



TWAEA Program-level International Accreditation

T-PIA Accreditation Standards 2.0

I. Background Information

(A) Rationale for the Revision of T-PIA Accreditation Standards

The revision of the T-PIA Accreditation Standards was undertaken to enhance the clarity, coherence, and usability of the program-level accreditation framework. Based on the review of Version 1.0, several indicators were found to address closely related concepts across different standards, including stakeholder engagement, performance monitoring, curriculum review, learning outcomes assessment, student support, and sustainability. While these elements remain essential to program quality, their distribution across five standards occasionally created overlaps in interpretation, evidence preparation, and review judgment.

Version 2.0 therefore reorganizes the standards into a more integrated four-standard framework. The revision clarifies the boundaries among program governance, curriculum and assessment design, teaching and learning implementation, student learning achievement, faculty capacity, operational resources, and student support systems. This adjustment is intended to help applicant programs prepare more focused self-assessment reports and enable Review Teams to make more consistent, evidence-based judgments.

The revision also strengthens the developmental and evidence-based orientation of T-PIA accreditation. Program-wide internal quality assurance, evidence-informed decision-making, quality enhancement, sustainability, and long-term resource planning are now integrated into Standard 1 as core elements of program governance and sustainable management. At the same time, assessment design is distinguished from student learning achievement, thereby clarifying that Standard 2 focuses on curriculum and assessment mechanisms, while Standard 3 focuses on teaching implementation and demonstrated student achievement.

In summary, Version 2.0 maintains the core principles of Version 1.0—outcome-based education, student-centered learning, evidence-based quality assurance, stakeholder engagement, digital transformation, and sustainability—while reorganizing the framework to improve clarity, coherence, and applicability. The revision reduces structural overlap, clarifies the distinction between design, implementation, achievement, and enhancement, and provides a more focused framework for applicant programs and Review Teams.

(B) Focus and Highlights in Version 2.0

- A streamlined four-standard framework**
 The standards have been revised from five standards to four standards. The former Standard 5, Self-Improvement & Sustainable Development, has been integrated into Standard 1, allowing internal quality assurance, performance monitoring, strategic development, long-term resource planning, sustainability, continuity, and resilience to be treated as part of overall program governance and sustainable management.
- Clearer distinction between curriculum design and learning achievement**
 Version 2.0 clarifies that Standard 2 focuses on curriculum structure, PLO–CLO design and alignment, assessment design, and curriculum-specific review mechanisms. Student learning achievement is addressed separately under Standard 3, which examines the evidence base for learning achievement and the extent to which students attain the intended learning outcomes at an appropriate degree level.
- Stronger emphasis on program-wide quality assurance and enhancement**
 Internal quality assurance is repositioned as a program-wide mechanism under Standard 1. This emphasizes the systematic collection and use of evidence, performance data, aggregated teaching and learning evidence, stakeholder perspectives, and learning analytics where appropriate to support program-level decision-making and continuous improvement.
- Greater attention to governance, transparency, and information disclosure**
 Version 2.0 strengthens the governance dimension by adding transparency and program information disclosure to Standard 1. This supports accountability to current and prospective students, stakeholders, and external partners.
- Integration of student support into faculty and resource systems**
 Student advising, career guidance, student progression support, student well-being and counseling support, employability development, and self-directed learning support are now located under Standard 4. This better reflects their role as part of the broader support system that enables student success.

(C) Overall Structural Comparison with Version 1.0

Version 1.0 treated self-improvement and sustainable development as a separate Standard 5, including IQA, performance monitoring, collaborative improvement, sustainability, and resilience. Version 2.0 integrates these elements into Standard 1 to position them as core elements of program-wide governance and sustainable management.

