International Joint Accreditation

Accreditation Standards Version 2.0 (Draft for Review)

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.
- **Addressing Technological Disruption and Digital Futures**
  Recognizing the transformative potential of emerging technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI), Virtual Reality (VR), and learning analytics, Version 2.0 embeds digital innovation into curriculum design, pedagogy, governance, and quality assurance systems.
- **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.

(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.

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 widely understood by internal and external stakeholders.	The institution articulates a clearly defined mission and vision 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.

Indicator		Descriptors
1-2. Strategic Responsiveness and Technological Foresight	The institution should monitor external developments and leverages data analytics and emerging technologies, such as AI, to integrate relevant insights into its strategic planning and institutional priorities, enhancing responsiveness to societal and global change.	The institution actively monitors developments in higher education, industry, policy, and society—both locally and globally—and integrates relevant insights into its strategic and operational planning. It employs data analytics and emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence (AI), to enhance foresight and responsiveness. Institutional priorities are shaped by an informed understanding of external needs and challenges, including demographic changes, technological advancements, and global frameworks like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This proactive approach strengthens relevance, impact, and long-term institutional sustainability.
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. 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.
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 promote institutional accountability, inclusivity, and continuous improvement.
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.

Indicator	Descriptors
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. It highlights the use of clear policies, regular evaluations, and stakeholder feedback to enhance performance. Data analytics and AI-enabled tools support real-time monitoring and continuous improvement, while public transparency reinforces accountability and institutional trust.

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.
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.

Indicator		Descriptors
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, ensuring public accountability and informed stakeholder engagement.
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.

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. Admission of Qualified Students	The institution should implement clear and fair admission policies to ensure that students admitted 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. The admissions process is transparent, 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 through interdisciplinary integration, sustainability themes, and emerging technologies while contributing to the achievement of intended learning outcomes.	Curricula are designed to meet academic standards while responding to societal needs and global challenges through the integration of interdisciplinary knowledge, critical thinking, AI fluency, digital ethics, and sustainability. These elements are further supported by emerging technologies such as AI-powered learning platforms, adaptive content delivery, and immersive learning experiences. Curriculum design and content are regularly reviewed and updated based on stakeholder feedback, learning outcome analysis, and international benchmarking to ensure continued relevance and high quality.
3-4. Faculty Structure for Education Delivery	Faculty structures should support collaborative, interdisciplinary, and innovation-driven teaching approaches that address emerging educational needs and learner diversity.	Teaching is supported by well-defined faculty roles and interdisciplinary team structures that foster collaboration, flexibility, and innovation. Faculty deployment and workload policies are aligned with institutional priorities and evolving learner needs, enabling responsive delivery of diverse and future-focused educational programs.
3-5. Learning Support and Pedagogy	Teaching practices should apply inclusive and student-centered pedagogies, 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.
3-6. Learning Environment and Infrastructure	The institution should maintain inclusive and accessible physical and digital infrastructure to support diverse and personalized learning.	Physical and digital infrastructure—including facilities, smart classrooms, immersive simulation labs, and AI-enabled platforms—are adequate, accessible, and continuously enhanced to 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.

Indicator		Descriptors
3-8. 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.
3-9. 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.
3-10. Program Review and Enhancement	The institution should regularly review and improve educational programs based on learning outcome data, stakeholder input, and evolving academic and societal needs.	Educational programs are reviewed on a regular cycle through structured procedures that include curriculum mapping, analysis of learning outcome data, and feedback from students, faculty, alumni, and employers. Review findings are used to revise course content, update delivery methods, and align programs with institutional priorities and evolving societal and industry needs.

Standard 4: Faculty Development & Research Integration

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. These systems are designed to attract and retain diverse academic talent while aligning with institutional goals, scholarly excellence, and evolving educational and societal needs.

Indicator		Descriptors
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.
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, with growing focus on AI-enabled solutions and data-driven innovation. Knowledge generated through collaborative research is integrated into the curriculum and disseminated through outreach activities, supporting experiential learning and societal advancement.
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.

Indicator		Descriptors
5-2. Industry and Government 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.
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.
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.

III. Corresponding Rubrics

(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
1-1. Mission, Vision, and Institutional Identity	Mission and vision are unclear, inaccessible, or not widely communicated across the institution.	Basic mission and vision statements exist but are not consistently shared or used in decision-making.	Mission and vision are clearly articulated, publicly available, and moderately used to guide planning.	Mission and vision are well-integrated into institutional strategy and regularly reviewed with stakeholder input.	Mission and vision are co-created with stakeholders and actively shape institutional identity, culture, and long-term direction.
1-2. Strategic Responsiveness and Technological Foresight	There is limited awareness of external developments, and no formal mechanism exists for monitoring or strategic integration.	The institution monitors some external trends, but integration into planning is inconsistent and lacks technological support.	External scanning is regular, with insights moderately integrated into planning; data analytics are emerging.	Insights from external monitoring and data analytics—including early AI use—inform planning and institutional priorities.	Proactive scanning and AI-enabled analytics drive foresight, agility, and strategic alignment with societal transformation.

