The Executive Summary Report

on Quality Assurance
for The Academic Year 2008

Foreword

This report of self-assessment is compiled for the purpose of reporting and analyzing the implementation results of Suranaree University of Technology by using the indicators and criteria laid down Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) and Suranaree University of Technology (SUT) during the academic year 2008 (May 2008 - April 2009). This report is intended for SUT and its stakeholders, especially the supervisory board and the public in order to develop quality and educational standards of the university into a higher level.

Suranaree University of Technology has established a policy on continuous educational assessment to create a quality corporate culture within SUT beginning with educational assurance since academic year 1998 with the suitable system and mechanism for educational assurance in consistence with the major SUT policy of **"centralized services and coordinated tasks"**. The educational assessment and assurance have been improved and revised continuously up until 2006. In 2007, OHEC set forth higher educational standards for internal quality assurance and SUT has used them as the main standards in its quality assessment aiming to become a university that emphasizes on producing graduates and undertaking research. SUT has modified the indicators following the OHEC indicator development using all the OHEC indicators, and included the SUT 5 indicators making it 9 components and 46 indicators. For data follow-up and implementation, SUT has compiled, in the report, all the data concerning the indicators for the second round of external quality assurance set out by Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (ONESQA, Public Organization). In the academic year 2008, SUT has improved its educational assurance indicators adding the component in the mission of technology modification, transfer, and development. This is the tenth component which consists of 4 indicators making it 10 components and 50 indicators. Besides, SUT has collected the data and facts concerning the ONESQA indicators to integrate both the internal and external quality assessment, and to save them as additional data for the next round of ONEQA assessment as well.

To implement PDCA in the academic year 2008, SUT arranged for the educational quality assessment by an external assessment committee at a departmental level in 20-31 July 2009, and at an institutional level in 13-15 August 2009. In addition, SUT organized a QA Forum in September 2009 to brainstorm, exchange ideas, and create a better understanding and awareness of educational quality assurance. From these activities, SUT has put into the results of the assessment in determining the SUT policy in order to strengthen its distinctive features, and, based on the indicators, correct those features lacking behind, and in preparing a strategic plan for the university. Moreover, individual units and departments of SUT have used in full or in part the benefit of self-assessment and quality assessment inspections of departments. In case of weak points, the

department has developed a plan to improve and correct the implementation results by assigning a certain person a clear-cut responsibility, and by putting them in plans of actions, and relevant projects/activities in order to develop the department or unit, and to propose for the budget in the next fiscal year leading to concrete implementation and optimal achievement, which in turn will improve and develop the quality of educational management into a more efficient, effective, and continuous manner.

P. Suebka.

(Professor Dr. Prasart Suebka)
Rector
Suranaree University of Technology

Contents

Page

The Report on Quality Assurance for Academic Year 2008
Executive Summary

Suranaree University of Technology has been the first autonomous, non - bureaucratic university in the form of **"a government-supervised university"** which focuses on teaching science and technology and research essential for national development under the administrative principle of **"centralized services and coordinated tasks"**. The university has implemented the educational quality assurance at the undergraduate level continuously since academic year 1998. In the academic year 2007, the university adjusted the indicators to make it consistent with the indicator development conducted by Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) classifying itself as an institution with the major emphasis on research and production of quality graduates and using all the 9 OHEC components and 41 indicators (except the indicator of graduate production and social development and the indicator of graduate production and arts and culture preservation) and included them in another 5 indicators determined by SUT totaling 46 indicators in the academic year 2008 (May 2008 - April 2009). Suranaree University of Technology has improved the university indicators of educational quality assurance by adding 4 more indicators of a task in the modification, transfer and development of technology, making it a total of 10 components and 50 indicators, which can be summed up as follows:

Overall Results of Educational Quality Assessment

1. As a whole, the implementation results of the university were ranked at a "very good" level in terms of quality, with the average of 2.85 out of 3 by the OHEC indicators, which was 95% (with 37 out of 41 indicators meeting the standards), and 2.74 out of 3, which was 91.33% (with 45 out of 54 indicators meeting the standards) by the combination of the OHEC and SUT indicators.
2. Based on 50 indicators, it was found that the assessment results of 41 indicators met the standards (full score of 3 points), or were categorized as distinctive features as explained below:

   1) **Indicator 1.1**   An identification of philosophy or vision followed by strategies and implementation plans. Indicators should be set up to observe the process of these plans.
   2) **Indicator 1.2**   The percentage of attaining indicators stated for each plan.
   3) **Indicator 2.2**   A learning process that emphasizes on learner.

