



TWAEA Program-level International Accreditation

T-PIA Accreditation Standards for EMI Programs 1.0

I. Background Information

(A) Rationale for the Development of T-PIA Accreditation Standards for EMI Programs

The expansion of English-medium instruction (EMI) has created new opportunities for higher education programs to strengthen international engagement, broaden access to global disciplinary knowledge, and prepare students for academic and professional participation in increasingly interconnected contexts. At the same time, the use of English as the medium of instruction introduces distinctive quality considerations that are not fully addressed by general program accreditation standards alone.

The use of English does not, by itself, demonstrate program quality or internationalization. An EMI program should clearly explain the educational purpose of English-medium provision and demonstrate that its mission, governance, curriculum, teaching, assessment, faculty capacity, learning resources, student support, and quality assurance arrangements enable students to achieve the intended disciplinary and degree-level learning outcomes through English. Particular attention is therefore required to ensure that academic rigor is maintained, linguistic demands are appropriately addressed, and students with diverse linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds have equitable opportunities to participate and succeed.

The T-PIA Accreditation Standards for EMI Programs were developed on the basis of the four-standard framework and core quality principles established in the T-PIA Accreditation Standards 2.0. They retain the general emphasis on outcome-based education, program coherence, student-centered learning, valid assessment, qualified faculty, adequate resources, student support, evidence-informed quality assurance, and sustainable development, while incorporating additional expectations directly related to English-medium education. These include the rationale and governance of English-medium provision, language-responsive pedagogy, disciplinary and academic communication, faculty readiness, assessment fairness, academic and language support, multilingual and intercultural learning, and the systematic monitoring of learning experiences and achievement gaps.

These standards are not intended to prescribe a single model of EMI or to treat general English proficiency as a substitute for disciplinary achievement. Rather, they provide a context-sensitive and developmental framework through which applicant programs can examine the educational effectiveness of their English-medium provision and demonstrate continuous improvement. In applying the standards, consideration should be given to the program's degree level, disciplinary characteristics, professional requirements, student composition, institutional context, national qualification framework, and intended learning outcomes.

(B) Focus and Highlights in Version 1.0

- **A clear educational rationale for English-medium provision**

Version 1.0 requires the program to explain why English has been adopted as the principal or exclusive medium of instruction and how this choice contributes to the program's mission, graduate profile, intended learning outcomes, internationalization objectives, and target student population. English-medium provision should serve clearly identified educational purposes rather than function primarily as a recruitment, marketing, or visibility strategy.

- **Coherent integration of EMI across the program**

English-medium provision is examined as an integral part of the overall program rather than as the simple translation or English-language delivery of an existing curriculum. The standards consider alignment among the program mission, admission policies, curriculum structure, PLOs and CLOs, teaching approaches, assessment, faculty capacity, learning resources, student support, and quality assurance arrangements.

- **Maintenance of disciplinary and degree-level rigor**

The standards emphasize that EMI programs should maintain disciplinary and degree-level rigor comparable to that expected of programs in similar fields and at the same qualification level, regardless of the language of instruction. Linguistic support, scaffolding, inclusive practices, and reasonable adjustments should enhance access to learning without reducing disciplinary expectations or academic standards.

- **Language-responsive, inclusive, and intercultural teaching and learning**

Version 1.0 gives particular attention to teaching disciplinary content through English. Relevant practices may include conceptual and linguistic scaffolding, explicit support for disciplinary terminology, guided academic reading and writing, structured interaction, multimodal materials, comprehension checks, and meaningful opportunities to use English for disciplinary thinking, communication, inquiry, research, and professional practice. The standards also recognize students' varied linguistic, cultural, educational, and accessibility needs.

- **Fair and transparent assessment of learning through English**

Assessment should be aligned with CLOs and PLOs and should appropriately distinguish disciplinary achievement from English-language accuracy or fluency where language competence is not itself an intended learning outcome. Assessment expectations, criteria, weighting, moderation arrangements, academic integrity requirements, and policies governing translation, language-support, and AI-assisted tools should be clearly communicated and consistently implemented.

- **Faculty readiness and sustained capacity for EMI delivery**

The standards examine not only faculty qualifications and disciplinary expertise but also their ability to explain complex concepts, facilitate interaction, support linguistically diverse learners, design appropriate learning activities, assess fairly, and provide constructive feedback through English. Faculty readiness should be evaluated through multiple forms of evidence rather than general English proficiency test scores alone and supported through structured professional development.

