



Part Six: IAPUC-IQA Academic Certification Quality Standards Manual

IAPUC Internal Quality Assurance System

Academic Quality Standards Manual

Document No.: IAPUC/IQA/AQS-2026-001

Version: 2.0

Effective Date: Pending Official Release

Formulated by: IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee

Applicable Recipients: Global private universities, private colleges and private higher vocational education institutions applying for or maintaining IAPUC-IQA accreditation

Preface

This manual is a supporting normative document of the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual*, focusing exclusively on academic quality, the core dimension of institutional accreditation. Within the framework of the eight standard domains of IAPUC-IQA, this manual integrates the essence of academic quality criteria from mainstream international accreditation systems including AACSB, IACBE, ACBSP and EQUIS, forming a systematic, rigorous and operable academic quality accreditation standard system.

This manual fundamentally addresses three core questions concerning academic quality:

How is academic quality defined for private higher education institutions? — Defined on the premise of mission-driven governance, verified by outcome-based orientation, and guaranteed by performance excellence;

How is academic quality assessed? — Established a multi-dimensional, cross-evidential assessment methodology;

How is academic quality continuously improved? — Constructed a closed-loop continuous improvement mechanism driven by the PDCA cycle.

This manual applies to all academic disciplines. Institutions shall translate these universal standards into context-specific practical practices in accordance with their institutional missions and disciplinary characteristics.

Chapter 1 General Provisions

Article 1 Positioning and Basis

As the core normative document governing academic quality evaluation within the IAPUC-IQA accreditation system, this manual is formulated based on the following foundations:

- (1) The eight-standard-domain framework specified in the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual*;
- (2) Core concepts of the AACSB 2020 Standards regarding faculty classification, Assurance of Learning (AoL), and academic impact;
- (3) The outcome-based evaluation framework and self-assessment methodology of IACBE;
- (4) The Baldrige Performance Excellence Program-based academic curriculum evaluation system of ACBSP;
- (5) The comprehensive evaluation criteria of EQUIS on academic governance, internationalization quality and ethical responsibility;
- (6) The process approach principles specified in the ISO 21001:2018 Educational Organization Management System.

Article 2 Definition of Academic Quality

IAPUC-IQA defines **academic quality** as:

The comprehensive capacity of an institution to consistently achieve and exceed established academic goals through systematic design, implementation and optimization of academic activities within its institutional mission framework, thereby meeting the diverse needs of learners, employers, society and the academic community.

This definition contains five core connotations:

- (1) **Mission Alignment:** Academic quality is measured against the institution's unique mission rather than a unified external benchmark;
- (2) **Systematic Nature:** Academic quality represents the systematic performance of the entire academic operation chain rather than isolated individual indicators;
- (3) **Dual Emphasis on Process and Outcome:** Focus is placed on both the design and implementation of academic activities and their practical outcomes;
- (4) **Continuous Improvement:** Academic quality is a dynamically evolving process; accreditation facilitates rather than terminates institutional quality advancement;
- (5) **Multi-stakeholder Responsiveness:** Academic quality must fulfill the diverse expectations of students, employers, society and academic communities.

Article 3 Principles of Academic Quality Evaluation

IAPUC-IQA academic quality evaluation adheres to the following five principles:

Principle	Core Connotation
Mission Adaptation Principle	Evaluation criteria are aligned with the institution's mission, positioning and resource endowments to avoid one-size-fits-all assessment.
Evidence-Based Principle	Evaluations are grounded in verifiable facts and data, adopting cross-verification via multiple direct and indirect assessment tools.
Peer Review Principle	Academic reviews are independently conducted by international peer experts with matching disciplinary backgrounds.
Transparency and Openness Principle	Evaluation standards, procedures and decision-making bases are fully disclosed to applicant institutions and the public.

Development Empowerment Principle	Evaluation serves not only judgment purposes but also functions as a developmental tool to help institutions identify gaps and clarify improvement directions.
--------------------------------------	--

Chapter 2 Academic Faculty Quality Standards

Section 1 Standard Overview and Conceptual Origin

Standard Overview: Institutions shall maintain a sufficiently sized, reasonably structured, qualified and academically active faculty team to support the achievement of institutional academic missions and talent cultivation objectives.

