



International Joint Accreditation

Accreditation Standards Version 2.0

I. Background Information for the Revision

(A) Rationale for the Revision of iJAS Standards

In light of profound transformations in the higher education landscape—driven by globalization, technological disruption, shifting labor market demands, and heightened expectations for social impact—the iJAS Standards have been substantially revised to reflect current international quality assurance trends and future-oriented institutional priorities.

Version 2.0 introduces an integrated, strategic, and developmental framework that addresses the evolving role of higher education institutions as agents of innovation, inclusion, and societal resilience. Informed by consultations with experts, benchmarking against global frameworks, and feedback from practitioners, the revised standards reflect a shift toward adaptive governance, mission alignment, digital agility, and cross-sector collaboration.

The key motivations for the revision include:

- **Aligning with International Agendas and Societal Needs**
The standards integrate principles from the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), emphasizing equity, sustainability, lifelong learning, and the role of higher education in advancing public value and global citizenship.
- **Reframing Quality through Strategy and Impact**
Version 2.0 transitions from static, compliance-driven models to a more dynamic, purpose-oriented approach that focuses on strategic planning, impact measurement, and value creation. Institutions are encouraged to align academic and operational quality with broader developmental missions.
- **Enhancing Stakeholder Participation and Institutional Transparency**
The revised framework reinforces the importance of participatory governance, including the voices of students, faculty, employers, alumni, and community stakeholders. This inclusive approach fosters trust, responsiveness, and co-ownership of institutional goals.
- **Supporting Quality Enhancement in a Digital Future**
Recognizing the transformative potential of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), Virtual Reality (VR), and learning analytics, Version 2.0 encourages institutions to leverage digital innovation to strengthen curriculum design, pedagogy, governance, and internal quality assurance. Importantly, references to AI throughout the standards are intended to illustrate possible tools and approaches that may support evidence-informed decision-making and continuous improvement; they are not prescribed requirements, and institutions may demonstrate advanced practice through context-appropriate digital or non-digital solutions.
- **Promoting Developmental Progress through Rubrics**
A key feature of the revision is the introduction of five-tier rubrics (Initial → Exemplary) for every performance indicator. These rubrics help institutions benchmark their maturity, identify areas for growth, and engage in structured self-assessment and peer review.

Ultimately, Version 2.0 positions the iJAS framework as a tool not only for quality assurance but for strategic transformation, enabling institutions to become more agile, future-ready, and socially impactful. iJAS Version 2.0 is designed as a developmental and internationally applicable framework. Indicators and descriptors are to be interpreted proportionally, taking into account institutional mission, size, maturity, and regulatory environment. The framework emphasizes clarity, coherence, and measurability, while avoiding unnecessary redundancy between indicators and descriptors.

(B) Revision Focus and Highlights in Version 2.0

- **Strategic Consolidation of Standards**
Version 1.0 addresses “Mission, Goals & Strategy” (Standard 1) and “Governance” (Standard 6) independently. In Version 2.0, these have been merged into a comprehensive Standard 1: Institutional Mission, Governance & Strategic Sustainability, emphasizing the integrated role of leadership and promoting holistic assessment while eliminating redundancy.
- **Stronger Integration of Global Policy Frameworks**
The updated standards explicitly incorporate global themes—such as the SDGs, resilience, digital equity, and inclusive excellence—providing a platform for institutions to articulate and evaluate their contributions to national and international priorities.
- **Emphasis on Stakeholder Engagement, Ethical Leadership, and Impact Orientation**
Institutions are assessed not only on internal effectiveness, but also on their ability to engage and empower diverse stakeholders, model ethical and forward-looking leadership, and generate measurable impact in society.
- **Recognition of Emerging Educational Technologies and Future-readiness**
Version 2.0 embeds digital innovation, AI, VR, immersive learning environments, and data analytics into quality expectations. This future-oriented approach reflects how technology is reshaping teaching, learning, governance, and institutional effectiveness.
- **Support for Institutional Differentiation and Innovation**
Version 2.0 encourages innovation in governance, curriculum, research, and engagement—especially for institutions seeking to differentiate themselves through unique contributions.
- **Inclusion of Rubric-Based Developmental Assessment**
Each performance indicator is accompanied by a five-tier rubric (Initial, Evolving, Mature, Advanced, Exemplary) to support diagnostic self-review, foster developmental benchmarking, and enhance the transparency and consistency of external evaluation processes.

II. Standards, Indicators, and Descriptors

Standard 1: Institutional Mission, Governance & Strategic Sustainability

This standard examines how the institution defines its mission, ensures inclusive governance, and implements data-informed strategies for long-term sustainability. It emphasizes responsiveness to external change, responsible use of emerging technologies like AI, and alignment with global trends such as digital transformation and sustainable development. Leadership, stakeholder engagement, and financial capacity are key to institutional resilience and impact. Mission, governance, and strategic sustainability are assessed in an integrated manner to reflect their interdependence in institutional practice, while each dimension is examined through distinct indicators to ensure analytical clarity.