Aspect	Version 1.0	Version 2.0	Major Change
Overall structure	5 standards 22 indicators	4 standards 17 indicators	Streamlined structure and reduced overlap
Standard 1	Program Mission, Goals & Management	Program Mission, Governance & Sustainable Management	Expanded to include governance, transparency, program-wide IQA, strategic resource planning, sustainability, continuity, and resilience
Standard 2	Curriculum & Learning Outcomes	Curriculum, Learning Outcomes & Assessment Design	Reframed to focus on curriculum and assessment design mechanisms

Aspect	Version 1.0	Version 2.0	Major Change
Standard 3	Teaching, Learning & Assessment	Teaching, Learning & Student Achievement	Shifted from assessment design to teaching implementation and student learning achievement
Standard 4	Faculty, Resources & Support Systems	Faculty, Resources & Student Support Systems	Integrated faculty development, professional engagement, operational resources, and student support systems
Standard 5	Self-Improvement & Sustainable Development	Integrated into Standard 1	IQA, performance monitoring, continuous improvement, sustainability, continuity, and resilience are consolidated into program governance

II. Standards, Indicators, and Descriptors

Application Note on Degree Levels

These standards apply to undergraduate, master's, doctoral, and other degree programs. In applying the indicators, the Review Team shall consider the degree level, disciplinary characteristics, professional requirements, national qualification framework, and the intended learning outcomes of the program. Evidence and expectations should therefore be interpreted in a degree-level appropriate manner.

Standard 1: Program Mission, Governance & Sustainable Management

This standard examines how the program defines its mission and educational goals, establishes effective governance, stakeholder engagement, information disclosure, and internal quality assurance (IQA) mechanisms, and implements strategic development, long-term resource planning, and sustainability strategies. It focuses on the program's coherence, responsiveness to emerging trends, program-wide quality assurance, evidence-informed decision-making, accountability, adaptability, and long-term contribution to institutional and societal development.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
1-1. Mission and Goals	The program defines its mission and educational goals in alignment with the institutional mission, disciplinary development, and societal needs.	- The program articulates a clear mission and educational goals reflecting its educational philosophy, disciplinary orientation, degree level, institutional context, student profile, and societal or professional relevance. - The mission and goals guide program planning, curriculum design, teaching and learning, assessment, student support, quality assurance, and long-term development, and are accessible to relevant stakeholders.
1-2. Governance and Transparency	The program maintains effective governance, stakeholder engagement, and information disclosure mechanisms to support transparent and	The program has appropriate governance and decision-making mechanisms for planning, implementation, monitoring, review, and enhancement. Roles and responsibilities for curriculum approval, faculty deployment, student admission, teaching quality, assessment, academic support, and program review are clearly defined.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
	accountable program management.	• Relevant parties, including faculty, students, alumni, employers, industry or community representatives, and other relevant stakeholders are involved, where appropriate, in program development, consultation, and quality improvement. • Program information, including the mission, educational goals, curriculum, learning outcomes, admission and graduation requirements, faculty, learning resources, student support, and other information needed for informed decision-making, is made accessible to current and prospective students and relevant stakeholders in a clear, accurate, and timely manner.
1-3. Program Coherence and Strategic Responsiveness	The program demonstrates coherence among its mission, graduate profile, curriculum framework, learning outcomes, implementation strategies, and development direction, while responding to emerging trends.	• The program maintains coherence among its mission, educational goals, graduate profile, admission policies, PLOs, curriculum structure, course sequencing, teaching approaches, assessment practices, faculty capacity, student support, and quality assurance arrangements. • The program responds appropriately to relevant academic, professional, technological, societal, and global developments through curriculum, teaching, assessment, faculty development, student support, and quality enhancement. Relevant developments may include sustainability, digital transformation, AI-related developments where appropriate, interdisciplinarity, global engagement, and changing stakeholder needs.
1-4. Internal Quality Assurance and Enhancement	The program maintains a program-wide internal quality assurance mechanism and uses relevant evidence to support program-level decision-making, continuous improvement, and quality enhancement.	• At the program-wide level, the program has a functioning internal quality assurance mechanism to monitor the overall effectiveness of program implementation, including aggregated learning outcome evidence, graduate performance, faculty development, resource use, student support, and other key performance indicators. • Evidence and data, including aggregated and appropriately disaggregated teaching and learning evidence, stakeholder perspectives gathered through quality assurance activities, and learning analytics where appropriate, are systematically collected, analyzed, and used to inform program-level decision-making, follow-up actions, accountability, and continuous improvement. • Results of performance monitoring, quality review findings, and related improvement actions are appropriately documented and communicated or disclosed to relevant internal and external parties, where appropriate, to support transparency, accountability, and quality enhancement.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
1-5. Strategic Development and Sustainability	The program formulates and implements a strategic development plan supported by long-term resource planning, sustainability, continuity, and resilience considerations.	• The program develops and implements a strategic development plan with clear goals, priorities, performance indicators, responsibilities, timelines, and long-term resource strategies. • Planning addresses the program's long-term quality and viability, including the recruitment, retention, succession, deployment, and continuing development of qualified faculty; student recruitment, diversity, and demand; resource capacity and digital infrastructure; administrative and technical support; financial viability; external partnerships; and operational continuity, institutional resilience, and sustainable growth. • The program regularly reviews and adjusts its development plan, resource strategies, and continuity arrangements based on evidence, performance results, changing student needs, institutional capacity, and external developments.