Concept Integration:

AACSB Contribution: Faculty categorized management (SA/PA/SP/IP framework), faculty sufficiency and deployment standards;

IACBE Contribution: Alignment of faculty qualifications with institutional missions and systematic faculty development planning;

ACBSP Contribution: Performance excellence criteria for faculty in teaching support, professional development and academic contributions;

EQUIS Contribution: Faculty internationalization and balanced integration of academic research and practical industry experience.

Section 2 Specific Quality Standards

Standard A-F1 Faculty Qualification Sufficiency

Standard Statement: Institutions shall ensure that all faculty members hold qualifications matching their assigned academic responsibilities.

Evaluation Key Points:

Faculty members' academic degrees, professional expertise and practical experience shall be consistent with the requirements of their instructed courses and academic activities;

Faculty undertaking core teaching tasks for degree programs shall generally hold academic degrees higher than the program level they teach; professional faculty shall possess verifiable industry experience and professional credentials;

Institutions shall establish and implement open and transparent faculty recruitment and assessment standards.

Evidence Requirements:

Faculty roster (including degree, professional title, expertise and employment type);

Official faculty recruitment and assessment policy documents;

Analysis forms verifying the matching degree between faculty qualifications and course arrangements.

Standard A-F2 Faculty Classification and Management

Standard Statement: Institutions shall establish a clear faculty classification system and implement differentiated categorized management.

Classification Framework (Referencing AACSB Standards):

Faculty Category	Definition	Minimum Qualification Requirements	Primary Responsibilities
Scholarly Academics (SA)	Tenure-track faculty focusing on academic research and postgraduate teaching	Doctoral degree or terminal professional degree	Academic research, postgraduate supervision, core curriculum teaching
Practice Academics (PA)	Faculty focusing on curriculum teaching and student academic advising	Master's degree or above	Course teaching, student guidance, curriculum development
Scholarly Practitioners (SP)	Faculty with outstanding industry experience specializing in practical teaching	Bachelor's degree plus verified substantial industry credentials	Practical teaching, industry connection maintenance, internship supervision
Instructional Practitioners (IP)	Temporary or part-time professional instructors participating in teaching activities	Determined by specific teaching tasks	Specialized course instruction, thematic lectures, short-term academic guidance

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall clearly define the definition, proportion and role positioning of each faculty category;

Faculty classification shall align with institutional missions and disciplinary characteristics;

Core academic courses shall be primarily undertaken by SA and PA faculty members;

The employment of part-time faculty shall not compromise the continuity and stability of academic quality and student learning experience.

Evidence Requirements:

Official faculty classification policy documents;

Statistical reports on the proportion and course undertaking ratio of each faculty category;

Part-time faculty management regulations.

Standard A-F3 Faculty Development and Evaluation

Standard Statement: Institutions shall establish a systematic mechanism for faculty development and performance evaluation.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall formulate formal faculty development plans covering academic competency improvement, teaching skill training and industry practice renewal;

Institutions shall implement regular faculty performance evaluation systems with assessment dimensions tailored to different faculty categories;

Evaluation results shall be effectively linked to faculty career development, resource allocation and employment decision-making;

Institutions shall provide systematic teaching guidance and adaptive support for newly recruited faculty members.

Evidence Requirements:

Faculty development planning documents;

Faculty performance evaluation policies and implementation records;

Faculty training activity records and effectiveness evaluation reports;

New faculty orientation and mentoring system documents.

Standard A-F4 Academic Community and Academic Freedom

Standard Statement: Institutions shall foster an organizational culture that respects academic freedom and encourages peer academic exchange.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall formulate clear policies to safeguard academic freedom;

Institutions shall provide resource support for faculty participation in academic

conferences, professional associations and peer exchange activities;

Institutions shall establish formal academic governance structures (e.g., Academic Committee, Faculty Senate) to guarantee faculty participation and discourse power in academic affairs.

Evidence Requirements:

Official academic freedom policy statements;

Academic governance structure documents;

Records and funding data of faculty academic exchange activities;

Faculty satisfaction survey results regarding academic freedom and institutional participation.

Chapter 3 Academic Curriculum Quality Standards

Section 1 Standard Overview and Conceptual Origin

Standard Overview: Institutions shall provide a scientifically designed, cutting-edge, standardized and continuously optimized academic curriculum system.