4)	**Indicator 2.3**	Projects or activities to support the curriculum development and learning process that allows individual, organization and external community to participate.
5)	**Indicator 2.5**	The proportion of the number of full-time faculty holding bachelor, master and doctoral degrees or equivalent to the number of full-time faculty.
6)	**Indicator 2.7**	A mechanism to promote the ethical professional practices among faculty.
7)	**Indicator 2.8**	A mechanism to promote research for teaching and learning development among full-time faculty.
8)	**Indicator 2.9**	Percentage of bachelor graduates who can secure jobs and who can be self-employed within one year.
9)	**Indicator 2.11**	Level of satisfaction of employers business operators and graduate users.
10)	**Indicator 2.12**	The percentage of students or alumni who have graduated within 5 years who are granted award in term of academic, professional, morality, ethics, sport, health, art and culture or environment at the national or international level.
11)	**Indicator 2.13**	The percentage of full-time faculties who are really function as thesis advisors in proportion to the number of those who are qualified. (only for institutions that emphasize on producing graduates and research)
12)	**Indicator 3.1**	Services offered to students and alumni.
13)	**Indicator 3.2**	Supports for students activities that are complete and conform to preferred characteristics of graduates.
14)	**Indicator 4.1**	A development of systems and mechanisms to support the conduct of research and innovations.
15)	**Indicator 4.2**	A knowledge management system for research and innovations.
16)	**Indicator 4.3**	The amount of internal and external grants for research and innovations in proportion to the number of full-time faculty.
17)	**Indicator 4.4**	The percentage of research and innovations published or registered as intellectual property or patented or utilized at the national or international level in proportion to the number of full-time faculty.
18)	**Indicator 4.5**	The percentage of research articles cited in the refereed journals or the national or international databases in proportion to the number of full-time faculty. (only for institutions that emphasize on producing graduates and research)

19)	**Indicator 5.1**	Processes and mechanisms to provide academic services to the society mentioned in the objectives of the institution.
20)	**Indicator 5.2**	The percentage of full-time faculty who are involved in providing academic services as consultants, thesis committees outside the institution, academic or professional committees at the national or international level in proportion to the number of full-time faculty.
21)	**Indicator 5.3**	The percentage of academic and professional service activities/projects responding to the needs for development and strengthening the society, community, nation and the international community in proportion to the number of full-time faculty.
22)	**Indicator 5.4**	The percentage of satisfaction levels of those who receive services from the institution.
23)	**Indicator 6.1**	A process and mechanism for the preservation of arts and culture.
24)	**Indicator 7.1**	The institution council exhibits good governance and drive the institution to compete in international level.
25)	**Indicator 7.2**	The exhibition of leadership among administrators in all levels.
26)	**Indicator 7.3**	Institution development for transformation into a learning organization.
27)	**Indicator 7.4**	A human resources system and mechanism to develop and maintain quality and efficient human resources.
28)	**Indicator 7.5**	Effectiveness of the database system for teaching and learning and research activities.
29)	**Indicator 7.6**	The level of achievement in allowing external individual to participate in the institution's development.
30)	**Indicator 7.7**	The percentage of full-time faculty who received academic or professional awards at the national and international level.
31)	**Indicator 7.8**	An implementation of risk management program in the education management.
32)	**Indicator 7.9**	The level of achievement to convey organizational indicators and targets to the individual level.
33)	**Indicator 8.1**	A system and mechanism to allocate and analyze expenses and audit finance and budgeting efficiently.
34)	**Indicator 8.2**	Internal and external sharing of resources.
35)	**Indicator 9.1**	A system and mechanism for internal quality assurance infused as one part of the education management process.
36)	**Indicator 9.2**	A system and mechanism to share knowledge and skills relevant to quality assurance to the students.

