and those who are on educational upgrading leave.
Indicator 7: Academic Output That Is Quality Certified at the National or International in Proportion to Number of Regular Faculty Members and Researchers

Explanation

Academic output that has passed a quality certification process reflects capabilities in the areas of study, investigation, analysis, synthesis, research, actual implementation, and the ability to apply these skills to solve problems or better carry out assigned duties; such achievements improve the quality of educational management and help bring about academic advancement.

Evaluation Criteria

The following quality levels for academic output have been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Quality Level of Academic Journals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Academic articles that have been published in national journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Academic articles that have been published in international journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>Textbooks or books that have passed the evaluation criteria of a panel of experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Textbooks or books that have passed the evaluation criteria for applying for academic rank, or high-quality textbooks or books that have been inspected by experts in accordance with the criteria used to apply for academic rank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method of Calculation

\[
\text{Weighted sum of academic output that is quality certified} \times 100 \\
\text{Total number of regular faculty members and researchers}
\]

Scoring Criteria

Use the conversion rule to define 10 percent as a score of 5 for all academic disciplines.

Information for Consideration

1. The total number and titles of good quality academic output (academic articles, textbooks, and books) by regular faculty members, both those who teach and those who are on educational upgrading leave, with the authors’ names, the years of completion, the year of certification by a reputable agency, the names of the certifying agencies, and documentation of quality from the agency or relevant organization, along with the weighting of each item of academic output.

2. The total number of regular faculty members and researchers for each academic year, counting both those who teach and those who are on educational upgrading leave.
C. Academic Services to Society

**Academic services to society** means that institutions of higher education provide academic services covering specific targeted groups of people both inside and outside of the country. The services may be provided using institutional resources, or by sharing institutional and individual resources in various manners, such as through consulting services, teaching services, research searching for answers to societal issues, various short-term training courses, continuing education programs, and services for alumni or the general public. These academic services may be provided free of charge as part of an institution’s broader responsibility to society, in a commercial format that generates compensation/income, or to provide feedback data as a basis for development, improvement, and creation of new knowledge. The provision of academic services through technology transfer and the transmission of beneficial knowledge furnishes academic support and endorsement; it suggests suitable pathways that will bring about stability, strength, and sustainable development of communities, societies, the nation, and other countries. In addition, it encourages an academic role for institutions of higher education and professional bodies in responding to, directing, and cautioning society as part of their responsibility to the public.

There are 2 indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Results of Introducing Knowledge and Experience from Providing Academic Services to Improve Learning, Teaching, and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Outcomes of Learning and Strengthening of Community or External Organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 8: Results of Introducing Knowledge and Experience from Providing Academic Services to Improve Learning, Teaching, and Research

Explanation

Providing academic service means that an institution of higher education, on which the community or society is dependent, provides academic endorsement or performs duties that result in academic development in the community, or the development of knowledge that brings strength to the nation and other countries. A service fee may be charged for academic service, and it may also be provided free of charge. The knowledge and experience that is gained must be used to develop or be integrated with learning, teaching and research; this may be done through articles, textbooks, books, courses, or study programs.

Method of Calculation

\[
\text{No. of academic service projects/activities that improved learning, teaching and research} \times 100
\]
\[
\text{Total number of academic service projects and activities}
\]

Scoring Criteria

Use the conversion rule to define 30 percent as a score of 5.

Information for Consideration

1. Evidence, documents, and data showing that regular faculty members have collected, organized, and processed the knowledge and experience gained from providing academic service and applied it in beneficial ways in their teaching and research. This information may be further developed into a book, a textbook, or a research project; the results may also be expanded to improve a course or lead to a new course being offered.

2. The academic service projects that are counted in the numerator have been integrated and produced results in the year of the assessment, and the academic service projects in the divisor have been carried out in the year of assessment. An individual project may be integrated only with learning and teaching, only with research work, or it may be integrated with both learning/teaching and research.

3. Academic service is service provided to people or agencies outside of the institution, both at the Faculty and institutional levels.
Indicator 9: Outcomes of Learning and Strengthening of Community or External Organizations

Explanation

Projects that impact the development and strengthening of communities refers to projects that are organized by an institution to develop a community or external organization, the results of which bring about various beneficial changes to a community or external organization, or help a community or external organization become more self-reliant as per its potential.