Concept Integration:

AACSB Contribution: Systematic alignment between curriculum content and learning objectives, structured curriculum management processes;

IACBE Contribution: Logical consistency between curricula and institutional missions, measurability of curriculum outcomes;

ACBSP Contribution: Stakeholder demand-driven curriculum design and ADLI-based continuous curriculum improvement methodology;

EQUIS Contribution: International vision integration and balanced development of theoretical knowledge and practical application in curricula.

Section 2 Specific Quality Standards

Standard A-C1 Curriculum Design Logic

Standard Statement: The institutional curriculum system shall be designed with clear philosophical foundations and complete logical chains.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall explicitly elaborate the curriculum design philosophy and its alignment with institutional educational missions;

The curriculum system shall demonstrate a complete logical chain: **Institutional**

Mission → Institutional Educational Goals → Program Goals → Course Objectives → Student Learning Outcomes;

The curriculum structure shall present a progressive hierarchical logic: Foundation Courses → Core Courses → Advanced Courses → Capstone/Integrative Courses;

Curriculum content shall reflect cutting-edge disciplinary developments and updated industry practical practices.

Evidence Requirements:

Curriculum design philosophy statements;

Curriculum logic chain diagrams or official curriculum maps;

Curriculum structure specifications for each academic program;

Documents specifying curriculum content update cycles and operational mechanisms.

Standard A-C2 Learning Outcome Definition

Standard Statement: Each academic program shall clearly define measurable student learning outcomes for program completion.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall formulate explicit Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) for all degree programs;

Learning outcomes shall cover three dimensions: knowledge mastery, practical skills and comprehensive literacy;

Learning outcomes shall be specific, measurable, achievable and commensurate with program academic levels;

The formulation of learning outcomes shall involve faculty, students, employers and industry representatives.

Evidence Requirements:

Official learning outcome statements for all programs;

Documents verifying the alignment between learning outcomes and academic degree levels;

Records of stakeholder participation in learning outcome formulation;

Evidence of public disclosure channels for learning outcomes (official website, student handbook, etc.).

Standard A-C3 Teaching Implementation Effectiveness

Standard Statement: Institutions shall ensure that teaching practices effectively facilitate the achievement of predefined student learning outcomes.

Evaluation Key Points:

Teaching methodologies shall be selected based on alignment with expected

learning outcome types;

Institutions shall establish teaching supervision and peer review mechanisms to sustain teaching quality improvement;

Institutions shall systematically collect and analyze student teaching feedback to support instructional optimization;

Institutions shall effectively integrate educational technology to improve teaching efficiency and learning coverage.

Evidence Requirements:

Documents illustrating the alignment between teaching methods and learning outcomes;

Teaching supervision systems and implementation records;

Student teaching feedback collection mechanisms and analytical reports;

Educational technology application and effectiveness statements.

Standard A-C4 Curriculum Review and Continuous Improvement

Standard Statement: Institutions shall establish a systematic curriculum review and optimization mechanism.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall establish formal curriculum review bodies (e.g., Curriculum Committee);

Regular curriculum reviews shall be conducted with a review cycle not exceeding three years;

Curriculum reviews shall synthesize multiple information sources including student learning outcome data, student feedback, employer input and disciplinary development trends;

Review results shall be translated into actionable improvement plans with tracked implementation progress.

ADLI Evaluation Dimensions:

Approach: Whether the curriculum review adopts systematic methods and standardized procedures;

Deployment: Whether review methods are consistently and comprehensively applied across all academic programs;

Learning: Whether the review mechanism is continuously optimized through institutional reflection and learning;

Integration: Whether the curriculum review mechanism is organically integrated with other institutional quality assurance activities.

Chapter 4 Academic Learning Outcome Assessment Quality Standards

Section 1 Standard Overview and Conceptual Origin

Standard Overview: Institutions shall establish a systematic learning outcome assessment system to verify the achievement of educational objectives through credible evidence and drive continuous quality improvement based on assessment results.

Concept Integration:

AACSB Contribution: Systematic Assurance of Learning (AoL) framework, core closed-loop improvement philosophy, and integrated application of direct and indirect assessment tools;

IACBE Contribution: Mandatory establishment of outcome assessment systems and public disclosure of assessment results to stakeholders;

ACBSP Contribution: Treating learning outcomes as core indicators of teaching effectiveness and correlating assessment results with stakeholder satisfaction evaluation.