	Indicator	Descriptors
1-1. Mission, Vision, and Institutional Identity	The institution should clearly define and communicate its mission, vision, and core values, ensuring they are publicly accessible and developed with stakeholder engagement, and guide institutional priorities and decision-making.	The institution articulates clearly defined mission, vision, and core values that express its educational philosophy, commitment to public good, and role in shaping sustainable futures. These statements are co-created with stakeholder input, publicly available, and guide strategic action at all institutional levels. They also communicate a clear institutional profile that informs priorities and decision-making.
1-2. Sustainability Foresight and Strategic Alignment	The institution should systematically analyze internal and external developments and demonstrate strategic responsiveness to ensure institutional relevance, impact, and long-term sustainability.	The institution conducts regular sustainability-focused foresight by tracking global and local trends in higher education, industry, policy, and society to enhance the relevance and impact of its mission. By leveraging data analytics and emerging technologies, it interprets signals such as demographic shifts, technological change, and sustainability agendas to inform mission-related priorities and institutional positioning. This proactive alignment with external challenges secures long-term institutional sustainability and maximizes societal contribution.
1-3. Strategic Planning and Institutional Resilience	The institution should develop and regularly review strategic plans that are evidence-informed, forward-looking, and aligned with its mission. The use of data analytics and AI-driven tools supports scenario planning, predictive analysis, and adaptive strategies to strengthen long-term adaptability and institutional resilience.	The institution formulates and implements mid- and long-term strategic plans that support innovation, institutional resilience, responsiveness to emerging global challenges, and achievement of its stated mission. Institutional resilience refers to the institution's capacity to anticipate, adapt to, and recover from internal and external disruptions while sustaining mission delivery and educational quality. These plans are grounded in data and enhanced by the use of AI-driven tools for predictive analysis and scenario planning. They are reviewed regularly and refined through inclusive consultation processes.

Indicator		Descriptors
1-4. Governance and Stakeholder Participation	The institution should establish transparent and inclusive governance structures that clearly define responsibilities and engage key stakeholders in decision-making.	Governance systems are clearly defined, transparent, and inclusive, with roles and responsibilities distributed across academic and administrative units. Decision-making processes engage diverse internal and external stakeholders—including faculty, staff, students, alumni, and industry or community representatives—and are regularly reviewed using appropriate evidence to ensure accountability, fairness, institutional integrity, and continuous improvement. Governance arrangements also support effective internal and external collaboration.
1-5. Ethical Leadership and Staff Development	Institutional leadership should demonstrate ethical and visionary leadership, support inclusive governance, and promote the ongoing professional development of academic and administrative staff, with attention to enhancing digital and AI-related competencies.	Leadership is future-oriented, values-driven, and ethically grounded. It fosters inclusive governance, data-informed decision-making, and organizational learning, while proactively guiding the institution through technological, environmental, and societal transformations—including the responsible adoption of AI. The institution also promotes the professional development of academic and administrative staff, with a focus on strengthening digital literacy and AI-related competencies to enhance institutional capacity.
1-6. Financial Sustainability	The institution should maintain sound financial management and ensure sufficient resources to sustain its educational mission and strategic priorities over time.	The institution maintains a sound financial management system and demonstrates the capacity to sustain its educational mission. Financial planning supports long-term institutional goals, ensures operational continuity, and adapts to changing internal and external conditions.

Standard 2: Internal Quality Assurance & Accountability

This standard focuses on how the institution ensures quality through a transparent, evidence-based internal quality assurance (IQA) system that is designed and implemented in alignment with the institution’s mission and strategic objectives. It highlights the use of clear policies, regularly implemented evaluations and participatory stakeholder feedback to enhance performance. Systematic data collection, analysis, and information sharing—supported where appropriate by data analytics and AI-enabled tools—enable monitoring, institutional steering, and continuous improvement. Public transparency reinforces accountability and institutional trust, and the IQA system is periodically reviewed and adapted to ensure its continued effectiveness.

	Indicator	Descriptors
2-1. IQA Policy and Structure	The institution should establish a robust internal quality assurance (IQA) framework with clearly defined standards, objectives, and responsibilities, regularly reviewed for alignment with strategic goals and international best practices.	An institution-wide internal quality assurance policy is established, outlining core principles, standards, and operational mechanisms. The policy is aligned with global quality frameworks and updated regularly to reflect institutional goals and emerging educational trends.
2-2. Operational Effectiveness and Intelligent Monitoring	The IQA system should operate effectively across academic and administrative units, supported by integrated data systems and, where appropriate, AI-enabled tools that facilitate real-time monitoring, evidence-based improvement, and consistent alignment with institutional quality objectives.	The IQA system is managed by a central coordinating unit or committee and embedded across all institutional levels. It ensures consistency in implementation, cross-unit collaboration, and adherence to quality standards and procedures, supported where appropriate by AI-enabled tools and integrated data systems that enhance coordination, monitoring, and decision-making. IQA systems may be centralized, decentralized, or hybrid in structure, depending on institutional mission and strategy, provided that coherence and effectiveness are ensured.
2-3. Evidence-based Quality Improvement	The institution should implement systematic mechanisms to assess the performance and effectiveness of the IQA system, with data analytics and, where appropriate, AI-driven tools used to generate insights that guide ongoing and forward-looking quality improvements.	Through systematic evaluation, data-driven analysis, and inclusive stakeholder feedback, the IQA system effectively supports evidence-based decisions and ongoing quality enhancement across academic and administrative domains. Where appropriate, AI-powered tools are used to generate predictive insights and strengthen the system's forward-looking improvement efforts.
2-4. Public Information and Transparency	The institution should ensure transparency through the timely dissemination of accurate, accessible, and relevant information regarding academic offerings, student success, financial integrity, and societal engagement.	The institution regularly publishes comprehensive and up-to-date information on academic programs, student achievement, financial integrity, and strategic priorities, including the results of IQA processes and how these results are used for quality enhancement and institutional steering. Disclosure is provided in appropriate and accessible forms to support public accountability and the informed engagement of higher education stakeholders.