37) **Indicator 9.3**   The level of achievement of the internal quality assurance program.

38) **Indicator 10.1*** There are systems and mechanisms for technology modification, transfer and development in line with the university goals.

39) **Indicator 10.2*** The percentage of full-time lecturers taking part in technology modification, transfer and development suitable for the full-time lecturers.

40) **Indicator 10.3*** The percentage of activities/projects in technology modification, transfer and development suitable for full-time lecturers.

41) **Indicator 10.4*** The percentage level of clients' satisfaction in technology modification, transfer and development.

In addition, it was also found that there were 6 indicators and 1 sub-indicator that need to be improved to meet the standard (assessment result =2). They are:

1) **Indicator 2.1**   A system and mechanism for curriculum development and management.

2) **Indicator 2.10**   Percentage of bachelor graduates receiving starting salaries in accord with the standardized scale.

3) **Indicator 2.14*** The percentage of disqualified students per class
   a) undergraduate level
   b) graduate level

4) **Indicator 2.15*** The percentage of undergraduate students graduating within the time schedule in each class.

5) **Indicator 2.16*** b) graduate students' GPA per year.

6) **Indicator 4.6***   The number of research articles published in recognized fields with peer review in proportion to full-time lecturers.

7) **Indicator 7.10*** Clients' satisfaction with the service under the principle of "centralized services, coordinated tasks".

Note: * refers to SUT indicators added to the OHEC indicators

There are still two more indicators and 1 sub-indicator needed to be improved to meet the standard (assessment result =1). They are:

1) **Indicator 2.4**   The proportion of the number of full-time equivalent students to the number of full-time faculty.

2) **Indicator 2.6**   The proportion of the number of the full-time faculty holding the position of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor to the number of full-time faculty.

3) **Indicator 2.16**   a) Undergraduate students' GPA in each year.

Note: * refers to SUT indicators added to the OHEC indicators

Notes: Indicator 2.4 : The proportion of the number of full-time equivalent students to the number of full-time faculty achieved only 1 score of assessment result since it has the value of 43.79 : 1, which is much higher than OHEC standard value. However, when considering the SUT identity, it was found that this indicator may not suit SUT, which has the policy of managing teaching-learning activities by using various types of technology to support classroom activities with better quality in which students can gain access to the technology all the time, e.g. e-Learning and other supportive systems through the Center for Library Resources and Educational Media, the Center for Educational Innovation and Technology and Teaching Assistant System to support students' skills and knowledge. Moreover, A majority of lecturers are Ph.D. holders with high capability in all missions; they are regularly and concretely evaluated by the students through Faculty Development Academy leading to higher teaching efficacy as can be witnessed from the past achievements such as students' high-ranking satisfaction in both undergraduate and graduate levels, employers', entrepreneurs', and graduate users' satisfaction, high percentage of graduates' employment, self-employment and high level of average starting salary.

3. Based on the quality assessment results of both the indicators that should be improved and the ones that need to be improved in order to meet the standards, when arranged in order of importance in accordance with the principles of risk management, and with the administrative management perspectives of Balanced-Scored Card, it can be classified into 3 groups as follows:

3.1 Students' and Stakeholders' Group has 3 Indicators:
1) **Indicator 2.10** Percentage of bachelor graduates receiving starting salaries in accord with the standardized scale.
2) **Indicator 2.14*** The percentage of disqualified students in each class
a) undergraduate level
b) graduate level
3) **Indicator 2.15*** The percentage of undergraduate students graduating within the time schedule in each class.
4) **Indicator 2.16** Undergraduate students' GPA in each year
a) undergraduate level
b) graduate level

Note: * refers to SUT indicators added to the OHEC indicators

Suranaree University of Technology and its departments involved with the assessment should have measures to continuously support and encourage higher achievements in students by focusing on the majority of students achieving higher GPA, decreasing the number of students' disqualification, and increasing the number of students' graduation within time schedule using the following input and process measures:

Input Measures
- There is a public relations campaign focusing on target groups of students with high capability, such as students on Scholarships for Developing and Promoting Outstanding Gifted Students in Science and Technology (Development and Promotion of Science and Technology Talents Project - DPST), Academic Olympic Camp, Promotion and Development of Mathematics and Science Genius Camp, and students from various special projects. This campaign has to be conducted all the year round by assigning the responsibility to a direct section in the form of "School Relations Division" to work closely with the faculty staff.