Section 2 Specific Quality Standards

Standard A-A1 AoL System Design

Standard Statement: Institutions shall establish formal Assurance of Learning (AoL) systems for all degree programs.

Core AoL System Elements:

Element	Specification
Learning Goals	3-6 measurable learning goals corresponding to official PLOs for each program
Assessment Instruments	At least one direct assessment tool configured for each learning goal
Data Collection Plan	Clear specification of collection timeline, sampling strategy, responsible personnel and evaluation criteria
Evaluation Rubrics/Standards	Explicit judgment criteria for achieving or failing to achieve learning goals

Closing the Loop Mechanism	Complete loop: Assessment Results → Analysis & Diagnosis → Improvement Actions → Reassessment & Verification
----------------------------	--

Evaluation Key Points:

Formal AoL systems shall be fully established for all institutional degree programs;

AoL systems shall be supported by clear organizational structures and role division frameworks;

AoL mechanisms shall cover all core program learning goals;

Learning assessment responsibilities shall be collectively undertaken by faculty teams rather than solely by quality assurance departments.

Evidence Requirements:

Overall AoL system design documents;

Individual AoL implementation plans for each academic program;

AoL organizational structure and responsibility specification documents.

Standard A-A2 Assessment Tools and Methodologies

Standard Statement: Institutions shall adopt diversified assessment tools and scientific methodologies to ensure the validity and reliability of learning outcome evaluations.

Assessment Tool Classification Matrix:

Assessment Dimension	Direct Assessment Tools	Indirect Assessment Tools
Knowledge Mastery	Standardized tests, embedded course examinations, professional qualification certification pass rates	Student self-evaluation reports
Skill Application	Portfolio evaluation, internship performance assessment, case/simulation analysis scoring	Employer satisfaction surveys, graduate tracking surveys
Comprehensive Literacy	Graduation thesis/project review, capstone course comprehensive evaluation	Alumni development tracking, graduation and further education rate statistics

Evaluation Key Points:

Each learning goal shall be assessed by at least one formal direct assessment tool;

Institutions shall verify the reliability and validity of all adopted assessment instruments;

Assessment criteria shall be equipped with clear operational definitions and standardized scoring rubrics;

Scientific sampling strategies shall be implemented to ensure representative and credible program-level assessment results.

Evidence Requirements:

Assessment tool inventory and corresponding matrix matching learning goals;

Official scoring rubric samples;

Assessment tool reliability and validity verification records (if applicable);

Formal sampling strategy specifications.

Standard A-A3 Data Collection and Analysis

Standard Statement: Institutions shall systematically collect, store and analyze learning outcome assessment data.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall formulate formal data collection plans and maintain complete implementation records;

Assessment data shall be systematically archived with full traceability and auditability;

Institutions shall conduct regular data analysis to identify institutional strengths and improvement areas;

Analytical results shall be presented in visualized forms to facilitate understanding and application by faculty and institutional administrators.

Evidence Requirements:

Data collection plans and implementation records;

Data storage and management system specifications;

Sample data analysis reports;

Visualized data presentation examples.

Standard A-A4 Closed-Loop Improvement

Standard Statement: Institutions shall verify that assessment results are systematically applied to curriculum, teaching and institutional management optimization.

Closed-Loop Verification Logical Chain:

1. **Problem Identification:** Which learning goals fail to meet expected standards as reflected by assessment data?
2. **Root Cause Diagnosis:** Fundamental causes of unmet learning outcomes (curriculum content, teaching methodology, assessment design, student preparedness, etc.)
3. **Intervention Formulation:** Targeted improvement actions formulated based on root cause analysis
4. **Intervention Implementation:** Practical deployment of improvement measures in curriculum design and teaching practice
5. **Effect Verification:** Reassessment data confirming the positive effectiveness of intervention measures
6. **Institutionalization:** Standardization and normalization of proven effective improvement measures

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall provide complete cases demonstrating full closed-loop improvement processes;

Closed-loop improvement mechanisms shall cover all institutional degree programs;

Institutions shall verify practical implementation of improvement actions rather than mere report compilation;

Improvement effectiveness shall be validated through subsequent rounds of assessment data.

Evidence Requirements:

Complete closed-loop improvement case records with full verification chains;

Trend analysis of multi-round historical assessment data;

Implementation records of improvement measures;

Quantitative data verifying improvement effectiveness.