	Indicator	Descriptors
2-5. Review and Evaluation Mechanisms	The institution should systematically collect and analyze feedback from faculty, staff, students, alumni, employers, and external partners, and incorporate the results into institutional quality enhancement initiatives.	The IQA system is subject to periodic internal review, external peer review, and benchmarking. These assessments guide system enhancement and ensure the IQA function remains agile, relevant, and effective in supporting institutional transformation.

Standard 3: Teaching, Learning & Student Achievement

This standard focuses on how the institution ensures student achievement through coherent academic policies, inclusive admissions, and curriculum design aligned with intended learning outcomes. It emphasizes technology-enhanced learning, inclusive pedagogy, robust assessment practices, and responsive student support. Faculty structures, infrastructure, and program review processes work together to promote quality teaching, equitable access, and continuous improvement informed by data and stakeholder input. Teaching and learning are informed, where appropriate, by research activities, applied projects, and engagement with professional and societal practice. Innovative pedagogical approaches and digitally enhanced learning models are considered developmental aspirations rather than baseline compliance requirements.

	Indicator	Descriptors
3-1. Academic Policies	The institution should establish and communicate coherent academic policies on student admissions, curriculum design, and degree conferral to promote transparency, equity, and alignment with educational objectives.	The institution formulates and disseminates comprehensive academic policies governing program structure, admission, progression, and graduation. These policies ensure coherence, transparency, and alignment with educational objectives and international good practice.
3-2. Student Admission Information and Fair Selection	The institution should implement clear, fair, and transparent admission policies and selection processes, ensuring that requirements and procedures are clearly communicated to applicants so that admitted students are prepared to succeed in their chosen programs, aligning with institutional mission and learning expectations.	The institution implements clear, fair, and consistent admission policies aligned with its mission and program learning expectations, using criteria based on academic readiness and program suitability that are regularly reviewed for relevance and equity. Admission policies and procedures, including clear information on the intended student profile, required academic preparation, and selection methods, are communicated to applicants and prospective students in an accessible and understandable manner. The admissions process is conducted fairly and transparently, supported by accurate information and guidance, and designed to identify students with the potential to succeed in their chosen fields of study.

	Indicator	Descriptors
3-3. Curriculum Design and Technology-Enhanced Learning	Curriculum design should ensure academic rigor and global relevance by aligning program learning outcomes with curriculum structure and course design, integrating interdisciplinary perspectives, sustainability themes, and appropriate emerging technologies to support intended learning outcomes.	In curriculum design, the institution applies clear procedures for program design, approval, revision, and closure, and ensures constructive alignment among intended learning outcomes, curriculum content, teaching approaches, and assessment. Curricula address academic standards while responding to societal needs and global challenges through the integration of interdisciplinary knowledge, critical thinking, digital competencies (including AI awareness and ethics where relevant), and sustainability-related learning. Technology integration is reflected in curriculum intent and structure—such as planned use of AI-supported learning resources or immersive learning components—where it meaningfully strengthens outcome achievement and program relevance.
3-4. Faculty Structure for Education Delivery	Faculty structures and deployment arrangements should support effective program delivery by enabling collaborative, interdisciplinary, and innovation-driven teaching, while ensuring coordination, role clarity, and course-level quality oversight responsive to evolving learner needs.	Teaching is supported by well-defined faculty roles and coordinated teaching teams, and appropriate deployment and workload arrangements that enable collaborative and interdisciplinary delivery. These structures support curriculum coherence, shared responsibility for course design and delivery, and timely adjustment to learner diversity and emerging educational needs. Where relevant, international and intercultural competencies are demonstrated. Teaching quality is reviewed at the course and program levels through transparent and appropriate criteria, and results are used to strengthen teaching coordination and instructional improvement.
3-5. Learning Support and Pedagogy	Teaching practices should apply an appropriate mix of inclusive and student-centered pedagogical approaches, supported by responsive academic services and digital innovations to enhance engagement, personalization, and learning effectiveness.	The institution adopts inclusive, student-centered pedagogies that incorporate digital innovations such as blended, flipped, AI-enabled, and self-directed learning models. Academic support services—including intelligent tutoring systems, immersive VR learning modules, and personalized advising—are delivered in a timely and accessible manner to promote active engagement, learning effectiveness, and student success. An appropriate mix of pedagogical approaches is applied to support diverse learning objectives and student needs.