Points for Consideration

1. Implementation of the quality cycle (PDCA) with the participation of a community or organization.
2. Achievement of not less than 80 percent of the goals outlined in the plan.
3. A community or organization has leaders or members who have learned and carried out activities on an ongoing basis.
4. A community or organization creates a mechanism that leads to ongoing and lasting self-development, while still retaining the identity and culture of the community or organization.
5. Beneficial impacts that are valuable to society or that strengthen communities or organizations.

Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One criteria is implemented</td>
<td>2 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>3 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>4 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>All 5 criteria are implemented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information for Consideration

1. Plans and activities or projects that strengthen a community or organization.
2. Reports and documents of the results of implementing activities or projects.
3. Information showing the results of implementing activities or projects. Leaders or members of the community or organization have learned and conducted ongoing activities, and improved them in harmony with the identity and culture of the community or organization.
4. Information showing the results of implementing community or organizational activities or projects that bring benefits, strength, and values to society, communities, or organizations.
5. "Ongoing" means work is carried out for a period exceeding two years.
6. "Lasting/Sustainable" work is carried out for a period exceeding five years.
7. "Strong" means ability to be self-reliant.

Remarks

For institutions that are assessed in 2011, in the case of new activities, one year may be used to meet the standards for “ongoing”, “lasting/sustainable”, and “strong”.
D. Preservation of Arts and Culture

Preservation of arts and culture means an institution has carried out the preservation of national arts and culture. It realizes the importance and value of arts and culture, along with the need to cultivate, foster, and develop things of beauty, aesthetic values, and cultural appreciation of environmental beauty and refined taste that springs up in the collective consciousness and lifestyle. This gives people confidence to live worthwhile lives, to be able to handle societal changes in matters of belief, values, and new cultures. Thus, an institution has policies that have been implemented at both the personal and institutional levels, with a system and mechanism in the form of a unit that promotes and supports projects that are part of teaching and learning management. This produces a pleasant lifestyle and atmosphere within the university, and an attractive life that is characterized by good taste enables its possessors to live in society with understanding, generosity, and happiness.

There are 2 indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Promotion and Support for Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Development of Aesthetics in Dimensions of Arts and Culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 10: Promotion and Support for Arts and Culture

Explanation

Arts and culture are indicators of the quality, lifestyle, and good-heartedness of individuals and a society. One basic mission that institutions should realize is that they must give priority to their promotion and support, so that the shared society within the institution is a happy and valuable one, is an admirable model, and is accepted in society. This promotion and support must be efficiently and sincerely carried out in an ongoing, steadfast, and sustainable manner by establishing clear objectives and goals that can be assessed.

Points for Consideration

1. There is implementation according to the quality cycle (PDCA).
2. Achievement of not less than 80 percent of the goals outlined in the plan.
3. There is consistent and ongoing implementation.
4. Gives rise to benefits and value to the community.
5. Acclaimed at the national and/or international level(s).

Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One criteria is implemented</td>
<td>2 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>3 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>4 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>All 5 criteria are implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information for Consideration

1. Policies, plans, systems and mechanisms to promote and support arts and culture.
2. Projects or activities that promote and support arts and culture, with details of the projects or activities, as well as indicators and achievement targets.
3. Result summaries or evaluation reports of projects or activities (benefits and value to the community).
4. Evidence that explains details and shows the processes of obtaining data for achievement summaries, such as the steps and duration of data collection, random sampling, surveys, questionnaires, or evaluation forms, method of analyzing results, and so on.
5. Reports, awards, honors, and plaudits received at the national and international level, from reputable institutions or agencies.
Indicator 11: Development of Aesthetics in Dimensions of Arts and Culture

Explanation

Arts and culture have to do with aesthetics and good taste, shaping lifestyles and society. They are dynamic in nature and are constantly changing, so it is necessary to wisely keep current by maintaining a development plan that provides aesthetic education and experience in the context of arts and culture. This enables us to choose, accept, preserve, and build an appreciation for the value of beauty and tasteful aesthetics in ourselves and our shared society.

Points for Consideration

1. Participation of staff in the institution that results in creation of good culture.
2. Buildings and facilities are clean, sanitary, and decorated in an aesthetically pleasing manner.
3. Landscaped in a manner that preserves beautiful and scenic views, is in harmony with nature, and is friendly to the environment.
4. A place for cultural activities that facilitates and promotes such events is provided, and activities are consistently organized.
5. Staff and student satisfaction levels are not lower than a score of 3.51 out of 5.00.

Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One criteria is implemented</td>
<td>2 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>3 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>4 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>All 5 criteria are implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information for Consideration

1. Evidence showing details of projects or activities to develop aesthetics in arts and culture that the institution carried out in each academic year.
2. Projects or activities for which detailed and tangible objectives and achievement targets were established and can be assessed.
3. Result summaries or evaluation reports of projects or activities that develop artistic and cultural aesthetics.
4. Evidence that explains details and shows the processes of obtaining data for achievement summaries, such as the steps and duration of data collection, random sampling, surveys, questionnaires, or evaluation forms, method of analyzing results, and so on.
5. Empirical data that becomes evident when items 2 and 3 are considered.

Remarks

1. “Clean” means tidy, orderly, easy to maintain, and convenient to use.
2. “Sanitary” means clean, safe, unpolluted, (fostering) happiness of heart, and physical comfort.
3. “Beautiful” means that buildings and the surrounding areas are appropriately decorated and landscaped, in harmony with the locale, with no waste, and in a manner that is friendly to the environment.
E. Institutional Administration and Development

Institutional administration and development means that institutions of higher education have good systems of administration and management that effectively transmit vision and integrate values into practice in a unified manner, in order to achieve the objectives and mission that have been set forth. The Institutional Council is responsible for overseeing policies; carrying out operations in accordance with plans; administration of personnel, budgets, and assets; administration of benefits provided to students and all staff members, including monitoring, verifying, and evaluating if operations are in accordance with established rules, regulations, directives, and laws. The operational results of the institutional council, along with the administration and management at all levels, are to be publicized to communities both inside and outside of the institution, according to the principles of good governance, which consist of effectiveness, efficiency, responsiveness, accountability, transparency, decentralization, the rule of law, equity, and a consensus orientation.

There are 3 indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Carrying Out the Roles and Duties of the Institutional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Carrying Out the Roles and Duties of the Institutional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Faculty Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explanation

The Council of an Institution of Higher Education is the main body of an institution of higher education, playing an important role in formulating policies and establishing frameworks that determine the direction of operations in accordance with the identity of the institution of higher education. It establishes a tangible administrative and management system, mechanisms, and processes to supervise and oversee the affairs of the institution of higher education. These include controlling and inspecting the operations of the institution of higher education so that they are effective, efficient, and lead to lasting institutional development.

Assessing the performance results of carrying out the roles and duties of the Institutional Council will focus on evaluating the quality of the direction setting, supervision, and oversight of the affairs and operations of the institution of higher education according to the Institutional Council’s duties and roles. It also includes administering and managing in accordance with the principles of good governance, and operating in accordance with the actions taken by the Council of the institution of higher education.

Scoring Criteria

Use the evaluation scores received from the members to assess the Institutional Council’s operational results (full score of 5), covering the following 5 points:

1. The Institutional Council fulfills all of its obligations according to the duties prescribed in the University Constitution and Bylaws (ข้อกําหนด); these must be in accordance with the Private University Act.
2. The Institutional Council establishes strategies and sets directions, while overseeing policies, directives, and regulations.
3. The Institutional Council follows the rules, regulations, and directives of higher bodies and related agencies.
4. The Institutional Council supervises and monitors the performance of the educational institution’s administrators.
5. The Institutional Council operates in accordance with the principles of good governance.

Information for Consideration

Documents or evidence showing assessment details in harmony with the points specified in the scoring criteria.

Remarks

Assessment is not required at the Faculty level.
Indicator 13: Carrying Out the Roles and Duties of the Institutional Administrators

Explanation

Assessing the performance results of carrying out administrators’ roles and duties in successfully administering and managing according to the strategic and annual operating plans of the institution of higher education will focus on evaluating the quality of administration per the policies of the Council of the Institution of Higher Education. This includes the effectiveness of the annual operating plan, ability in administration, and management according to the principles of good governance by the administrators.

Scoring Criteria

Use the administrators’ evaluation scores received from the Committee appointed by the Institutional Council (full score of 5).