Chapter 5 Academic Research Quality Standards

Section 1 Standard Overview and Conceptual Origin

Standard Overview: Within the scope of institutional missions and resource endowments, institutions shall conduct matched academic research activities and produce verifiable academic contributions.

Concept Integration:

AACSB Contribution: Academic impact definition and evaluation framework, correlation verification between faculty academic qualifications and research outputs;

EQUIS Contribution: Internationalization evaluation of academic achievements and industry-research linkage assessment;

IAPUC Innovative Interpretation: Private institutional research contributions are diversified, including academic papers, applied research, pedagogical research and policy influence outcomes, with no single standardized evaluation criterion.

Section 2 Specific Quality Standards

Standard A-R1 Research Positioning and Strategy

Standard Statement: Institutional research activities shall align with institutional missions, disciplinary structures and resource conditions.

Classification Evaluation Framework:

Institutional Type	Research Positioning Characteristics	Core Academic Contribution Focus
Research-Intensive Institutions	Knowledge creation-oriented mission with doctoral programs offered	Peer-reviewed journal articles, academic monographs, funded research projects, conference presentations
Teaching-Research Oriented Institutions	Teaching-dominant and research-supplementary with master's programs offered	Pedagogical research, case development, applied research, regional research projects
Teaching-Focused Institutions	Teaching-centered mission focusing on undergraduate education	Teaching innovation achievements, curriculum development research, professional practical research, teaching resource development

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall clarify their institutional research positioning and strategic orientation;

Research expectations shall match faculty classification and institutional resource investment;

Institutions shall provide sufficient resource support (time, funding, facilities, etc.) for faculty research activities.

Evidence Requirements:

Official institutional research strategy documents;
Research resource allocation specifications;
Official faculty research expectation statements.

Standard A-R2 Academic Contribution and Impact

Standard Statement: Institutional academic activities shall produce verifiable academic contributions and social impact.

Diversified Forms of Academic Contribution (Extended Application of AACSB Impact Framework):

Contribution Type	Typical Output Forms	Impact Verification Methods
Academic Knowledge Contribution	Peer-reviewed journal articles, academic monographs, conference proceedings	Citation metrics, peer evaluations, academic awards and honors
Pedagogical Knowledge Contribution	Teaching cases, textbooks, pedagogical research outcomes	Teaching achievement awards, textbook adoption coverage, pedagogical promotion scope
Practical Knowledge Contribution	Policy consultation reports, industry standard formulation, professional guideline development	Policy adoption certificates, industry application verification, professional institutional recognition
Social Knowledge Contribution	Public knowledge dissemination, community service research, public welfare consultation	Media coverage records, social impact assessment, beneficiary feedback data

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall define customized evaluation dimensions and standards for institutional academic contributions;

Institutions shall collect and present five-year cumulative evidence of faculty academic contributions;

Academic contribution evaluations shall be differentiated according to faculty employment types and institutional research expectations;

Evaluation shall prioritize the quality and impact of academic outputs rather than mere quantitative indicators.

Evidence Requirements:

Five-year faculty academic contribution summary reports;

Detailed introduction and impact verification materials for representative academic achievements;

Matching analysis between academic contributions and faculty classification positioning.

Standard A-R3 Research Ethics and Academic Integrity

Standard Statement: Institutions shall establish comprehensive mechanisms to safeguard research ethics and academic integrity.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall establish formal research ethics review mechanisms (e.g., Research Ethics Committee);

Institutions shall formulate and effectively implement academic integrity policies;

Institutions shall provide systematic research ethics and academic norm training for faculty and students;

Institutions shall establish standardized reporting and investigation procedures for academic misconduct.

Evidence Requirements:

Research Ethics Committee establishment documents and operational records;

Official academic integrity policy documents;

Academic ethics training records for faculty and students;

Academic misconduct case handling records (if applicable).

Chapter 6 Academic Quality Continuous Improvement Standards

Section 1 Standard Overview and Conceptual Origin

Standard Overview: Institutions shall establish systematic academic quality continuous improvement mechanisms to transform quality assurance from passive compliance to active pursuit of excellence.