	Indicator	Descriptors
3-6. Learning Environment and Infrastructure	The institution should maintain inclusive and accessible physical and digital infrastructure to support diverse and personalized learning.	Inclusive learning environments are supported through appropriate academic, social, and advisory services. Physical and digital infrastructure—including facilities, teaching and research laboratories, smart classrooms, immersive simulation labs, and AI-enabled platforms—are adequate, accessible, and continuously enhanced to ensure equitable access and effective use by diverse learners, support academic and research activities, diverse learning modalities, and personalized educational experiences.
3-7. Student Support and Well-being	The institution should provide a comprehensive and inclusive system of student support to foster academic success, personal development, and career readiness, ensuring equitable access for all learners.	The institution provides equitable, integrated support services that address academic, psychological, social, and career development needs—such as scholarships, advising services, mental health counseling, and career planning. These services are inclusive and data-informed, designed to promote individual growth, resilience, and well-being throughout the student lifecycle. Support services also facilitate students’ actual engagement with the labor market and society, including career preparation, employability development, and opportunities for civic or community contribution.
3-8. Learning Outcomes Assessment	The institution should systematically assess learning outcomes across multiple levels using data analytics and, where appropriate, AI-assisted analysis to track student progress, predict achievement trends, and support continuous improvement and accountability.	Learning outcomes are assessed systematically at the course, program, and institutional levels, with results linked to curriculum refinement, teaching enhancement, and strategic planning. Data analytics and, where appropriate, AI-assisted tools are used to track student progress, identify achievement patterns, and support evidence-based decision-making and continuous improvement.
3-9. Assessment and Degree Awarding	Student learning should be assessed through valid, transparent, and authentic methods that align with intended learning outcomes and ensure academic integrity in awarding degrees.	Assessment practices are valid, reliable, and clearly aligned with intended learning outcomes, utilizing diverse and authentic methods such as portfolios, projects, and performance-based tasks. Degree awarding processes are governed by transparent policies that uphold academic integrity and reflect institutional regulations and disciplinary standards.

Indicator		Descriptors
3-10. Program Review and Enhancement	The institution should regularly review and enhance educational programs through structured procedures that use learning outcome evidence, impact analysis, and stakeholder and needs-based feedback to maintain relevance, quality, and continuous improvement.	Educational programs are reviewed on a regular cycle through structured procedures that include curriculum mapping, analysis of learning outcome data, impact analysis of implemented improvements, and surveys or feedback mechanisms to identify emerging needs. Input is gathered from students, faculty, alumni, and employers, and is used to refine course content, update delivery methods, and align programs with institutional priorities and evolving societal and industry expectations.

Standard 4: Faculty Development & Research Engagement

This standard examines how the institution recruits, develops, and supports faculty to excel in teaching, research, and leadership. It highlights transparent performance management, structured faculty development programs, and active engagement in research and knowledge transfer. Emphasis is placed on interdisciplinary and socially relevant research aligned with institutional goals and global development priorities.

Indicator		Descriptors
4-1. Recruitment and Performance Management	Faculty recruitment, evaluation, and promotion processes should be transparent, inclusive, and aligned with principles of academic excellence, institutional values, and global standards for diversity, equity, and merit.	Faculty recruitment, evaluation, and promotion are conducted through clear, merit-based, and inclusive procedures governed by defined institutional policies. These processes are designed to attract and retain diverse academic talent, ensure consistency and fairness, and support scholarly excellence in alignment with institutional goals and evolving educational and societal needs.
4-2. Faculty Development (FD) Programs	The institution should provide structured and forward-looking Faculty Development (FD) programs that foster continuous professional growth in teaching, research capacity, and academic leadership.	The institution provides faculty with structured and responsive professional development opportunities, including training in innovative pedagogy, AI and digital integration, inclusive teaching, research leadership, and global academic engagement. FD programs are strategically aligned with institutional priorities and regularly reviewed for relevance and effectiveness. Through these FD programs, the institution helps ensure that faculty and staff qualifications, competencies, and profiles remain appropriate to institutional goals and program requirements.

	Indicator	Descriptors
4-3. Research and Knowledge Transfer	Faculty should engage in research that enhances teaching and contributes to innovation and knowledge transfer through active collaboration with industry, government, civil society, and other external partners.	Faculty actively engage in research that enhances teaching quality and drives impact across communities and industries. Knowledge generated through collaborative research is integrated into the curriculum and disseminated through outreach activities, supporting experiential learning and societal advancement. The scope and depth of research engagement are assessed in relation to institutional mission and profile, recognizing that teaching-oriented institutions may demonstrate impact through pedagogical scholarship, applied projects, or professional engagement.
4-4. Research Relevance and Impact	The institution should encourage interdisciplinary and socially relevant research by providing support mechanisms aligned with national priorities and global development agendas.	The institution supports research that addresses critical societal and global challenges through interdisciplinary collaboration, sustainability-oriented inquiry, and policy-relevant outcomes. Incentive structures, research infrastructure, and partnerships enable open knowledge sharing and measurable contributions to the public good.

Standard 5: Social Engagement & Global Connection

This standard examines how the institution contributes to society through civic engagement, strategic partnerships, and international collaboration. It emphasizes clear policies for social responsibility, collaboration with external stakeholders to address societal challenges, and globally minded initiatives that foster mobility, intercultural fluency, and meaningful community impact aligned with the institutional mission.