Standard 2: Curriculum, Learning Outcomes & Assessment Design

This standard examines how the program designs and maintains a coherent outcome-based curriculum and assessment system. It focuses on curriculum structure, PLO–CLO design and alignment, learning progression, assessment design, curriculum-specific review mechanisms, and the integration of key competencies and global perspectives. The curriculum and assessment design should be appropriate to the program's degree level, disciplinary characteristics, professional requirements, and intended learning outcomes.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
2-1. Curriculum Structure and Alignment	The curriculum is coherently structured and demonstrates that PLOs and CLOs are clearly defined, assessable, appropriate to the degree level and disciplinary context, and aligned with course content, learning activities, assessment, and learning progression.	• The curriculum is designed as a coherent and progressive structure that supports the achievement of the program's educational goals, graduate profile, and intended learning outcomes. Program learning outcomes (PLOs) and Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) are clearly defined, assessable, and appropriate to the degree level, disciplinary context, and professional requirements. Clear alignment is demonstrated among PLOs, CLOs, course content, learning activities, assessment tasks and criteria, credit distribution, course sequencing, disciplinary competencies, and learning progression. • Where students enter with varied levels of academic preparation, appropriate curricular bridging or progression arrangements are provided and coordinated with the learning and student support mechanisms addressed under Indicators 3-2 and 4-4. • Where experiential or work-integrated learning is included in the curriculum, its role, credit arrangements, learning expectations, progression, and alignment with CLOs and PLOs are clearly defined.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
2-2. Key Competencies and Global Perspectives	The curriculum integrates disciplinary knowledge, key competencies, global perspectives, and emerging themes appropriate to the program's objectives.	• The curriculum embeds relevant disciplinary knowledge and key competencies, such as critical thinking, communication, problem-solving, ethical reasoning, collaboration, global engagement, interdisciplinary learning, sustainability, digital literacy, and AI awareness where appropriate. These elements are integrated in ways that reflect the program's mission, degree level, disciplinary context, and the needs of students, society, and relevant professional fields.
2-3. Assessment Design	The program establishes a valid, fair, reliable, transparent, and coherent assessment system aligned with CLOs and PLOs.	• The program designs assessment methods, criteria, rubrics, and procedures that are aligned with course and program learning outcomes and appropriate to the degree level, disciplinary context, and professional requirements. • Assessment mechanisms support consistency, fairness, reliability, moderation, accessibility, academic integrity, and appropriate review or appeal arrangements. Clear policies govern the use of dictionaries, generative AI where appropriate, citation, authorship, plagiarism, and reasonable adjustments. • Assessment methods may include examinations, assignments, projects, presentations, portfolios, simulations, capstone projects, experiential or work-integrated learning assessments, research outputs, theses, dissertations, or other forms appropriate to the program's objectives.
2-4. Curriculum Review Mechanism	The program maintains a systematic mechanism for reviewing and renewing the curriculum based on curriculum-related evidence and input from relevant parties.	• At the curriculum-specific level, the program regularly reviews and renews the curriculum through mechanisms that examine curriculum structure and sequencing, course content, PLO–CLO design and alignment, teaching and learning activities, assessment design, student workload and achievement, progression and completion, graduate outcomes, professional or industry needs, disciplinary developments, and international benchmarking where appropriate. • Curriculum-related input is gathered from faculty, students, alumni, employers, professional bodies, external partners, experiential or work-integrated learning providers where applicable, and other relevant parties. Evidence and stakeholder input are systematically analyzed and used to inform curriculum renewal, strengthen alignment with intended learning outcomes, and ensure the ongoing relevance and coherence of the curriculum.