Concept Integration:

IACBE Contribution: PDCA cycle as the core methodology for continuous quality improvement;

ACBSP Contribution: Performance excellence framework-driven quality upgrading and stakeholder-oriented improvement direction identification;

AACSB Contribution: Periodic institutional review as an opportunity for strategic reflection and systematic optimization;

ISO 21001 Contribution: Systematic operation of process methodology, risk-based thinking and continuous improvement mechanisms.

Section 2 Specific Quality Standards

Standard A-Q1 Internal Quality Assurance Organization

Standard Statement: Institutions shall establish a normalized organizational structure for academic quality assurance.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall establish dedicated academic quality assurance bodies (e.g., Academic Quality Committee) reporting directly to senior institutional leadership;

Quality assurance bodies shall be equipped with clear responsibilities, authority and guaranteed resource allocation;

Quality assurance institutions shall form collaborative operational synergy with academic governance bodies including Academic Committees and Curriculum Committees;

Institutions shall establish a campus-wide quality assurance liaison network covering all academic units to ensure full penetration and coordination of quality management activities.

Evidence Requirements:

Academic quality assurance organizational charts and responsibility specification documents;

Operational records of quality assurance bodies (meeting minutes, decision records, etc.);

Quality assurance resource allocation verification documents.

Standard A-Q2 Data-Driven Decision Making

Standard Statement: Institutions shall support academic quality improvement decisions through systematic data collection, analysis and reporting mechanisms.

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall establish a complete system of Academic Quality Key Performance Indicators (KPIs);

Institutions shall deploy integrated data collection and management systems to ensure data accuracy and completeness;

Institutions shall compile regular academic quality analysis reports for feedback to decision-making bodies and academic units;

Major institutional quality improvement decisions shall be primarily evidence-based on quality monitoring data.

Evidence Requirements:

Official definition documents of academic quality KPIs;

Data management system specification documents;

Three-year institutional academic quality analysis reports;

Practical cases of data-driven quality improvement decisions.

Standard A-Q3 Stakeholder Engagement

Standard Statement: Institutions shall effectively integrate multi-stakeholder participation into academic quality assurance practices.

Stakeholder Engagement Matrix:

Stakeholder Group	Engagement Methods	Engagement Frequency	Feedback Application
Current Students	Course evaluation, student satisfaction surveys, student committee representation	Semiannual/Annual	Teaching optimization and student service improvement
Faculty	Academic committee participation, self-assessment working groups, faculty satisfaction surveys	Continuous/Annual	Standard formulation and institutional improvement decision-making
Alumni	Alumni tracking surveys, alumni advisory committee participation	Annual/Biennial	Program objective revision and curriculum system updating
Employers/Industry	Employer	Annual	Talent cultivation

y Partners	satisfaction surveys, industry advisory committees, internship feedback collection		objective adjustment and practical teaching optimization
Community	Community impact assessment, public academic forums	Biennial	Institutional social responsibility strategy adjustment

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall identify and cover all core stakeholder groups;

Institutions shall design targeted participation channels and mechanisms for different stakeholders;

Stakeholder feedback shall be systematically organized, analyzed and applied to institutional improvement decisions;

Institutions shall provide systematic feedback to stakeholders on how their opinions are adopted and responded to.

Evidence Requirements:

Complete stakeholder identification and coverage list;

Various survey tools and analytical result reports;

Practical improvement cases driven by stakeholder engagement;

Official stakeholder feedback response records.

Standard A-Q4 PDCA Cycle Operation

Standard Statement: Institutions shall verify that quality improvement practices follow standardized PDCA cycle logic.

PDCA Operational Verification Standards:

Stage	Core Requirements	Verification Key Points
Plan (P)	Identify improvement opportunities based on quality data analysis; formulate specific, measurable improvement goals and action plans	Whether improvement plans are data-driven, specific and quantifiable

Do (D)	Implement improvement plans with clear responsible personnel and time schedules	Whether practical improvement actions are completed with verifiable implementation records
Check (C)	Track and evaluate the effectiveness of improvement measures through follow-up data collection	Whether improvement effectiveness is scientifically verified via standardized evaluation methods
Act (A)	Institutionalize proven effective improvement measures; adjust or revise ineffective strategies	Whether successful experiences are standardized; whether failed practices are analyzed for iterative improvement

Evaluation Key Points:

Institutions shall provide 2-3 complete and verified PDCA cycle cases;

PDCA cycles shall cover multiple academic quality dimensions including teaching, assessment and research;

All cases shall demonstrate practical quality enhancement rather than mere plan formulation;

Institutions shall exhibit a campus-wide organizational culture and institutional inertia of continuous quality improvement.