- **Integrated academic, language, and student support**

Academic and language support should be responsive to the demands of the curriculum, teaching, assignments, and assessment rather than provided solely as optional and separate language instruction. Relevant support may include orientation, diagnostic assessment, disciplinary vocabulary, academic communication, tutoring, advising, early-alert mechanisms,

intercultural adjustment, counseling, career guidance, employability development, and self-directed learning support.

(C) Comparison with non-EMI Programs

Aspect	Non-EMI Programs	EMI Programs	Additional EMI Emphasis
Overall structure	Four standards covering mission and governance, curriculum and assessment, teaching and achievement, and faculty, resources, and student support	The same four-standard structure and developmental quality framework	The general requirements are interpreted in relation to teaching and learning disciplinary content through English
Program mission and goals	Alignment with the institutional mission, disciplinary development, and societal needs	The same alignment, together with a clearly defined rationale for English-medium provision	The educational value of English should be connected to the graduate profile, intended outcomes, internationalization objectives, and target student population
Governance and transparency	Clear governance, stakeholder engagement, and disclosure of basic program information	Additional governance and disclosure requirements concerning English-medium implementation	Clear responsibilities for language expectations, faculty readiness, assessment, academic support, course delivery through English, and the permitted use of other languages
Program coherence	Coherence among mission, curriculum, learning outcomes, teaching, assessment, faculty, and support systems	Coherence must also demonstrate that EMI is meaningfully integrated into overall program design	EMI should not consist merely of translating or delivering an existing curriculum in English
Curriculum structure and alignment	Coherent curriculum structure, PLO–CLO alignment, progression, and degree-level appropriateness	Additional consideration of the linguistic and academic demands of learning disciplinary content through English	Defined distribution and sequencing of English-medium courses, progressive academic communication development, and appropriate curricular bridging
Key competencies and global perspectives	Integration of transferable competencies, sustainability, digital literacy, interdisciplinary learning, and global perspectives	Stronger attention to academic communication, disciplinary literacy, intercultural interaction, and engagement with international knowledge through English	English-medium provision should contribute substantive educational value rather than represent only a change in instructional language

Aspect	Non-EMI Programs	EMI Programs	Additional EMI Emphasis
Teaching and learning	Student-centered, inclusive, active, and technology-enhanced teaching	Teaching should also be language-responsive and appropriate to students' linguistic and academic backgrounds	Scaffolding, disciplinary terminology support, guided reading and writing, comprehension checks, structured interaction, and academic or professional communication through English
Assessment design	Valid, reliable, transparent, fair, and outcome-aligned assessment	Assessment must address the linguistic demands of tasks and distinguish disciplinary achievement from language-related performance where appropriate	Students should not be disproportionately penalized for linguistic limitations unrelated to the intended disciplinary outcomes
Student learning achievement	Evidence that students achieve the intended PLOs and degree-level competencies	Evidence that students achieve those outcomes through English	English-language test scores alone are insufficient unless English-language competence is explicitly included in the PLOs
Inclusive learning	Attention to diverse learner needs, accessibility, and equitable participation	Additional attention to linguistic diversity, intercultural participation, and confidence in learning through English	Strategic use of multilingual resources or languages other than English may be permitted where educationally justified and clearly defined
Faculty capacity	Appropriate qualifications, disciplinary expertise, pedagogical competence, workload, and deployment	Faculty should also possess sufficient English communication ability and competence in English-medium and language-responsive pedagogy	Faculty readiness should be demonstrated through multiple forms of evidence and supported by targeted professional development
Resources and administrative services	Adequate learning resources, facilities, digital infrastructure, and support services	Additional English-language and disciplinary resources and service capacity are required	Essential academic and administrative information and assistance should be available in English where necessary
Student support	Advising, progression, well-being, counseling, career, employability, and self-directed learning support	Support should also address the linguistic, academic, and intercultural demands of learning through English and strengthen students' capacity to manage their own learning	Academic, language, and self-directed learning support should be coordinated with the curriculum, teaching, assignments, assessment, and relevant English-language, disciplinary, multilingual, and digital learning resources