	Indicator	Descriptors
5-1. Social Engagement Policies and Initiatives	The institution should establish clear policies to guide civic and societal engagement, positioning itself as a catalyst for inclusive, equitable, and sustainable development at both local and global levels.	Policies, frameworks, and initiatives demonstrate an institution-wide commitment to public engagement and societal development through education, research, and community service. Engagement activities may include regional initiatives that contribute to local development and knowledge exchange.

	Indicator	Descriptors
5-2. Cross-Sector and Academic Collaboration	The institution should engage in strategic collaborations with industry, government, and civil society to co-develop innovative solutions, foster service learning, and extend the reach of applied research that addresses community and societal challenges.	The institution sustains long-term, multi-stakeholder partnerships that support applied research, policy dialogue, knowledge transfer, and inclusive innovation. These collaborations foster mutual learning and shared responsibility for addressing societal needs and driving community development. Collaboration may include internationalization at home, such as academic cooperation, benchmarking, and joint activities with domestic partner institutions.
5-3. Internationalization and Mobility	The institution should promote student and faculty mobility, intercultural fluency, and sustainable global partnerships through inclusive, hybrid, and locally responsive internationalization strategies.	Internationalization is advanced through holistic and integrated strategies—such as physical and virtual mobility, Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL), and Internationalization at Home (IaH)—to build global competencies, intercultural understanding, and reciprocal international partnerships. Internationalization activities are guided by an explicit institutional concept or strategy and are linked, where appropriate, to the formulation and assessment of international and intercultural learning outcomes.
5-4. Contribution to Societal Engagement and Impact	The institution should ensure that outreach, extension, and engagement activities are strategically aligned with its mission, yielding measurable contributions to community well-being, knowledge equity, and social innovation.	The institution’s outreach and engagement initiatives are designed to generate meaningful societal impact through interdisciplinary collaboration, community-driven approaches, and inclusive innovation. Partnerships are co-created with stakeholders and evaluated based on their contributions to sustainability, social equity, and responsible global engagement. Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to participate in societal and community engagement activities. Such activities are supported, documented, and, where relevant, validated or formally recognized.

III. Corresponding Rubrics

Descriptors, which describe the characteristics of each performance level, serve to explain the content and context of indicators and to illustrate developmental expectations. They are not intended as exhaustive checklists, quantitative scoring tools, or substitutes for qualification frameworks.

(A) Rubric Level Definitions

Level	Description
1. Initial	Institutional practices are largely undeveloped and fragmented, with no clear framework or systematic implementation in place.
2. Evolving	Basic practices are in place, but they remain informal, inconsistently applied, and not yet embedded in institutional systems.
3. Mature	Practices are formalized and consistently applied across the institution, with moderate coherence and operational stability.
4. Advanced	Practices are institutionally integrated, regularly reviewed, and refined based on performance data and stakeholder feedback.
5. Exemplary	Practices demonstrate innovation, stakeholder engagement, collaborative governance, and strategic leadership that generate meaningful institutional and societal outcomes.

(B) Rubric Tables

Standard 1: Institutional Mission, Governance & Strategic Sustainability

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
<p>1-1. Mission, Vision, and Institutional Identity</p>	<p>Mission and vision are unclear, outdated, or undocumented, are not consistently accessible, show little reflection of institutional identity, involve minimal stakeholder engagement, and are not reviewed systematically.</p>	<p>Mission and vision are documented and available in limited forms, but are inconsistently communicated and only partially accessible, reflect institutional identity in limited ways, involve occasional stakeholder input, and are reviewed informally or irregularly.</p>	<p>Mission and vision are clearly documented and publicly accessible, reflect a coherent institutional identity, engage key stakeholders periodically, and are reviewed on a defined cycle with stable implementation across the institution.</p>	<p>Mission and vision are clearly documented and widely accessible, reflect and reinforce institutional identity in governance and quality processes, engage diverse stakeholders through structured consultation, and are regularly reviewed and refined using performance evidence and stakeholder feedback.</p>	<p>Mission and vision are collaboratively documented through broad stakeholder co-creation, are highly accessible and widely understood, strongly embody and shape institutional identity and culture, engage stakeholders as ongoing partners in governance, and are continuously reviewed and renewed to drive strategic leadership and meaningful institutional and societal outcomes.</p>
<p>1-2. Sustainability Foresight and Strategic Alignment</p>	<p>The institution rarely monitors external trends, and strategic actions show limited relevance or public impact.</p>	<p>The institution responds to trends in an ad hoc manner, and improvement actions are inconsistently evidenced and not supported by systematic analytics.</p>	<p>The institution conducts regular environmental scanning and uses evidence to adjust priorities to maintain relevance and operational sustainability.</p>	<p>The institution systematically integrates performance data and stakeholder feedback to anticipate change and refine initiatives for measurable impact and sustainability.</p>	<p>The institution employs strategic foresight and advanced analytics to proactively lead transformation and demonstrate sustained, measurable institutional and societal outcomes.</p>