Process Measures
- There are more varied funds and scholarships with more "worthiness" for example, Tutor Scholarships, and Research Scholarships for high caliber students to become the "key force" for acting as "Friends Help Friends" in study and in bringing reputations to the university.

- There are guidelines for the procedures on remedy examinations for the undergraduate courses that many students fail to pass, e.g. Calculus, Physics, Engineering Static, and Engineering Materials to reduce students' repeats of those courses, and allow a continuous flow of courses for students.
- There is regular follow-up to students' study results to assist them with their study and improve their performance, and increase the roles of advising lecturers making them closer to students than before through:-

  The Division of Student Affairs. The division should set up the counseling office for students who have problem with their study or other difficulties.

  The Institution. Each institution should have a students' union for students to organize their activities and, at the same time, they have a place to meet or discuss their problems among themselves in the form of "Friends Help Friends" or "Old Siblings Help Little Darlings".

  The Faculty Development Academy. This faculty should immediately create an efficient and effective advising-lecturer system.
- There is an arrangement of a learning evaluation and assessment system that helps reduce students' tensions, e.g. more examinations in each course, and reduction of subject matters, enabling students to become more enthusiastic about learning.
- There is the use of classroom research process, especially in medium-size and large-size classrooms to investigate causes of students' failures, find out solutions, and put the research results into immediate practice.

In the long term, SUT should find out the causes of students' GPA being lower than the target each year, of students' being disqualified higher than the target at both undergraduate and graduate levels each class, and of lower rates of undergraduate students' graduation within the time schedule through the institutional research in order to compare it with those of other universities with the same characteristics, find out the causes and determine measures/solutions, and put them in the plan of action for more serious solutions to the problems with concrete results. To achieve the goal, a responsible body and time frame should be assigned.

3.2 Staff, Learning and Innovation Group Consists of 3 Indicators.

1) **Indicator 2.6**   The proportion of the number of the full-time faculty holding the position of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor to the number of full – time faculty.

2) **Indicator 4.6***   The number of research articles published in acceptable fields with peer review in proportion to full-time lecturers.

Note: * refers to SUT indicators added to the OHEC indicators

SUT should do the following:-

3.2.1 Encourage and motivate full-time lecturers who are now with no academic ranks or who want to rise in ranks to bring out academic achievements in the forms of textbooks, books, and publications in quality journals.

3.2.2 Support, stimulate, promote lecturers to get published increasingly and continually in national and international academic journals with peer review and acceptable in the field of study, for example by:-
- Providing funds/facilities/equipment for promising lecturers with high capabilities to produce quality research with high impact and citation in a refereed journal or in national and international database continually.
- Determining the workload with research missions as part of performance evaluation.

3.2.3 Inviting well-known, recognized scholars in hot-issue fields of study to work as visiting professors who will teach and conduct research to create bodies of knowledge and research and human resources databases for SUT.

3.2.4 Recruiting selectively the highly capable faculty staff (only Ph.D. holders with academic ranks) who can produce research articles cited in a refereed journal or in national and international databases in the field needed by the university and with clear individual KPIs.

3.2.5 Inspiring to become a world class university with focus on spreading university products published in English, including disseminating university information in English. To achieve this goal, SUT should have a skillful body of staff to support such implementation.

3.3 Internal Process Group has 1 Indicator.

1) **Indicator2.1**   A system and mechanism for curriculum development and management.

2) **Indicator 7.10***   Clients' satisfaction with the service under the principle of "centralized services, coordinated tasks".

Note: * refers to SUT indicators added to the OHEC indicators

SUT and the departments involved should do the following:-

3.3.1 Four graduate curricula are beyond the assessment cycle and have not been assessed or improved. The following departments should assess their curricula immediately or within the academic year 2009:-

1) School of Transportation Engineering (Master's degree)

2) School of Computer Engineering (Master's degree)

3) School of Telecommunication (Master's and Doctoral degrees)

3.3.2 SUT should bring the Thailand Qualification Framework (TQF) system to use in the curriculum improvement process and also to determine the graduates' suitable characteristics.