Standard 3: Teaching, Learning & Student Achievement

This standard examines how the program implements student-centered, inclusive, and technology-enhanced teaching and learning practices to support student engagement, learning progress, and achievement. It focuses on teaching strategies, learning engagement, feedback for learning, course feedback and reflection, course-level learning data and analytics where appropriate, the evidence base for learning achievement, and PLO attainment in relation to the program's degree level, disciplinary expectations, and intended learning outcomes.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
3-1. Teaching Strategies and Learning Engagement	Teaching strategies are student-centered, appropriate to the program's degree level and disciplinary context, and promote active engagement, independent inquiry, and achievement of learning outcomes.	• Faculty adopt teaching approaches appropriate to the program's degree level, disciplinary characteristics, learning objectives, and students' backgrounds. • Teaching methods may include active learning, problem-based learning, seminar-based learning, research supervision, experiential or work-integrated learning where applicable, collaborative learning, or technology-supported learning. These strategies promote student engagement, motivation, independent inquiry, and the achievement of intended learning outcomes.
3-2. Inclusive and Technology-Enhanced Learning	The program provides inclusive and technology-enhanced learning environments that support diverse learners, equitable participation, and effective learning experiences.	• The program fosters inclusive, flexible, and supportive learning environments that accommodate diverse student needs, backgrounds, learning preferences, and accessibility requirements. • Digital technologies, AI tools, learning platforms, simulations, data analytics, or other technology-enhanced approaches are used purposefully, accessibly, and ethically, where appropriate, to support personalized learning, comprehension, interaction, engagement, and effective learning experiences.
3-3. Feedback, Reflection and Learning Analytics	The program systematically uses feedback, reflection, learning evidence, and learning analytics where appropriate to enhance teaching effectiveness and student learning experiences.	• Students receive timely, constructive, understandable, and actionable feedback on disciplinary learning. At the course and learning-process levels, the program collects and uses evidence such as student feedback and course evaluations, comprehension and participation data, workload and learning difficulties, assessment and performance results, peer observations, faculty and student reflection, learning-platform data, support-service data, and learning analytics where appropriate. • This evidence informs improvements in instructional clarity, teaching pace, classroom interaction, learning materials, academic communication support, assessment, learning activities, student engagement, and differentiated support. Faculty and students engage in structured reflective practices that support continuous improvement in teaching methods, learning strategies, disciplinary understanding, academic communication, and student learning experiences.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
3-4. Student Learning Achievement	The program demonstrates that students achieve the intended learning outcomes at a level appropriate to the degree level and disciplinary expectations.	• The program provides credible and sufficient evidence that students achieve the intended disciplinary and degree-level learning outcomes and demonstrate appropriate academic, professional, practical, or research competencies. • Evidence may include PLO and CLO attainment results, examinations and student work, projects and presentations, portfolios and capstone projects, experiential or work-integrated learning performance where applicable, research outputs, theses or dissertations, progression and completion data, external examinations or certifications, graduate outcomes, employer or workplace feedback, and external moderation or benchmarking. • Achievement results are systematically analyzed, including across relevant student groups where appropriate, and used to improve curriculum, teaching, assessment, faculty development, and student support.