Aspect	Non-EMI Programs	EMI Programs	Additional EMI Emphasis
Internal quality assurance	Program-wide monitoring of implementation, performance, and improvement	Additional evidence concerning the effectiveness and equity of English-medium provision	Monitoring of comprehension, participation, progression, faculty readiness, linguistic or educational background differences, support use, and achievement gaps
Academic standards	Outcomes and expectations are interpreted according to degree level and disciplinary context	The same degree-level and disciplinary standards apply	Language support and inclusive practices should facilitate achievement without lowering disciplinary rigor
Use of evidence	Evidence supports curriculum review, teaching improvement, decision-making, and quality enhancement	Evidence should also demonstrate whether EMI supports effective and equitable disciplinary learning	Aggregated and appropriately disaggregated evidence should be used to identify and address EMI-related learning gaps

II. Standards, Indicators, and Descriptors

Application Note

These standards apply to degree programs in which English is used as the principal or exclusive medium of instruction. In applying the standards, the Review Team shall consider the program's degree level, disciplinary characteristics, professional requirements, student composition, institutional context, national qualification framework, and intended learning outcomes.

For the purposes of these standards, an EMI course is one in which English is the principal language used to teach and learn disciplinary content, including instruction, learning activities, and assessment. Other languages may be used where their educational purpose and boundaries are clearly defined and justified. Courses primarily intended for English-language instruction are not, by themselves, regarded as EMI courses. The program shall establish clear criteria for classifying EMI courses and ensure consistency among published information, approved curriculum documents, and actual course delivery.

The program shall clearly disclose the proportion and distribution of courses or credits delivered through English, including core courses, electives, practica, internships, research, and other learning components where applicable. Its designation of English as the principal medium of instruction shall comply with relevant national and institutional requirements.

In these standards, **academic and disciplinary communication** refers to the language practices through which students access, construct, communicate, and apply disciplinary knowledge. **Language-responsive pedagogy** refers to teaching approaches that address the linguistic demands of disciplinary learning without lowering disciplinary or degree-level expectations. **Faculty readiness for EMI teaching** refers to the combined disciplinary expertise, pedagogical competence, and English communication ability required for effective teaching through English and shall be demonstrated through multiple forms of evidence.

The use of English as the medium of instruction shall not, in itself, be regarded as evidence of program quality. The program shall demonstrate that its governance, curriculum, teaching, assessment, faculty capacity, learning resources, student support, and quality assurance arrangements enable students to

achieve the intended disciplinary and degree-level learning outcomes through English. Unless English-language competence is explicitly included in the program learning outcomes, English proficiency shall not substitute for disciplinary learning achievement.

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 program-wide internal quality assurance (IQA) mechanisms, and implements strategic development, long-term resource planning, and sustainability strategies. Particular attention is given to whether English-medium provision has a clear educational rationale, is coherently integrated into the program, and is supported by appropriate governance, evidence-informed enhancement, and sustainable institutional capacity.

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, societal needs, and the intended educational value of English-medium provision.	• 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 rationale for English-medium provision is clearly defined and aligned with the program's positioning, graduate profile, intended learning outcomes, internationalization objectives, and target student population. English is adopted as the medium of instruction for clearly identified educational purposes rather than primarily for recruitment, marketing, or institutional visibility. • 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 accountable program management	• 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, language expectations, teaching quality, assessment, academic support, and program review are clearly defined. • Relevant parties, including faculty, students, alumni, employers, academic language specialists, administrative units, international partners, and other relevant stakeholders are involved, where appropriate, in program development, consultation, and quality improvement. • Clear, accurate, and timely information is accessible to current and prospective students and relevant stakeholders, including the language of instruction; the extent and distribution of courses delivered through English; language-related admission, progression, and graduation expectations; the

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
		language used in teaching, assessment, practicum, internship, and other learning activities; the circumstances in which other languages may be used; and available academic, language, advising, and student support services.
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. • English-medium provision is meaningfully integrated into the overall program design and aligned with the disciplinary context, student learning needs, intended learning outcomes, and internationalization priorities. It is supported by appropriate curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and support arrangements rather than merely by translating or delivering an existing curriculum in English. • 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 internationalization, multilingual and intercultural learning, 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. • For English-medium provision, monitoring considers, where appropriate, the actual language used in instruction, learning activities, and assessment, and its consistency with published information and approved EMI course classifications; the implementation and educationally justified use of languages other than English; student comprehension, participation, and engagement; progression, retention, withdrawal, failure, and completion; PLO and CLO achievement; learning gaps and performance differences among students with varied linguistic or educational backgrounds; faculty readiness and teaching effectiveness; student and faculty feedback; the suitability of learning