3.3.3 SUT and its departments should continually improve the implementation to increase the level of clients' satisfaction with the policy of "centralized services, coordinated tasks", e.g. bringing the assessment results of clients' satisfaction with the following in order for each department to plan, develop, and improve the implementation continually:-

- the system of "centralized services, coordinated tasks"

- the internal process

- finance

- innovation learning

3.3.4 SUT should organize training, seminar, workshops on trends and guidelines on the administrative management of "centralized services, coordinated tasks" for its staff and the target group.

Results of Quality Assessment by Components at Institutional Level
Executive Summary

Suranaree University of Technology has been the first autonomous, non-bureaucratic university in the form of **"a government-supervised university"** which focuses on teaching science and technology and research essential for national development under the administrative principle of **"centralized services and coordinated tasks"**. The university has implemented the educational quality assurance at the undergraduate level continuously since academic year 1998. In the academic year 2007, the university adjusted the indicators to make it consistent with the indicator development conducted by Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) classifying itself as an institution with the major emphasis on research and production of quality graduates and using all the 9 OHEC components and 41 indicators (except the indicator of graduate production and social development and the indicator of graduate production and arts and culture preservation) and included them in another 5 indicators determined by SUT totaling 46 indicators in the academic year 2008 (May 2008 - April 2009). Suranaree University of Technology has improved the university indicators of education quality assurance by adding 4 more indicators of a task in the modification, transfer and development of technology, making it a total of 10 components and 50 indicators.

Suranaree University has carried out the internal education quality assessment at the university or institutional level by appointing an Internal Quality Assessment Committee consisting of external and internal distinguished scholars with qualifications required by the OHEC criteria. The committee conducted the internal assessment within SUT at the institution level in the academic year 2008 on 13-15 August, 2008. It was found that the internal education quality assessment results, of SUT were ranked at a very good level, with the average of 2.85 out of 3. It was then able to find out the distinctive features and features with details needed to be improved as follows:

Component 1 : Philosophy, Commitments, Objectives and Implementation Plans

SUT has a firm pledge to maintain its excellence in all tasks, to develop quality of life aiming at the achievements in the collection, creation of knowledge, moral, wisdom standards in order to attain eternal development of mankind. One of the major tasks, which is very important, is the creation of innovations, modifications, transfer and development of appropriate technology for competition and self-reliance. Suranaree University of Technology has Institute of Engineering, Institute of Agricultural Technology, and Institute of Medicine as a major work group, and the Center for Cooperative Education and Career Development and Technopolis as a work group relating to communities and manufacturing sectors as well as Institute of Science with a distinction in fundamental sciences as in-depth production unit.

Therefore, there should be an arrangement of plans, missions, and indicators in line with the expertise of each unit. Furthermore, SUT should set out its clear, practical, and concrete strategies, and implementation plans, both long and short terms. However, SUT may have to encourage its institutes, schools, and departments to set up their own strategies and implementation plans as a road map to excellence in accordance with those of the university. Similarly, SUT should encourage all of the institutes to set their goals towards international standards and establish a clear connection with graduate programs of study in order to eventually develop the university into a world class university.

Component 2 : Teaching and Learning

1) **The Curricula**: SUT should strengthen and distinguish its curricula by promoting a curriculum or a curriculum group to the rank of special distinction and implement the rest of curricula to the top rank later. However, that depends on the university and the schools to plan for the distinction together.

2) **Lecturers' Qualifications**: SUT has more than 75% of Ph.D. holding lecturers and it is believed that the qualifications of the lecturers should bring forth high quality of learning-teaching activities in both undergraduate and graduate levels. The university has more than 85% of lecturers who can work as thesis advisers.

3) **Learning-Teaching Process**: SUT has made a successful arrangement of co-operative education and become an exemplary model. However, the university should increase the proportion of courses offered in various curricula to become more student-centered, especially in theoretical courses.