Evidence Requirements:

Complete PDCA cycle case records;

Quantitative data verifying improvement effectiveness;

Institutionalization documents of optimized operational mechanisms;

Staff perception survey results on institutional continuous improvement culture.

Chapter 7 Discipline-Specific Quality Standards

Section 1 Universal Standards and Disciplinary Adaptation

As a comprehensive accreditation system covering all disciplinary fields, the core standard framework of IAPUC-IQA (Chapters 2 to 6) applies to all academic disciplines. On this basis, institutions shall provide supplementary explanations and

supporting evidence in accordance with the characteristics of specific disciplines in the dimensions specified below:

Disciplinary Field	Key Supplementary Dimensions for Focus	Supplementary Evidence Requirements
Business and Management	Industry practice docking, business ethics education, internship quality assurance, employer relationship management	Quality review standards for internship organizations, systematic collection and analysis of employer feedback
Engineering and Technology	Laboratory safety and management, engineering ethics, industry accreditation docking, graduation project quality control	Laboratory safety regulations and records, industry accreditation docking certification documents
Humanities and Social Sciences	Research methodology training, critical thinking cultivation, fieldwork ethics, cross-cultural literacy	Research methodology curriculum design, thesis quality assurance mechanism
Natural Sciences	Laboratory facilities and safety, research ethics review, experimental teaching management, research training system	Laboratory management regulations, research ethics review records
Art and Design	Creative spaces and facilities, portfolio evaluation criteria, exhibition and performance quality assurance, industry mentor participation	Studio facility specifications, portfolio evaluation Rubrics
Medicine and Health Sciences	Clinical internship quality assurance, patient safety ethics, professional accreditation docking, faculty clinical qualifications	Clinical internship base agreements and quality review standards, professional accreditation status
Education and Teacher Training	Teaching practice quality assurance, teacher certification docking, educational internship	Internship school quality standards, teaching internship evaluation tools

	management, teacher ethics cultivation	
--	---	--

Section 2 Special Standards for Interdisciplinary Programs

For interdisciplinary or emerging field degree programs, institutions shall provide supplementary evidence to verify the following requirements:

1. The establishment of interdisciplinary programs is supported by sufficient demand demonstration and feasibility analysis;
2. The curricula of interdisciplinary programs are jointly designed by faculty from relevant disciplines, reflecting disciplinary integration logic rather than a simple combination of separate disciplines;
3. The evaluation criteria for interdisciplinary programs integrate perspectives from all relevant disciplines;
4. The assessment methods and standards for student learning outcomes embody the characteristics of interdisciplinary integration.

Appendices

Appendix A: Academic Quality Standards Self-Assessment Checklist

Institutions may conduct preliminary self-assessment of academic quality standards using the following checklist:

Standard Domain	Core Assessment Questions	Yes/Partially/No	Evidence Index
Faculty Qualification	Has the institution established a formal faculty classification and management system?		
Faculty Development	Does the institution conduct regular faculty performance evaluations and apply the results to development decision-making?		
Curriculum Design	Does the curriculum system present a clear logical chain and curriculum map?		

Curriculum Review	Has the institution established a formal curriculum review body and conducted regular reviews?		
AoL System	Has the institution established a formal Assurance of Learning (AoL) system for each degree program?		
Assessment Tools	Is each learning objective equipped with valid assessment tools?		
Closed-Loop Improvement	Can the institution demonstrate at least one complete closed-loop improvement case?		
Research Positioning	Has the institution clarified its research positioning and put forward matching expectations for faculty?		
Research Contribution	Can the institution provide evidence of faculty academic contributions in the past five years?		
Research Ethics	Has the institution established a formal research ethics review mechanism?		
IQA Organization	Has the institution established a formal academic quality assurance body with clear responsibilities?		
Data-Driven Mechanism	Has the institution established an academic quality KPI system and data analysis reporting mechanism?		
Stakeholder Engagement	Does the institution systematically collect and utilize feedback from diverse stakeholders?		
PDCA Cycle	Can the institution demonstrate multi-dimensional and substantive continuous improvement cycles?		