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
1-3. Strategic Planning and Institutional Resilience	Strategic planning is ad hoc or outdated, with little alignment to mission or evidence-based practices.	Basic strategic plans exist but lack coherence, stakeholder input, or systematic review processes.	Strategic plans are evidence-informed, reviewed periodically, and moderately align with institutional mission.	Plans are forward-looking and evidence-informed, supported by systematic data analysis and stakeholder input, and enhanced by advanced analytics (where appropriate) to strengthen institutional resilience and adaptability.	Strategic planning is dynamic and inclusive, using advanced analytics and, where appropriate, AI-enabled foresight to guide timely interventions, resulting in demonstrable improvements in long-term resilience.
1-4. Governance and Stakeholder Participation	Governance roles and processes are unclear, and decision-making is opaque with minimal stakeholder participation.	Governance structures exist, but transparency and stakeholder engagement are limited and inconsistent.	Governance roles and procedures are defined, and stakeholder input is periodically incorporated into decisions.	Governance is participatory and accountable, and decisions are evidence-informed and regularly evaluated for effectiveness.	Governance is collaborative and agile, and it enables ethical leadership, innovation, and a sustained culture of improvement.
1-5. Ethical Leadership and Staff Development	Leadership lacks clear direction and does not support staff development or governance structures.	Leadership is partially inclusive; professional development opportunities are limited or informal.	Leadership is ethically grounded and inclusive; staff development is structured and supports institutional goals.	Visionary leadership fosters data-informed governance and promotes digital and AI literacy across staff.	Leadership exemplifies innovation and ethical foresight, guiding staff development and AI readiness institution-wide.
1-6. Financial Sustainability	Financial planning is reactive, with unclear budgeting and insufficient resources for mission delivery.	Basic financial systems are in place, but planning is short-term and misaligned with strategic goals.	Financial management is stable and aligned with long-term goals, with periodic reviews.	Financial systems support strategic priorities and adapt to internal and external changes.	Financial planning is strategic, forward-looking, and ensures long-term sustainability through risk-informed practices.

Standard 2: Internal Quality Assurance & Accountability

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
2-1. IQA Policy and Structure	The institution lacks a formal IQA policy, and quality responsibilities are unclear or fragmented.	The institution has basic QA rules or guidelines, but they are incomplete, inconsistently applied, or not institution-wide.	The institution has a documented IQA policy with defined roles and procedures that are implemented across units.	The IQA policy is aligned with institutional strategy and international good practice, and it is regularly reviewed and updated.	The IQA policy is deeply embedded in institutional culture, is co-owned by stakeholders, and demonstrably guides strategic decisions and improvement priorities.
2-2. Operational Effectiveness and Intelligent Monitoring	IQA operations are sporadic, manual, and largely disconnected across academic and administrative areas.	IQA processes operate in selected units, but coordination is weak and monitoring is mostly periodic and reactive.	IQA processes function across key areas with defined workflows, and data are used for routine monitoring and follow-up.	IQA operations are integrated across the institution, supported by interoperable data systems and AI-enabled tools (where appropriate) for timely monitoring and decision support.	IQA operations are agile and consistently effective, using integrated platforms and AI-enabled analytics (where appropriate) to enable real-time oversight and rapid, evidence-based improvement.
2-3. Evidence-based Quality Improvement	Improvement actions are not evidence-based, and evaluation results are rarely collected or used.	Data and feedback are collected, but analysis is limited and improvement actions are inconsistent or undocumented.	The institution analyzes evidence and uses results to plan and implement improvement actions across major functions.	Improvement cycles are systematic and institution-wide, using performance analytics and AI-enabled tools (where appropriate) together with stakeholder feedback to refine processes and outcomes.	The institution uses advanced analytics and, where appropriate, AI-driven insights to anticipate risks, prioritize improvements, and demonstrate measurable enhancement over time.
2-4. Public Information and Transparency	Little or no information is publicly available about institutional performance or academic offerings.	Some information is published but lacks consistency, clarity, or accessibility.	The institution publishes core information related to academic and operational performance.	Transparency is proactive, with regularly updated, user-friendly, and comprehensive disclosures.	Public reporting includes performance metrics, strategic progress, and impact analysis co-communicated with stakeholders.

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
2-5. Review and Evaluation Mechanisms	No mechanisms exist to review or improve the IQA system itself.	Ad hoc or informal evaluations are occasionally conducted.	Periodic internal reviews are conducted with limited external input.	The IQA system undergoes regular internal and external evaluation with benchmarking.	Review processes are embedded in institutional governance, driving continuous innovation and systemic quality culture.