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, supported by data and stakeholder input, and include AI tools for resilience and adaptability.	Strategic planning is dynamic and inclusive, using predictive analytics and AI-driven foresight to ensure long-term resilience.
1-4. Governance and Stakeholder Participation	Governance structures are informal, poorly defined, and lack inclusivity or transparency.	Governance roles and structures exist but are not consistently applied or inclusive of stakeholders.	Governance is clearly defined and transparent, with moderate stakeholder involvement.	Inclusive governance actively engages diverse stakeholders and supports transparent, accountable decision-making.	Governance is collaborative, data-informed, and integral to a culture of continuous improvement and stakeholder empowerment.
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	No formal IQA policy exists; quality-related practices are ad hoc and lack coherence.	An IQA policy is drafted or partially implemented but lacks clarity or institutional alignment.	A formal IQA policy is in place, aligned with institutional objectives and partially applied.	The IQA policy is well-integrated, regularly reviewed, and aligned with strategic planning and international standards.	The IQA framework is a strategic asset, co-developed with stakeholders and regularly refined to reflect best practices and institutional goals.
2-2. Operational Effectiveness and Intelligent Monitoring	The IQA system is informal or ad hoc, with limited coordination across units.	Basic structures exist for IQA operations, but implementation is inconsistent and lacks data support.	The IQA system is centrally coordinated and functions consistently across units using standard data systems.	The system integrates cross-unit collaboration and intelligent monitoring tools (e.g., dashboards, early alerts) to enhance efficiency and quality alignment.	AI-enabled tools and integrated data systems support real-time decision-making, predictive insights, and continuous optimization across institutional levels.
2-3. Evidence-based Quality Improvement	There is no systematic approach to assessing IQA effectiveness; improvements are reactive and undocumented.	Some performance assessments occur, but lack consistency or data depth to drive quality improvement.	Regular evaluations are conducted and used to inform improvements; stakeholder feedback is occasionally incorporated.	Data-driven evaluations and stakeholder feedback routinely guide enhancements; AI tools are used for pattern recognition and forecasting.	A culture of continuous improvement is evident, supported by predictive analytics and AI-driven insights for strategic transformation.
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. Admission of Qualified Students	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	Curricula lack coherence and relevance, with minimal integration of emerging knowledge or technologies.	Some programs begin to integrate interdisciplinary content or digital tools, but not systematically.	Curricula incorporate interdisciplinary perspectives, sustainability, and basic use of educational technologies, with review processes in place.	Curricula reflect global trends, integrate digital and AI-enhanced tools, and are reviewed based on learning outcomes and stakeholder input.	Curriculum design is innovative, forward-looking, and deeply integrated with AI and digital platforms, continuously improved through international benchmarking and predictive data.

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 responsibilities are unclear or inconsistently defined. Interdisciplinary or collaborative teaching is minimal or non-existent.	Basic structures exist but are inconsistently applied across units. Some interdisciplinary teaching occurs on an ad hoc basis.	Faculty structures and roles are formalized, with growing support for collaboration and innovative teaching practices.	Well-defined interdisciplinary teams and faculty structures are in place and regularly reviewed to meet institutional and learner needs.	Faculty structures promote sustained interdisciplinary collaboration, innovation, and responsiveness to emerging trends, informed by feedback and strategic goals.
3-5. Learning Support and Pedagogy	Teaching relies primarily on traditional, instructor-centered methods with minimal support services.	Some student-centered approaches and basic academic support services are in place but are inconsistently applied.	Inclusive, student-centered pedagogies are adopted across many programs, with adequate digital and academic support.	Learning is enhanced through integrated digital innovations, responsive academic support, and inclusive pedagogies across all programs.	Pedagogical innovation is supported by AI and emerging technologies, with comprehensive, data-informed academic support systems ensuring equitable student success.
3-6. Learning Environment and Infrastructure	Learning environments are outdated, limited in accessibility, and lack essential technologies.	Basic physical and digital infrastructure exists but is unevenly accessible and inconsistently updated.	Infrastructure supports most learning needs, with ongoing enhancements and efforts to improve access.	Adaptive and inclusive environments are supported by smart and immersive technologies, regularly maintained and improved.	Environments are fully inclusive and personalized, leveraging advanced technologies including AI to optimize learning and research experiences.
3-7. Student Support and Well-being	Limited support services are offered, often reactive and not integrated.	Basic support systems are available but lack coordination or inclusivity.	Comprehensive support services address a range of needs, with increasing integration and outreach.	Support services are inclusive, data-informed, and aligned with student needs across the lifecycle.	Proactive, holistic support systems use data and technology to ensure equitable access, well-being, and personal and academic success.