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
		materials and assessment demands; and the use and effectiveness of academic and language support. • 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.
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; academic and language support capacity; English-language learning resources and digital infrastructure; administrative and technical support; financial viability; international or 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. Particular attention is given to whether the curriculum enables students to achieve disciplinary and degree-level outcomes through English while maintaining academic rigor, fairness, and educational coherence.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
2-1. Curriculum Structure and Alignment	The curriculum is coherently structured and demonstrates that PLOs and CLOs are	• 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

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
	clearly defined, assessable, appropriate to the degree level and disciplinary context, and aligned with course content, learning activities, assessment, and learning progression.	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, learning progression, and the linguistic demands of learning through English. • The role, proportion, distribution, and sequencing of courses delivered through English are clearly defined, and related content, materials, learning activities, and assessment arrangements support effective disciplinary learning through English. The curriculum supports progressive development in disciplinary terminology, academic reading and writing, oral interaction, classroom participation, and professional or research communication where relevant. • Language-related admission and entry expectations are reasonably aligned with the academic and linguistic demands of the curriculum. Where students enter with varied levels of English proficiency or 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.
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 and English-medium context.	• The curriculum integrates disciplinary knowledge with relevant key competencies, including critical thinking, communication, problem-solving, ethical reasoning, academic and disciplinary communication, intercultural understanding, collaboration, global engagement, interdisciplinary learning, sustainability, digital literacy, and AI awareness where appropriate. • English-medium provision is used purposefully to support engagement with international disciplinary knowledge, academic communication, intercultural interaction, and global or professional contexts. Where academic communication, disciplinary literacy, intercultural competence, or professional communication through English forms part of the intended learning outcomes, these competencies are explicitly defined, progressively developed, and appropriately assessed. English-medium provision therefore contributes substantive educational value rather than serving merely as a change in the language of instruction.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
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 design considers the linguistic demands of tasks and, where appropriate, distinguishes disciplinary knowledge and competence from academic communication and English-language accuracy or fluency. Language-related performance is assessed only to the extent that it is explicitly included in the CLOs or PLOs or is necessary to demonstrate the disciplinary or professional competence required by the assessment task. • Where English-language competence is not itself an intended learning outcome, students are not disproportionately penalized for linguistic limitations unrelated to the disciplinary competence being assessed. Language-related expectations, assessment criteria, and the weighting of disciplinary and communication components are clearly communicated. • Assessment mechanisms support consistency, fairness, reliability, moderation, accessibility, academic integrity, and appropriate review or appeal arrangements. Clear policies govern the use of translation tools, dictionaries, language assistance, 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, disciplinary and academic communication progression, the role and distribution of courses delivered through English, teaching and learning activities, assessment design and linguistic demands, student workload and achievement, progression and completion, graduate outcomes, the suitability of English-language materials and resources, the effectiveness of academic and language support, professional or industry needs, disciplinary developments, and international benchmarking where appropriate.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
		Curriculum-related input is gathered from faculty, students, alumni, employers, academic language specialists, 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 improve curriculum coherence, relevance, progression, assessment, support arrangements, and the educational effectiveness of English-medium provision.

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. Particular attention is given to teaching disciplinary content through English, supporting linguistically and culturally diverse learners, and demonstrating that students achieve the intended learning outcomes at the appropriate degree level.

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. These strategies promote student engagement, motivation, independent inquiry, and the achievement of intended learning outcomes. - In English-medium settings, strategies may include structured explanations, conceptual and linguistic scaffolding, explicit treatment of disciplinary terminology, multimodal presentation, guided reading and writing, comprehension checks, active and problem-based learning, collaborative discussion, and experiential, research-informed, or technology-supported learning. Faculty provide meaningful opportunities for students to use English for disciplinary thinking, analysis, discussion, writing, presentation, collaboration, and professional or research communication. Teaching practices maintain disciplinary rigor while supporting comprehension, interaction, confidence, and equitable participation.
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. It recognizes differences in students' English proficiency, linguistic and cultural backgrounds, prior educational experiences, learning needs and preferences, accessibility needs, and confidence in participating through English. - Teaching and learning arrangements promote equitable access and participation without lowering disciplinary or