Standard 3: Teaching, Learning & Student Achievement

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
3-1. Academic Policies	Academic policies are incomplete, unclear, or inconsistently applied.	Basic policies are in place but are inconsistently communicated or enforced.	Academic policies are documented, publicly available, and applied across major functions.	Policies are clearly aligned with institutional goals and regularly reviewed for effectiveness.	Policies are strategic, equity-focused, and co-developed with stakeholders to drive academic quality and access.
3-2. Student Admission Information and Fair Selection	Admission criteria are unclear or inconsistently applied, with limited regard for student readiness or equity.	Basic admission policies exist but lack alignment with institutional mission or consistent review mechanisms.	Clear, fair admission policies are implemented and aligned with institutional goals, with periodic review of admission outcomes.	Admissions policies are consistently applied, regularly updated based on data and stakeholder input, and supported by guidance systems.	Admissions processes are transparent, equity-driven, data-informed, and strategically aligned with student success and institutional goals.
3-3. Curriculum Design and Technology-Enhanced Learning	Curriculum design is fragmented, and alignment among intended learning outcomes, content, teaching, and assessment is not evident.	Curriculum procedures exist, but alignment and review are inconsistent, and technology use is limited, uncoordinated, or not clearly linked to learning outcomes.	The institution applies clear curriculum procedures and ensures constructive alignment that supports intended learning outcomes, making appropriate and coordinated use of digital tools where they add educational value.	The curriculum integrates interdisciplinary learning and sustainability, incorporates technology-enhanced approaches (where appropriate) to strengthen learning design, and is regularly reviewed.	The curriculum is agile and globally benchmarked, and it leverages advanced learning technologies (where appropriate) to deliver demonstrable improvements in curriculum relevance, learning effectiveness, and learning outcomes.

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
3-4. Faculty Structure for Education Delivery	Faculty roles and workload arrangements are unclear, and teaching delivery depends on individual effort rather than coordinated structures.	Faculty deployment exists, but workload allocation is uneven or informally managed, collaboration is limited, and teaching quality assurance is inconsistent.	Faculty roles are defined, workload allocation follows basic rules and supports program delivery, and teaching quality is reviewed using transparent criteria.	Faculty structures enable interdisciplinary collaboration and innovation, and workload and deployment policies are reviewed and adjusted to respond to evolving learner needs and institutional priorities.	Faculty structures are highly collaborative and adaptable, and workload models are flexible, equitable, and strategically managed to enable future-focused teaching excellence, sustained innovation, and continuous program enhancement.
3-5. Learning Support and Pedagogy	Teaching relies on limited methods, and academic support services are minimal or difficult to access.	Some support services and technology tools exist, but provision is inconsistent and pedagogy remains largely traditional.	The institution applies student-centered pedagogy and provides accessible academic support that promotes engagement and achievement.	The institution integrates inclusive pedagogy with context-appropriate innovations, including digital approaches where relevant, supported by timely and effective services that enhance student engagement and learning effectiveness.	The institution delivers highly personalized and scalable learning support through digital or other effective approaches as appropriate, and demonstrates strong and sustained learning effectiveness and student success.
3-6. Learning Environment and Infrastructure	Learning spaces and digital access are insufficient, and infrastructure does not reliably support teaching and learning needs.	Basic facilities and platforms exist, but accessibility, maintenance, and user support are uneven.	Physical and digital infrastructure adequately supports program delivery and is generally accessible to learners.	Infrastructure is continuously upgraded to support diverse learning modalities, including smart classrooms and immersive or AI-enabled platforms where relevant.	Infrastructure is future-ready and inclusive by design, and it demonstrably enables flexible, high-quality, and technology-enhanced learning experiences.

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
3-7. Student Support and Well-being	Student support services are limited, fragmented, or unavailable, and access is not systematically ensured.	Some services exist, but coverage is uneven and coordination across academic, psychological, and career support is limited.	The institution provides integrated support services for learning, well-being, and career development with equitable access.	Support services are data-informed and proactive, and they are refined based on student needs, outcomes, and feedback.	Support systems are comprehensive and personalized, and they demonstrably strengthen student resilience, employability, and engagement with society.
3-8. Learning Outcomes Assessment	Learning outcomes are not systematically assessed; data use is minimal.	Basic outcome assessment occurs at some levels, but not systematically; limited use of data.	Learning outcomes are assessed at course and program levels; data informs teaching and review.	Assessments occur across all levels, supported by data analysis; results inform curriculum and planning.	Comprehensive outcome assessments are integrated into institutional planning and curriculum enhancement, with digital or AI-assisted approaches applied where appropriate.
3-9. Assessment and Degree Awarding	Assessment is irregular or lacks clear alignment with learning outcomes. Degree awarding is inconsistently applied.	Assessment practices are developing but vary widely in quality and transparency.	Assessments are valid, aligned with outcomes, and consistently implemented; degree conferral processes are formalized.	Transparent and authentic assessments are linked to outcomes and reviewed for integrity and fairness.	Assessments use diverse, innovative methods and data analytics to uphold academic integrity and drive continuous improvement.
3-10. Program Review and Enhancement	Program review is absent or irregular, and improvement actions are not documented or sustained.	Reviews occur occasionally, but methods are inconsistent and follow-up actions are limited.	Programs are reviewed on a regular cycle using structured procedures and evidence, and improvements are documented.	Reviews integrate outcomes data, stakeholder feedback, and benchmarking, and findings drive targeted curriculum and delivery enhancement.	Program review is continuous and strategic, and it demonstrably strengthens relevance, quality, and labor-market or societal alignment through sustained improvement.