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
3-8. 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.
3-9. 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, AI-assisted outcome assessments are integrated into institutional planning and curriculum enhancement.
3-10. Program Review and Enhancement	Program review is ad hoc or absent. Feedback and data are rarely used.	Review processes are in development but applied inconsistently and without formal use of data.	Structured review cycles include stakeholder input and learning outcome data.	Program reviews are systematic, inclusive, and aligned with strategic and societal needs.	Reviews are dynamic and continuous, using predictive analytics and stakeholder engagement to drive innovation and relevance.

Standard 4: Faculty Development & Research Integration

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
4-1. Recruitment and Performance Management	Recruitment and evaluation processes are informal, opaque, or inconsistently applied.	Some merit-based policies are in place, but transparency and inclusiveness are limited.	Faculty recruitment and evaluation follow formal, merit-based procedures aligned with institutional values.	Transparent, inclusive career systems are regularly reviewed to attract and retain diverse, high-quality faculty.	Recruitment and performance systems are internationally benchmarked, equity-driven, and strategically aligned with evolving academic and societal needs.

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
4-2. Faculty Development (FD) Programs	No formal faculty development programs are offered or participation is minimal.	Some FD activities are available, but they are ad hoc, optional, or disconnected from institutional priorities.	Structured and regular FD programs support teaching, research, and leadership development.	FD programs are aligned with institutional goals and include global trends, AI and digital integration, and inclusive pedagogies to enhance teaching and research effectiveness.	FD programs are faculty-led and co-designed, embedding AI-driven learning analytics, digital innovation, and are strategically integrated into institutional innovation, with measurable impact on teaching, research, and engagement.
4-3. Research and Knowledge Transfer	Faculty research is minimal, disconnected from teaching, and lacks societal or applied relevance.	Some faculty engage in research or outreach, but collaboration is limited and unstructured.	Research activities inform teaching and include community or industry partnerships.	Faculty engage in interdisciplinary and collaborative research, integrating AI-enabled solutions and data-driven approaches to address real-world issues, with outcomes directly applied to curricula and experiential learning.	Research is co-produced with external stakeholders, leveraging AI-driven innovation and advanced analytics to generate transformative knowledge that drives teaching capacity, institutional innovation, policy dialogue, 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
5-1. Social Engagement Policies and Initiatives	No clear policies or strategies guide societal engagement; activities are isolated and informal.	Some engagement activities exist and are documented, but coordination and alignment with institutional goals are limited.	The institution has defined policies and frameworks that guide civic engagement and align with its mission.	Engagement policies are integrated across the institution, regularly reviewed, and co-developed with internal and external stakeholders.	Social engagement is embedded in institutional identity and governance, with strategic initiatives that catalyze inclusive and sustainable development at local and global levels.
5-2. Industry and Government Collaboration	Collaboration with industry and government is minimal or informal, with no clear structure or outcomes.	Basic partnerships exist but are project-based, short-term, or not strategically aligned.	The institution maintains strategic partnerships that support applied learning, research, and mutual benefit.	Long-term, multi-stakeholder collaborations are institutionalized, supporting innovation, public policy dialogue, and social impact.	The institution co-leads ecosystem-wide partnerships with government and industry that drive systemic transformation, innovation, and inclusive development.
5-3. Internationalization and Mobility	International activities are limited to ad hoc exchanges or a few bilateral agreements.	Mobility programs and cross-border partnerships are present but inconsistently implemented.	Internationalization is guided by a clear strategy and includes physical and virtual mobility, joint programs, and cultural exchange.	Internationalization is institution-wide, including COIL, IaH, intercultural development, and global partnership networks.	Global engagement is inclusive, reciprocal, and embedded across teaching, research, and governance—positioning the institution as a global learning hub.

Indicator	Level 1: Initial	Level 2: Evolving	Level 3: Mature	Level 4: Advanced	Level 5: Exemplary
5-4. Contribution to Societal Engagement and Impact	Outreach and engagement activities are uncoordinated and lack measurable outcomes.	Some activities show social relevance, but impact is limited or not evaluated.	Engagement initiatives are aligned with institutional mission and include community participation and basic impact measures.	Activities are interdisciplinary, co-created with stakeholders, and evaluated for sustainability and equity impacts.	The institution drives transformative social innovation through collaborative, evidence-informed engagement that contributes to global citizenship, justice, and inclusive knowledge ecosystems.