Information for Consideration

1. Documents or evidence showing details of formulating or reviewing policies regarding oversight of the institution of higher education, including reviewing the framework that determines the direction of operations of the institution of higher education, according to the duties and roles of administrators of higher education institutions.
2. Documents or evidence showing operational details according to the supervisory system of the institution of higher education. These documents, evidence, reports, or committee minutes should show that the institutional administrators have established tangible management processes to control and examine the operations of the institution of higher education.
3. Documents or evidence showing that institutional administrators are monitoring important operations, such as systems for policy and planning, personnel management, finances and budgets, and especially carrying out the central mission of the institution of higher education per the actions/resolutions of the Institutional Council.
4. Documents or evidence showing the institution’s policy of establishing a system to evaluate its administrators via a committee appointed by the Institutional Council, and evidence that this system is carried out.
5. Reports synthesizing actions or policies, including the impact of decisions made by the administrators of the institution of higher education.

Remarks

At the Institutional level, “administrator” refers to the university President, and at the Faculty level, “administrator” refers to the Faculty Dean.
Indicator 14: Faculty Development

Explanation

The quality of faculty members is a factor that affects the quality of students, and also a consideration of the institution’s success in promoting and supporting faculty development so that faculty members can keep up with academic advances on an ongoing basis. This will make an institution able to compete at the international level. The quality of faculty members can be gauged from their academic qualifications and ranking.

Consideration Criteria

The following weighting of quality levels for faculty members has been established:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Rank</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Bachelor Degree</th>
<th>Master Degree</th>
<th>PhD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method of Calculation

The faculty member quality index is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{Weighted sum of regular faculty members} \div \text{Total number of regular faculty members}
\]

Scoring Criteria

Use the conversion rule to define a faculty member quality index result of 6 as equal to a score of 5.

Information for Consideration

The number and names of all regular faculty members in each academic year should be listed, counting both those who teach and those who are on educational upgrading leave. There should also be a database specifying details regarding their educational qualifications and academic ranking.
F. Development and Internal Quality Assurance

**Development and internal quality assurance** means that institutions of higher education are required to show their standards and quality by being communities that create new knowledge – learning organizations that are capable of discovering, researching, and generating new information in order to develop society and themselves in an ongoing manner. Thai higher education must also demonstrate quality higher education for the people at large. In addition to this, Thai higher education must be superb and functional in a society of intense scrutiny in order that standards and quality will be continuously developed and will lead Thai higher education to become international higher education. Thus, higher education quality assurance is quality assurance for the sake of excellence in learning, and for the sake of the learners.

The heart of a good quality assurance system is the use of quality assurance systems and processes to build a community with a culture of learning that always inspects its work for others. This will lead it to become a dynamic organization of learning that effectively institutes change, disseminates news throughout the institution, and establishes professional work standards in all areas that can be verified at every step. There is a mechanism for listening to both internal and external institutional stakeholders in order to introduce opinions from all involved parties for use in overseeing the institutional quality assurance guidelines. However, institutions ought to have academic independence and freedom to develop appropriate quality assurance systems of their own. At the same time, they should give freedom to internal agencies in developing quality assurance systems according to the specific conditions of each agency.

Internal quality assurance systems generally consist of three systems. The first system is a quality development system which encompasses establishing standards, planning processes, and designing work systems for quality and process management, as well as quality control. The second system is a quality inspection system to accelerate the achievement of goals according to the specified quality standards, and the third system is a system of internal evaluation and quality improvement processes.

Internal quality assurance is a duty of institutions, as is developing the internal quality assurance system by allowing for stakeholder and community participation, and support from higher bodies. Thus, internal quality assurance is part of the educational administrative process leading to ongoing improvement in quality and educational standards, and providing support for external quality assessment.

There is 1 indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Internal Quality Assessment Results That Are Certified by Higher Bodies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 15: Internal Quality Assessment Results That Are Certified by Higher Bodies

Explanation

The Ministerial Decree Regarding Systems, Standards, and Methods of Educational Quality Assurance of 2010 states that “the bodies which are responsible for institutions of higher education must monitor and inspect their educational quality at least once every three years, and notify the institution of higher education regarding the results, as well as disclose the results of monitoring the educational quality to the general public.” Thus, educational institutions will conduct internal quality assurance that covers the indicators specified by the Office of the Higher Education Commission or the (appropriate) higher entity. These indicators emphasize input factors and processes, and internal quality assurance assessment by higher bodies will produce scores that reflect the efficiency, effectiveness, and quality of various operational aspects of institutions of higher education. Thus, to evaluate this indicator, the average scores of (prior) internal quality assurance assessment that was conducted by higher bodies will be used so that reassessment will not be needed.