Standard 4: Faculty Development & Research Engagement

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
<p>4-1. Recruitment and Performance Management</p>	<p>The institution lacks clear and transparent policies for recruitment, evaluation, and promotion, and there is no systematic review of these processes.</p>	<p>The institution has basic recruitment and evaluation procedures, but implementation is uneven and reviews are informal or irregular, with limited alignment to institutional values and equity principles.</p>	<p>The institution consistently applies documented, merit-based recruitment, evaluation, and promotion policies, and it conducts periodic internal reviews to support alignment with institutional goals.</p>	<p>The institution regularly reviews recruitment and performance systems using evidence and stakeholder input, and it strengthens fairness, quality, and alignment with evolving needs.</p>	<p>The institution operates an integrated talent system with continuous, evidence-informed review and improvement, attracting and retaining diverse excellence, supporting clear career pathways, and demonstrably strengthening institutional capacity and impact.</p>
<p>4-2. Faculty Development (FD) Programs</p>	<p>The institution provides little or no structured faculty development; activities are rarely offered, or—when offered—participation is low or undocumented.</p>	<p>The institution offers some FD activities, but they are ad hoc or optional, and weakly linked to institutional priorities; participation and follow-up are not systematically tracked.</p>	<p>The institution delivers structured and regular FD programs that are accessible to faculty and support teaching, research engagement, and leadership development.</p>	<p>The institution aligns FD with strategy and includes training in innovative pedagogy, AI and digital integration, and inclusive teaching, and it reviews effectiveness using participation data and documented outcomes.</p>	<p>The institution delivers faculty-led, co-designed FD that embeds AI-enabled learning analytics and global collaboration, and it demonstrates measurable improvements in teaching quality, research capacity, and societal engagement outcomes.</p>

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
4-3. Research and Knowledge Transfer	Faculty research and external engagement are limited, fragmented, or disconnected from teaching and societal needs.	Some faculty conduct research or outreach, but collaboration is limited and knowledge transfer is unstructured or inconsistent.	Faculty research and professional practice inform teaching and include partnerships with community or industry, and outputs are integrated into learning activities.	Faculty engage in interdisciplinary and collaborative research with clear application to real-world issues, and research outcomes are systematically integrated into curriculum and outreach.	Research is co-produced with external stakeholders and leverages advanced technologies and data-driven insights to generate demonstrable improvements in teaching capacity, curriculum enrichment, institutional innovation, and societal advancement.
4-4. Research Relevance and Impact	Research lacks strategic focus or relevance to social needs or global trends.	Some research aligns with societal issues or sustainability, but impact is limited or unmeasured.	Institutional support promotes research addressing national and global challenges with some impact tracking.	Research agendas are aligned with sustainable development, equity, and interdisciplinary innovation, supported by strong institutional infrastructure.	Research demonstrates transformative societal impact, is openly disseminated, and contributes to inclusive global knowledge ecosystems.

Standard 5: Social Engagement & Global Connection

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
<p>5-1. Social Engagement Policies and Initiatives</p>	<p>The institution lacks clear engagement policies, and civic or community activities are minimal and uncoordinated, with no systematic review or documentation.</p>	<p>The institution has basic engagement intentions, but activities are isolated and not guided by consistent frameworks or targets, and review is informal or irregular.</p>	<p>The institution has defined engagement policies and implements coordinated initiatives through education, research, or service, and it conducts periodic review based on documented outputs and outcomes.</p>	<p>The institution aligns engagement policies with regional needs and institutional priorities, and it reviews effectiveness using evidence and structured stakeholder feedback to inform improvement actions.</p>	<p>The institution embeds public engagement into its identity and strategy, and it maintains continuous, impact-oriented review and learning cycles that demonstrate sustained, measurable community and societal outcomes through collaborative initiatives.</p>
<p>5-2. Cross-Sector and Academic Collaboration</p>	<p>Collaboration with industry, government, or civil society is limited, informal, or short-term, with no clear structure or outcomes.</p>	<p>The institution signs MOUs or conducts occasional projects, but partnership governance and follow-through are inconsistent.</p>	<p>The institution maintains functional partnerships that support student projects, applied research, or knowledge exchange with documented outputs.</p>	<p>The institution sustains long-term, outcome-oriented partnerships that support applied innovation, service learning, and policy dialogue, and it evaluates impact using evidence.</p>	<p>The institution co-develops strategic alliances with partners that drive inclusive innovation and community development, and it demonstrates significant, shared societal outcomes.</p>

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
5-3. Internationalization and Mobility	International activities are limited, and opportunities for intercultural learning are rare or not systematically supported.	The institution offers occasional exchanges or partnerships, but participation is limited and learning outcomes are not clearly defined.	The institution implements a clear internationalization strategy with regular mobility and partnership activities that support intercultural learning.	The institution integrates internationalization through inclusive approaches such as COIL and IaH, and it assesses international and intercultural learning outcomes where appropriate.	The institution advances reciprocal, sustainable global partnerships that expand access to international learning for most learners and demonstrate measurable global competency outcomes.
5-4. Contribution to Societal Engagement and Impact	Outreach and engagement activities are sporadic, weakly aligned with mission, and rarely documented or evaluated.	The institution conducts some outreach activities, but alignment, coordination, and impact assessment remain limited.	The institution aligns outreach and extension activities with mission, documents participation, and demonstrates tangible contributions to community needs.	The institution designs interdisciplinary, community-driven initiatives with stakeholders, and it evaluates outcomes using evidence related to well-being, equity, or social innovation.	The institution consistently generates meaningful societal impact through co-created partnerships, recognized participation by faculty, staff, and students, and transparent evidence of sustained outcomes.