4) **Students**: Among various students' problems, SUT should think of methods to:

    4.1 Decrease the number of students who cannot graduate in the time schedule.

    4.2 Decrease the number of students who cannot graduate.

    4.3 Increase the undergraduate students' GPA to the level set up by the university policy (≥ 2.50).

    4.4 Encourage mutual cooperation between the university and its institutes to maintain the students' GPA above 2.00 after their taking first year courses.

Component 3 : Student Development Activities

SUT has prepared the learning space in order to support students' autonomous learning through different activities, e.g. group discussion, practice of a second language by VCD watching/listening leading to reinforce students' learning. Through its public relations system, SUT should inform students to use the space to its maximum efficiency.

Component 4 : Research

1) **Research outcomes** : SUT lecturers have distinguished research outcomes published in highly cited journals, a high proportion of lecturers holding Ph.D. The university should promote and support distinguished researchers and research units to develop into an Excellence Center, making it the unique identity of SUT, and recognized in the national and international communities. In addition, SUT produced research outcomes in consistence with its major missions, and it is a national research university with initiation of "in-depth research with solutions in response to national problems", and the initiation begins to yield results.

2) **National Research University** : Since SUT has been selected as a national research university having about 500 articles published in Scopus Database in the past five years, it has a high risk of failure to pass the criteria in the following year. Therefore, SUT should provide its institutions or individuals with a challenging action plan in order to make sure that the university will meet the criteria. The university should also find out how to increase the number of doctoral and post-doctoral students, which will become a major force for producing research outcomes including improving several databases concerning research outcomes, which underlie the opportunity for becoming a national research university. In the institutional level, there should be an academic cooperation with foreign universities, development of international curricula, one of the major components in becoming a national research university.

3) **SUT possesses a research fund** : ranked at a very good level, to support the conduct of research, and mechanisms and plans, ranked at a very good level, for the coordination of the university research and development. There are also full-cycle, underlying offices, e.g. Research and Development Institute, Technopolis, University Farm, Community Knowledge-based Services Unit and Intellectual Property Management Office to support university research. To develop such underlying offices, SUT should arrange clear plans and set up a career path for the staff in the supportive section for progress in their career.

4) **Institutional Research** : SUT should encourage and support institutional research for better assessment and efficient learning-teaching development.

Component 5 : Academic Services to the Community

A large number of full-time lecturers form SUT usually take part in public academic services, working as advisors, external committee members for theses, academic committee members and professional committee members at the national and international levels. The university offer a number of public academic and professional service activities in response to the needs to develop and reinforce the strength of the society, community, nation and international community. Thus, SUT should collect the data on the number of full-time lecturers, of activities and projects on public academic services in full and with clear-cut measures in order to prevent from organizing public academic services about which the university does not know. Also, SUT should increase academic services for communities around the university campus and it should offer the services in the form of project sets with research and academic services, which will lead to a more concrete implementation results.

Component 6 : Preservation of Arts and Culture

Although SUT is classified as a university of technology, it also places prime importance upon arts and culture promotion and preservation, especially the creation of understanding and appreciation of local traditions and cultures. The university should extend its tasks and responsibilities of the units responsible for arts and culture to other divisions within the university, such as university staff or to communities.

Component 7 : Administration and Management

1) According to the principle of "**Centralized Services, Coordinated Tasks**", every division in the Office of the Rector is overall responsible for the university tasks enabling it to implement the university policy efficiently. Therefore, SUT should set up the TOR for each institute focusing on its expertise. For instance, Institute of Science should stress on producing fundamental research outcomes, which can be evaluated from published research articles, and Institute of Agricultural Technology and Institute of Engineering emphasize on technology transfer to the public, etc. Also, the university should conduct a study on the implementation expenditure of the principle of "Centralized Services, Coordinated Tasks" to see whether or not it can save the expenses and to become an obvious example of the implementation.

2) In order to adopt its policy more effectively, Suranaree University of Technology has implemented the Administrative Management of Knowledge and the Risk Administration Systems. However, SUT should extend its implementation of the "**Learning Organization**" to every division, with serious practice by using, as its prototype, the Competency Based Management model initiated at the Scientific and Technological Equipment Center.