Standard 4: Faculty, Resources & Student Support Systems

This standard examines how the program ensures qualified faculty, appropriate faculty development and professional engagement, adequate operational resources, infrastructure and administrative support, and coordinated student support systems to achieve its objectives. It focuses on faculty capacity, teaching and professional development, resources for program delivery and daily operation, academic advising and progression, career guidance and employability development, student well-being and counseling, and support for self-directed learning.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
4-1. Faculty Capacity	Faculty members possess appropriate qualifications, disciplinary expertise, pedagogical competence, and relevant experience and are effectively deployed to support program objectives and student learning.	• Faculty members possess the academic qualifications, disciplinary expertise, professional or research experience, and degree-level teaching competence required for effective program delivery. The collective faculty profile is appropriate to the curriculum, student needs, degree-level expectations, disciplinary developments, and program priorities. • Faculty deployment ensures adequate coverage of teaching, research or professional practice, supervision, advising, assessment, student support, and other program responsibilities. Workload, class size, team-teaching arrangements, teaching assistance, and staffing sustainability support student learning, faculty well-being, and long-term program quality.
4-2. Faculty Development and Professional Engagement	The program supports faculty development, research, professional practice, and engagement that	• The program provides structured and responsive faculty development opportunities that support teaching innovation, inclusive pedagogy, disciplinary literacy, assessment, reflective practice, digital and AI-related competencies where

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
	enhance teaching quality and program relevance.	appropriate, research capacity, and global or industry engagement. • The program periodically evaluates the impact of faculty development on teaching quality, student engagement, assessment, and learning outcomes. Faculty development needs are identified through student learning evidence, faculty feedback, teaching observations, peer review, quality assurance findings, and program priorities. • Faculty research, professional practice, scholarly activities, international engagement, and knowledge transfer contribute to curriculum relevance, teaching quality, student learning, and societal or professional impact.
4-3. Resources, Infrastructure and Administrative Support	Adequate operational resources, infrastructure, and administrative support are available and regularly reviewed to support teaching, learning, assessment, student development, and daily program operation.	• The program has access to adequate learning spaces, laboratories, libraries, equipment, digital infrastructure, learning platforms, administrative services, technical support, and other necessary operational resources to support effective teaching, learning, assessment, research or professional practice, student development, and program management. • Resources and administrative services are accessible, fit for purpose, properly maintained, regularly reviewed, and updated in response to student and faculty needs, program development priorities, digital transformation, and evidence of effectiveness. • For the purposes of this indicator, administrative and technical services include support for program operations, access to essential services, assessment administration, student records, digital platforms, and related operational needs. Academic advising, counseling, career development, and self-directed learning support are addressed under Indicator 4-4.
4-4. Student Support Systems	The program provides coordinated academic advising, progression support, career guidance, student well-being and counseling support, and self-directed learning support, and systematically reviews and improves these mechanisms to promote equitable student success.	• The program establishes appropriate mechanisms for academic advising, student progression support, experiential or work-integrated learning preparation and support where applicable, career guidance and employability development, student well-being and counseling, and self-directed learning. • Self-directed learning support helps students identify learning needs, set appropriate learning goals, plan and manage their learning, select and use relevant learning resources, monitor their progress, reflect on their performance, and adjust their learning strategies. Relevant mechanisms may include individualized learning plans; learning consultations; study-skills and academic-skills development; guidance on goal-setting, learning planning, and time management; peer mentoring or

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
		peer-learning arrangements; reflective learning activities; e-portfolios; digital learning resources; and access to independent learning spaces, platforms, and other relevant resources. • Support services are coordinated among faculty, academic and administrative units, learning-support units, counseling or student-affairs units, career services, experiential or work-integrated learning providers, employers, and external partners where appropriate. • Student progression records; advising, career, and support-service use data; engagement with self-directed learning opportunities; learning engagement and achievement evidence; student feedback; graduate outcomes; and employer or alumni perspectives are used, with due regard to privacy and confidentiality, to review and improve student support mechanisms.

III. Rubric Level Definitions

Level	Description
1. Initial	Program-level practices are largely undeveloped, fragmented, or ad hoc, with no clear framework or systematic implementation in place.
2. Evolving	Basic program-level practices have been introduced, but they remain informal, inconsistently applied, or not yet fully embedded in program operations and quality assurance mechanisms.
3. Mature	Program-level practices are formalized, consistently implemented, and operationally stable, with reasonable coherence across program operations.
4. Advanced	Program-level practices are well integrated into program management and quality assurance systems, regularly reviewed, and refined based on performance data, evidence, and stakeholder feedback.
5. Exemplary	Program-level practices are strategically embedded, adaptive, evidence-informed, and demonstrably effective, and may demonstrate innovation, stakeholder partnership, leadership, or wider impact as appropriate.