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
		degree-level expectations. Appropriate measures may include accessible and clearly structured materials, advance provision of key terminology or readings, captions, transcripts, recordings, digital learning platforms, multimedia resources, online discussion and collaborative tools, simulations, language-support tools, AI-supported learning tools where appropriate, and multilingual resources where educationally justified. • 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. • Languages other than English may be used strategically where they support learning, inclusion, safety, or professional practice, provided that their educational purpose and boundaries are clearly defined.
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 and, where relevant, academic or professional communication. At the course and learning-process levels, the program collects and uses evidence such as student feedback and course evaluations, perceptions of the language of instruction, 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.
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 through English, including relevant academic, professional, practical, research, intercultural, or communication competencies where applicable. • 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

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
		examinations or certifications, graduate outcomes, employer or workplace feedback, and external moderation or benchmarking. • The program examines whether students from different linguistic, cultural, or educational backgrounds have equitable opportunities to achieve the intended outcomes and addresses identified achievement gaps. Achievement results are analyzed and used to improve curriculum, teaching, assessment, faculty development, and student support. • English-language test scores alone are not considered sufficient evidence of program learning achievement unless English-language competence is explicitly included in the PLOs.

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. Particular attention is given to the capacity required to teach disciplinary content through English and to support students with varied linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds in an English-medium environment. It focuses on faculty readiness, English-language and disciplinary learning resources, academic and language support, academic advising and progression, career and employability development, student well-being and counseling, and the development of students' capacity for self-directed learning through English.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
4-1. Faculty Capacity	Faculty members possess appropriate qualifications, disciplinary expertise, English-medium teaching readiness, 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. • Those assigned to courses delivered through English demonstrate sufficient English communication ability and language-responsive pedagogical competence to explain complex disciplinary concepts, facilitate meaningful interaction, support students with varied linguistic backgrounds, design appropriate learning activities, assess learning fairly, and provide constructive feedback through English. • Faculty readiness for English-medium teaching is evaluated through multiple forms of evidence, such as teaching demonstrations or observations, course materials, student learning evidence, student and peer feedback, professional experience, and relevant training, rather than general English proficiency test scores alone. • Faculty deployment ensures adequate coverage of teaching, research or professional practice, supervision, advising, assessment, student support, and other

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
		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 enhance teaching quality and program relevance.	• The program provides structured and responsive faculty development opportunities that support teaching innovation, English-medium and language-responsive pedagogy, disciplinary literacy, academic interaction, assessment, reflective practice, inclusive and intercultural teaching, academic communication, digital and AI-related competencies where 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 English-language and disciplinary learning resources, including journals, databases, research and academic writing materials, libraries, laboratories, equipment, learning spaces, digital infrastructure, learning platforms, multimedia facilities, software, simulations, and technical or instructional-design support. • Administrative and technical services have sufficient capacity to support students, faculty, and program operations in an English-medium environment. Where necessary, essential administrative assistance is available in English for admission, registration, course selection, assessment, appeals, student records, internship or practicum arrangements, and graduation requirements. • 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.

Indicator Title	Indicator Statement	Descriptors
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 in an English-medium learning environment.	• The program identifies students' academic, linguistic, and support needs before entry, throughout their studies, and during their transition to employment or further study. Support may include orientation to learning through English, diagnostic assessment, academic English and disciplinary vocabulary development, academic reading and writing, oral communication, tutoring, learning consultation, peer mentoring, academic advising, progression monitoring, early-alert mechanisms, preparation and support for experiential or work-integrated learning where applicable, career and employability support, intercultural adjustment, student well-being and counseling, and self-directed learning support. • Self-directed learning support helps students identify their disciplinary and language-related learning needs; set appropriate learning goals; plan and manage their learning; select and use relevant English-language, disciplinary, multilingual, digital, and AI-supported resources where appropriate; monitor their comprehension and progress; seek appropriate feedback and assistance; 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 peer-learning arrangements; reflective learning activities; e-portfolios; digital learning resources; and access to independent learning spaces, platforms, and other relevant resources. • Academic, language, and self-directed learning support is connected, where appropriate, to the curriculum, teaching, assignments, and assessment rather than provided solely as optional and separate provision. Services are coordinated among faculty, academic language or learning-support units, administrative offices, international offices, counseling or student-affairs units, career services, 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.