3) Administrators' occupying 2 major positions causes the failure to work in-depth, unable to keep the division moving at full potential. The university should search for an individual to fill each position.

4) Suranaree University of Technology should speed up conducting an analysis of the staff in the Office of the Rector in order to cope with the increasing tasks enabling the office to fulfill the SUT strategic plans. In addition, SUT should take urgent action upon the Career Path System to enabling the staff in the supportive section to go into the professional position, and arrange a meeting to discuss, and inform the staff of the steps, or procedure, and speed on implementing the policy to produce its outcomes.

5) In case of developing MIS by creating its own software, which takes a very long time to get an effective system, SUT should conduct a study from a division undertaking closely related tasks; then, purchase and adapt the system to use in the university. That will be a faster and more efficient track to follow and it is consistent with a criterion of a national research university required by the OHEC to develop MIS that is able to connect with the system used by the OHEC (see Component 7.5, Level 6).

6) According to the Education Quality Assurance, SUT should arrange a meeting to explain and create mutual understanding of the basic indicator in each of the components in order that the Office of the Rector has the same low-level indicator as other SUT divisions, and the indicator developed by the individual division must be in line with the task it performs; it must also clearly indicates the major tasks of the division, and it should be the quality indicator rather than the quantitative or activity indicator.

Component 8 : Finance and Budgeting

Suranaree University of Technology has had a financial stability, and is able to find out rewards in a satisfactory level without risks. It also has a system and mechanism of allocation, expenditure analysis, efficient financial and budgetary audition, and sharing of internal and external resources leading to saving the expenses. The university should develop a system which is able to continually record and analyze the capital of each division.

Component 9 : Systems and Mechanism for Quality Assurance

Suranaree University of Technology has an obvious system and mechanism of managing and administrating internal quality assurance, cooperation of staff in a division, sharing, and attention on problem solutions through quality assurance mechanism, and it is regarded as part of a continuous administrative process, which cause a high-level effectiveness of internal quality assurance and that of internal quality assurance of the staff. The university should take urgent action to develop the MIS to be used as a main data resource in quality assurance. In addition, the quality assurance is a task of a division; not part of regular routines. As a result, several divisions do not take it seriously and do not continually use the results of the assessment to improve their implementation. Thus, SUT should have a system to transfer and create understanding of quality assurance to all levels the staff.

Component 10 : Technology Adaptation, Transfer and Development.

Suranaree University of Technology possesses a mechanism and division that can systematically adapt, transfer and develop technology, resulting in an outstanding number of products in technology adaptation, transfer and development in line with major SUT missions added by the university itself, which makes it different from the missions of other universities. The implementation results in the past years can be considered a successful mission in terms of quantity. However, in terms of quality, if assessed from the mechanism and form of implementation, it is believed that the mission shall become outstanding in the long term. The staff working on technology adaptation, transfer and development obviously understand the missions of their organization, express good intention and set their mind on the duties, reflecting it on the average satisfaction score of 4.20 out of 5. Therefore, SUT should set the goal of the indicators in line with the institute context, which will cause the institute to focus on the missions of their expertise. Besides, SUT should adopt a system of support or compensation for lecturers working in such divisions in order that they will own academic products, and go into or rise in the academic rank, including finding the measures to put to good use of a large number of the adapted from of patented or trade-secret products.

Working Group

1. Assistant Rector for Academic Affairs

    Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sittichai   Seangatith

2. Chief, Academic Support Division

    Ms. Chantana   Promsiri

3. Quality Assurance Officer

    * Ms. Kingthong   Yongyutmeechai

    * Ms. Thitika   Chanlah

    * Ms. Nattakarn   Ponloha

English Translator :   Dr. Dhirawit Pinyonattakarn

Graphic Designer   :   Mr. Pongsak   Withayagiat

Printed By : The Center for Library Resources and Educational Media

Suranaree University of Technology

Quality Assurance Subdivision, Division of Academic Support

111 University Avenue, Muang District, Nakhon Ratchasima 30000, Thailand

Tel : 66-4422-4045-(6)   Fax : 66-4422-4040

http ://www.sut. ac. th/qa   E-mail : sutqa@sut.ac.th