Scoring Criteria

Use the internal quality assurance assessment scores which are granted by higher bodies.

Information for Consideration

The internal quality assurance assessment scores which are given by higher bodies.

Remarks

1. Use the internal quality assurance system assessment scores (5-point system) given at the institutional level by higher bodies since 2010 (because of the new assessment criteria); for example
   – For 2010, use the assessment scores for one year, which is 2010
   – For 2011, use the average assessment score for two years: 2010 and 2011
   – For 2012, use the average assessment score for three years: 2010, 2011, & 2012

2. For assessment at the Faculty level, if a Faculty’s internal quality assurance evaluation did not include scores for all indicators specified at the Institutional level, then use the assessment score attained at the Institutional level for that particular indicator instead.
2) Group of Distinctive Identity Indicators (p. 43)

Distinctive identity indicators means indicators that evaluate productivity in accordance with philosophy, commitment, mission and objectives of institutions of higher education, including success in terms of the emphases and highlights that reflect the uniqueness of each institution, which are approved by Institutional Councils.

Distinctive identity refers to educational output (graduates) according to the philosophy, commitment, mission, and objectives of the institution of higher education that has been approved by the Institutional Council.

Uniqueness refers to success in terms of the emphases and highlights that reflect a prominent feature of the institution.

This section has consists of 2 indicators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Developmental Outcomes in Accordance with Institutional Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>Institutional Administrative Outcomes that Produce Distinctive Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>Graduate Development Outcomes in Accordance with Distinctive Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Developmental Outcomes in Accordance with Emphases and Highlights that Reflect Institutional Identity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 16: Developmental Outcomes in Accordance with Institutional Identity

Explanation

Institutions of higher education have a mission to produce and develop middle- and upper-class citizens, conduct research to create and develop the store of knowledge, give academic service to society, and preserve arts and culture. Thus, the establishment of institutions of higher education is varied according to each institution’s objectives. This leads to the setting of goals and operational plans, including the quality improvement plans of each institution, that will create knowledge which is harmonious with its identity and objectives.

Indicator 16.1: Institutional Administrative Outcomes that Produce Distinctive Identity

Points for Consideration

1. Strategies and operational plans have been formulated that are in harmony with the institutional identity and have been approved by the Institutional Council.
2. A system has been created that fosters the participation of students and employees in fully and completely implementing these strategies.
3. Employee evaluation results regarding the institutional performance as being in harmony with its distinctive identity are not lower than 3.51 out of a score of 5.
4. Operational results generate beneficial effects and/or create value for society.
5. Commendation is received at the national and/or international level(s) regarding issues related to distinctive identity.

Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One criteria is implemented</td>
<td>2 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>3 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>4 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>All 5 criteria are implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information for Consideration

Evidence of recognition, awards, or being hailed as an example of good performance in advancing distinctive identity, such as trophies, certificates of merit, honorary awards, letters of commendation, etc

Remarks

For Indicator 16.1, assessment is not required at the Faculty level.
Indicator 16.2: Graduate Development Outcomes in Accordance with Distinctive Identity

Method of Calculation

Sum of evaluation scores attained by graduates evaluated according to the distinctive identity

Total number of graduates who were evaluated

Scoring Criteria

Use the average score of the graduates who were evaluated (full score of 5).

Information for Consideration

Both quantitative and qualitative survey data must be representative of and cover graduates from all Faculties, with a response rate of at least 35% of graduates at each level. The data presented for consideration must include the following information:

1. The philosophy, commitment, mission and objectives of the institution, as well as its strategic plans and annual operational plans, have been approved by the Institutional Council.
2. The institutional quality improvement plan in various areas has been approved by the Institutional Council.
3. Annual operational reports are approved by the Institutional Council, which demonstrate the performance and success of operations and are in harmony with the institutional philosophy, vision, and mission.
Indicator 17: Developmental Outcomes in Accordance with Emphases and Highlights that Reflect Institutional Identity

Explanation

Consider operational outcomes in accordance with the institution’s emphases, highlights, or specialized expertise reflecting its unique identity that result from carrying out its work.

