

### **Criterion 1: Goals of Academic Program**

Are goals for the transnational collaborative program clearly articulated and shared among the participating institutions in the three countries?

#### **Examples of good practices**

a) Setting goals for the academic program (including a vision for fostering excellent students)

- Societal and academic needs for fostering excellent human resources (e.g., the need for global talent within East Asia) are articulated in the program goals. The program goals have been set through deliberation and analysis among the participating institutions and other stakeholders.
- The goals are clearly articulated including expected learning outcomes with respect to knowledge, skill, and attitude acquisition by the students.
- Strengths and weaknesses of the institution and its partner institutions are considered using as a benchmark those of other local and overseas institutions, and unique goals are set for the program.
- The goals clearly state the need for a transnational collaborative program with overseas institutions.
- When a program leads to an academic degree, the degree is clearly established within the institution and its title and level are suitable for the program.
- When a double-degree or a jointly-delivered program is newly established within the program, clear goals are set based on the above viewpoints.

b) Sharing goals among the participating institutions

- The goals for the collaborative academic program are shared among participating institutions and function as guidelines for implementing the program.
- The goals for the program fall in line with the objectives and global strategies at the institutional level, and are shared in common with related divisions in the institution.
- When the academic program is a component of another degree program or crosscuts a multi-degree program, its positioning within the goals is clearly stated.

## Rubric for Analyzing the Quality Level

	Descriptions
Needs Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The program goals and vision for fostering excellent human resources are not clearly established. The goals are not suitable for transnational program nor awarded degrees.</li> <li>The goals are not widely recognized by the staffs of the participating institutions.</li> </ul>
Average	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The program goals are clearly set with a vision for fostering human resources and stipulate the need for the transnational collaborative program.</li> <li>Participating institutions commonly recognize the program goals. When the program is a component of another degree program or leads to other degree awards, the relationship between the programs is articulated within their goals.</li> </ul>
Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The program goals and vision for fostering human resources have been established via discussion among the participating institutions. Expected learning outcomes are articulated with respect to knowledge, skill, and attitude acquisition by the students.</li> <li>The program goals are shared among staffs and students of the participating institutions, and a consensus is formed.</li> </ul>
Highly Advanced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The program goals and vision for fostering human resources have been clearly established via deliberation and analysis carried out with the participating institutions and other stakeholders. A periodical review of them is also conducted.</li> <li>The program goals have been jointly developed and are shared among the participating institutions, and they function as guidelines for developing and implementing the academic program.</li> </ul>

### \*How to use the rubric

“High advanced” is a measure used by the monitoring organization, which will indicate in the monitoring report initiatives considered to be outstanding as “highly advanced” initiatives.

For monitored program providers, please give a self-assessment on a **three-point scale (needs improvement, average, or advanced)** of the state of quality initiatives in the program. Those that judge an initiative as “highly advanced” during their self-analysis, should describe it as “advanced” in their self-assessment.

The monitoring organization determine to give a judgment of either of “**needs improvement,**” “**average,**” “**advanced,**” or “**highly advanced,**” based on the self-analysis report.