Appendix B: Glossary of Key Terms (Academic Quality Special Edition)

Term	Full Name/Source	Definition
AoL	Assurance of Learning (Core Framework of AACSB)	A closed-loop mechanism for systematically defining, assessing and improving student learning outcomes
PLO	Program Learning Outcomes	The knowledge, skills and literacy levels that students are expected to achieve upon completion of a specific degree program
SA	Academically Qualified (Scholarly Academics) (AACSB Faculty Classification)	Faculty whose core responsibilities focus on academic research and postgraduate teaching
PA	Practice Academics (AACSB Faculty Classification)	Teaching-oriented faculty with core responsibilities in curriculum teaching and student academic advising
SP	Scholarly Practitioners (AACSB Faculty Classification)	Practice-oriented faculty featured by rich industry experience and practical teaching capabilities
IP	Instructional Practitioners (AACSB Faculty Classification)	Part-time or visiting professional instructors participating in institutional teaching activities on a temporary basis
ADLI	Approach-Deployment-Learning-Integration (ACBSP/Baldrige)	An analytical framework for evaluating the maturity of institutional quality management systems
PDCA	Plan-Do-Check-Act (Core Methodology of IACBE)	A universal methodological cycle for sustained organizational continuous improvement
Closing the Loop	—	An institutionalized complete process in which assessment results are systematically applied to quality improvement and the improvement effectiveness is fully verified (Core

		Concept of AACSB)
Rubrics	—	Structured assessment tools that clearly define different performance levels and their corresponding evaluation criteria

Appendix C: Explanation of the Relationship with the IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual

This manual is a supporting and refined document of the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual*. The specific relationship between the two documents is specified as follows:

Dimension	IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual	This Manual (Academic Quality Standards)
Positioning	Overall framework document	Specialized refined document focusing on academic quality dimensions
Coverage Scope	Eight standard domains (including governance, resources, social responsibility, etc.)	Focuses on core academic dimensions (faculty, curriculum, assessment, research, continuous improvement)
Core Function	Defines "what needs to be assessed in accreditation"	Defines "how academic quality is specifically assessed"
Applicable Users	All institutions applying for IAPUC-IQA accreditation	Institutional academic affairs administrators, quality assurance staff and accreditation reviewers
Legal Effect	Fundamental basis for accreditation	Operational guideline for academic quality evaluation, to be used in conjunction with the official accreditation manual

Correspondence between the standard clauses of this manual and the eight standard domains of the IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual:

Standards in This Manual	Corresponding Accreditation Manual Standard Domains
--------------------------	---

Chapter 2 Academic Faculty Quality Standards	Standard 3: Faculty Team
Chapter 3 Academic Curriculum Quality Standards	Standard 2: Curriculum and Teaching
Chapter 4 Academic Learning Outcome Assessment Quality Standards	Standard 4: Student Learning Outcome Assessment
Chapter 5 Academic Research Quality Standards	Standard 5: Research and Innovation
Chapter 6 Academic Quality Continuous Improvement Standards	Standard 8: Continuous Improvement Mechanism

Document Approval

Role	Name/Position	Date
Compiled by	Academic Standards Working Group, IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee	May 2025
Reviewed by	IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee	Pending
Approved by	IAPUC Council	Pending

Copyright Statement

The intellectual property rights of this document and the IAPUC-IQA academic accreditation quality standard system contained herein belong to the International Association of Private Universities and Colleges (IAPUC). Without written authorization from IAPUC, no institution or individual may copy, revise or use this document for commercial purposes. Institutions applying for accreditation may freely use this document for internal self-assessment and quality improvement purposes.

Compilation Explanation

This manual thoroughly integrates the faculty classification and AoL (Assurance of Learning) framework of AACSB (2020 Edition), the mission-driven and outcome-based methodology of IACBE, the Baldrige Criteria for Performance Excellence-

based academic evaluation system of ACBSP, and the comprehensive evaluation criteria for academic governance and academic impact of EQUIS. Adhering to the three core pillars of IAPUC-IQA (Mission-Driven, Outcome-Based, Performance Excellence), this manual systematically refines the core academic dimensions within the eight major standard domains. It aims to provide private higher education institutions with a fully operable academic quality evaluation standard system that complies with international best practices.