Points for Consideration

1. Operational strategies have been formulated that are in harmony with institutional emphases, highlights, and specialized expertise, and have been approved by the Institutional Council.
2. A system has been created that fosters the participation of students and employees in fully and completely implementing these strategies.
3. The satisfaction survey results of employees involved in operations in accordance with the institution’s emphases, highlights, or specialized expertise are not lower than 3.51 out of a score of 5.
4. Operational results are achieved according to the institution’s emphases, highlights, or specialized expertise, causing beneficial effects and creating value for society.
5. The institution has a unique identity in harmony with its particular emphases, highlights, or specialized expertise, and is accepted at the national and/or international level(s).

Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One criteria is implemented</td>
<td>2 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>3 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>4 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>All 5 criteria are implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information for Consideration

1. Documents/evidence showing the establishment of the institution’s unique identity, emphases, or highlights.
2. Strategic plans, annual operational plans, including quality improvement plans that are consistent with the institution’s unique identity, emphases, or highlights, which have been approved by the Institutional Council.
3. Annual operational reports that have been approved by the Institutional Council, showing operational results and achievements consistent with the unique identity, emphases, or highlights established by the institution; or operational results and achievements that are recognized as arising from the institution’s unique identity, emphases, or highlights.
4. Evidence of recognition, awards, or being hailed as an example of good performance, such as trophies, certificates of merit, honorary awards, letters of commendation, etc.

Remarks

This indicator may be assessed or not assessed at the Faculty level. If assessed, it must indicate the unique identity of a Faculty that has been approved by the Institutional Council.
3) Group of Advancement Measurement Indicators (p. 47)

Advancement measurement indicator means an indicator that evaluates an educational institution’s performance in establishing developmental guidelines in order to jointly lead, prevent, and solve social problems in accordance with governmental policies. These may be modified in accordance with changing times and social problems, with the goal of showing the educational institution’s societal leadership in pointing out and solving various social problems. These may include, for instance, promoting and following through with royally initiated projects, patriotic projects, nurturing religion and honoring the King, health, values and public consciousness, creative thinking, the underprivileged and aged, government policy, the economy, readiness for membership in the ASEAN community, energy and the environment, disasters, drugs, wasteful extravagance, conflict resolution, creating social peace and harmony, as well as respectfully introducing the Sufficient Economy Philosophy as an example of institutional sufficiency.

This section has consists of 1 indicator:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator No.</th>
<th>Name of Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Results of Pointing Out/Leading, Preventing, and Solving Various Social Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>Results of Pointing Out/Leading, Preventing, and Solving Social Problems, Issue 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Results of Pointing Out/Leading, Preventing, and Solving Social Problems, Issue 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 18: Results of Pointing/Leading, Preventing, and Solving Various Social Problems

Indicator 18.1 Results of Pointing/Leading, Preventing, and Solving Social Problems, Issue 1
Indicator 18.2 Results of Pointing/Leading, Preventing, and Solving Social Problems, Issue 2

Explanation

Higher educational institutions select 2 issues from various fields to carry out by leading or resolving social problems, such as promoting and following through with royally initiated projects, patriotic projects, nurturing religion and honoring the King, health, values and public consciousness, creative thinking, the underprivileged and aged, government policy, the economy, readiness for membership in the ASEAN community, energy and the environment, disasters, drugs, wasteful extravagance, conflict resolution, creating social peace and harmony, as well as respectfully introducing the Sufficient Economy Philosophy as an example of institutional sufficiency.

However, the issue or social problem chosen by the institution to point out/lead or resolve must be approved by the Institutional Council.

Points for Consideration

1. The quality cycle (PDCA) is implemented.
2. Achievement is not less than 80% of the goals outlined in the plan.
3. There is benefit and value to the institution.
4. There are beneficial and valuable impacts to the community or society.
5. Commendation is received at the national and/or international level(s).

Scoring Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One criteria is implemented</td>
<td>2 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>3 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>4 criteria are implemented</td>
<td>All 5 criteria are implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information for Consideration

1. Projects or activities carried out by an institution of higher education that are beneficial and valuable to the institution. It has a role in pointing out or resolving various social problems, specifying objectives and target groups, and the success of the projects.
2. Evidence that a project/activity carried out by an institution of higher education was approved by the Institutional Council, and the institution has had a role in leading or solving various social problems.
3. Reports summarizing the results of all projects.
4. Evidence, documentation, and information showing the beneficial effects and creation of value to society from carrying out the project(s).
5. Evidence, documentation, and information showing commendation received at the national or international level.

Remarks

This indicator may be assessed or not assessed at the Faculty level.
Chapter 3 (p. 50)
Accreditation of Quality Standards

In the third round of external quality assessment of higher educational institutions, 2 pathways have been established for examining the accreditation of educational institutions’ quality standards. They are accreditation of higher educational institutions’ quality standards, and evaluation of outstanding institutions. The appraisal standards are as follows.

3.1 Accreditation of the Standards of Higher Educational Institution

The third round of external quality assessment of higher educational institutions will consider information from the evaluation of indicators linked to the accreditation of institutional quality standards as follows.

1. Evaluation at the Indicator Level

In the third round of external quality assessment, the weighting of all indicators is the same, as considered from actual institutional operations, and the full score for each indicator has been fixed as 5, using a score from 0 to 5.

2. Calculation of Evaluation Results

The results of external quality evaluation should be presented indicator by indicator, with the average score for each indicator group in accordance with the details shown in the table below. In calculating the scores and average scores of quantitative indicators, use 2 decimal places. If the third decimal place is more than 0.005, then it should be rounded up – otherwise, it should be dropped. In deciding the results and accreditation of higher educational institutions’ quality standards, the evaluation results of indicators related to the institution’s core mission (indicators 1–11) will be considered, as will the overall picture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Indicator</th>
<th>No. of Indicators</th>
<th>Average Score Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Indicators</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctive Identity Indicators</td>
<td>2 (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement Measurement Indicators</td>
<td>1 (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators of Educational Institutions’ Core Mission (Indicators 1-11)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>18 (20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks:
1) Within the Distinctive Identity and Advancement Measurement indicator categories, sub–indicators have been established, which are 16.1, 16.2, 18.1, 18.2. Thus, the numbers of indicators used to calculate the average score is shown in parentheses.

2) If indicators are not evaluated at the Institutional or Faculty level, then the divisor is reduced by the number of indicators that were not evaluated.
3. Accreditation of the Quality Standards of Educational Institutions

ONESQA has established the following criteria for accreditation of quality standards:

3.1 The average score of evaluation results from indicators of higher educational institutions’ core mission (Indicators 1–11) is 3.51 or higher, and

3.2 The average score of overall evaluation results of all indicators is 3.51 or higher.

In the third round of external quality assessment of higher educational institutions, the unit of evaluation is the Faculty or equivalent organizational unit, and the Institution. Therefore, the criteria used to consider accrediting the quality of educational management will examine quality at two levels.

1) Level of the Faculty, or equivalent organizational unit
2) Institutional level

1) Accreditation of Quality Standards at the Faculty Level or Equivalent Unit

A Faculty or equivalent organizational unit receives accreditation when the average score of its evaluation results are in accordance with the required standard.

2) Accreditation of Quality Standards at the Institutional Level

An Institution receives accreditation when

2.1 The average score of its evaluation results meet the required standard, and

2.2 The score of evaluation results at the Faculty level or equivalent unit meet the following conditions.

2.2.1 For institutions with 1–3 Faculties, all Faculties must meet the required standard.

2.2.2 For institutions with 4–9 Faculties, only one Faculty may not meet the required standard.

2.2.3 For institutions 10 or more Faculties or equivalent units, 90 percent of the total number of Faculties meet the required standard.

Accreditation of Off-Campus Educational Programs

Guidelines for the accreditation of off-campus educational programs are as follows:

1. The evaluation of off-campus educational programs is conducted only for programs which have been reported and are listed in the database of the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC). In such cases, ONESQA will evaluate the off-campus educational programs based on the 18 indicators that it has established.

2. If the evaluation results of off-campus educational programs fail to pass the OHEC standards, then an institution will not be accredited by ONESQA at the institutional level. If an educational institution improves an off-campus educational program until it passes the OHEC standards, then ONESQA will evaluate the off-campus educational program.

3. If the off-campus educational program is part of a Faculty, it will be evaluated together with the Faculty. If not, it will be counted as an equivalent organizational unit.

4. If the off-campus educational program is not a part of a Faculty, then ONESQA will evaluate it as an equivalent organizational unit.

5. If evidence is later found that an educational institution has organized off-campus educational program(s) aside from what has been reported to the OHEC, then the OHEC will
announce that the entire institution is not accredited. If accreditation has already been granted, action to withdraw the accreditation will be taken.

4. Quality Levels

The average score for indicator groups or the overall picture of quality levels may be interpreted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Quality Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.51 – 5.00</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.51 – 4.50</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.51 – 3.50</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.51 – 2.50</td>
<td>Improvement Required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00 – 1.50</td>
<td>Improvement Urgently Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Evaluation of Outstanding Institutions

In order to propel educational institutions to be able to constantly develop and enhance their potential and strive for excellence, guidelines for evaluation of outstanding institutions have been drawn up to build cooperation, generate mutual assistance, and strengthen educational management at all levels. Educational institutions may apply for additional evaluation, subject to the following conditions:

Guidelines for “1 Helps 9” (1 Educational Institution Helps 9 Institutions)

The educational institution that applies for additional evaluation leads 9 other institutions in its development network to move forward until they become quality educational institutions and are accredited by ONESQA in the third round of external quality assessment.

Conditions

1. This type of evaluation of an educational institution is voluntary, and the institution itself applies for the evaluation.

2. The educational institution applying for the evaluation must have been accredited by ONESQA during the second round of quality assessment (2006-2010), and have been rated at the level of very good quality only.

3. The educational institution applying for evaluation as outstanding will be evaluated as usual during the third round of external quality assessment; the outstanding evaluation is additional. Therefore, the institution that applies for this evaluation still needs to prepare a self-assessment report that meets the standards and covers other indicators like other educational institutions that report to higher bodies and ONESQA, so that it may be evaluated as usual during the third round of external quality assessment.

Criteria

1. The educational institutions in the development network of the institution applying for outstanding evaluation must be institutions with evaluation results from the second round of external quality assessment by ONESQA at the levels of “improvement needed”, or “fair”, or “good” only.
2. The educational institutions in the development network of the institution applying for outstanding evaluation may be institutions at the same educational level or different levels. For instance, the institution applying for outstanding evaluation is Institution A, and it has 9 institutions in its development network; two are vocational colleges, and seven are schools. They may be located in the same area or in different areas.

3. The 9 educational institutions in the development network of the institution applying for outstanding evaluation will undergo external quality evaluation according to the standards, indicators, and consideration criteria of the framework for the third round of external quality assessment like other institutions. The evaluation results of all 9 educational institutions must improve.

**Procedures**

1. Educational institutions participating in a project applying for outstanding evaluation must notify ONESQA and submit a project proposal at least 6 months or one semester in advance. Along with this, information and operational plans related to the outstanding evaluation according to the chosen guidelines must be submitted, such as the names of the 9 educational institutions in their development network, together with plans for developing the institutions in their network, and length of time for the development. This is so that ONESQA can organize groups of educational institutions and make specific preparations for evaluation.

2. The Executive Committee of ONESQA gives its approval after consideration by the relevant academic subcommittee, such as the Basic Education Quality Evaluation Development Committee (กพพ), the Vocational Education Quality Evaluation Development Committee (กพศ), or the Higher Education Quality Evaluation Development Committee (กพอ).

3. ONESQA reports the examination results to the educational institutions participating in the project.

4. The educational institutions conduct their operations in accordance with their plans and project details as approved by ONESQA.

5. ONESQA conducts the third round of external quality assessment and evaluation of outstanding institutions.

6. The results of the third round of external quality assessment and evaluation of outstanding institutions are announced.

7. Educational institutions that pass the evaluation of outstanding institutions process will receive a figurine (sculpture) signifying quality to be displayed at institution.

**Expected Results**

1. The educational institution’s reputation is enhanced and it receives more recognition by society.

2. Students and parents have more high-quality learning centers.

3. Education in Thailand will be developed to the level of international standards.

Thus, the development of quality standards and the potential of educational institutions in the development network of the institution applying for outstanding evaluation must clearly show that they indeed proceed together with their operations. The development that occurs is related to or in harmony with the development plan that the institution applying for outstanding evaluation.
for outstanding evaluation has originated, jointly implemented, and monitored throughout the specified period of time. This continues until developmental results are seen in learners, teachers, administrators, and institutions as a whole, and real success is achieved. In addition, the 9 institutions become strong enough to continue developing themselves towards excellence, despite not having a key educational institution to monitor them.