

Support to the Development of the Indonesian Qualification Framework

Roadmap of Qualifications Framework Implementation



The Education Sector Analytical And Capacity Development Partnership
(ACDP)

Support to the Development of the Indonesian Qualification Framework

Roadmap of Qualifications Framework Implementation

Published by:

Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP)

Agency for Research and Development (BALITBANG), Ministry of Education and Culture

Building E, 19th Floor

Jl. Jendral Sudirman, Senayan, Jakarta 10270

Tel.: +62-21 5785 1100, Fax: +62-21 5785 1101

Website: www.acdp-indonesia.org

Secretariat email: secretariat@acdp-indonesia.org

Published in March 2016

The Government of Indonesia (represented by the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Ministry of Religious Affairs and the Ministry of National Development Planning/ BAPPENAS, the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), the European Union (EU) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) have established the Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP) as a facility to promote policy dialogue and institutional and organizational reform of the education sector to underpin policy implementation and help reduce disparities in provincial and district education performance. The facility is an integral part of the Education Sector Support Program (ESSP) which consists of EU sector budget support with agreed arrangements for results-led grant disbursement, and earmarked policy and program-led AusAID sector development grant support consisting of a school infrastructure program, a nationwide district and school management development program and a program to accelerate the GOI's accreditation of private Islamic schools. This report has been prepared with grant support provided by AusAID and the EU through ACDP.



KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN
DAN KEBUDAYAAN



KEMENTERIAN
AGAMA



Kementerian PPN/
Bappenas



EUROPEAN UNION



The institution responsible for implementation of the study was **PT. Trans Intra Asia**.

The Consultants Who Prepared This Report Are:

1. **Bagyo Y Moeliodihardjo**, Higher Education Expert / Team Leader
2. **Ann Elizabeth Doolittle**, Qualifications Framework Expert
3. **Andrea Bateman**, Qualifications Framework Governance Expert
4. **Megawati Santoso**, Qualifications Framework Expert
5. **Eliane Kotler**, Recognition of Prior Learning Expert
6. **I.B. Ardhana Putra**, Recognition of Prior Learning Expert
7. **Sumarna F. Abdurrahman**, Vocational Education & Training Expert
8. **Anna Agustina**, Communications Specialist

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Government of Indonesia, the Government of Australia, The European Union or the Asian Development Bank.

Support to the Development of the Indonesian Qualification Framework

Roadmap of Qualifications Framework Implementation

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	i
List of Table.....	i
List of abbreviations	ii
1 Background and Rationale.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Rationale of IQF	2
2 International experiences on NQF Implementation.....	2
3 IQF Implementation Road Map in Higher Education.....	7
3.1 Structure of the IQF.....	7
3.2 Implementation Strategy.....	8
3.3 Implementation Stages.....	9
3.3.1 Promoting Accountability In Delivering Degree Programs.....	9
3.3.2 New Qualification Types And Definitions.....	10
3.3.3 Respectable Quality Assurance System.....	10
a) Quality Assurance Standards.....	10
b) Quality Assurance Agency	11
c) Quality Assurance in professional stream	11
3.3.4 Official Documentations.....	12
3.3.5 IQF Higher Education Website.....	12
3.3.6 IQF Logo And Register.....	13
3.4 Engagement strategy.....	13

List of Table

Table 1: Comparison of quality assurance arrangements for higher education for case study countries: Australia, New Zealand, Ireland & Hong Kong.....5

List of abbreviations

AEC	ASEAN Economic Community
AIPDKI	Indonesian Nursing Diploma Education Institution
AIPNI	Indonesian Nursing Education Institution Association
AQF	Australian Qualifications Framework
AQRF	ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASEM	ASEAN – EU Education Ministers' Meeting
BAN-PT	<i>Badan Akreditasi Nasional Perguruan Tinggi</i> - National Accreditation Agency for Higher Education
Bappenas	<i>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional</i> - National Development Planning Agency
BLK	<i>Balai Latihan Kerja</i> – Skills Training Center
BNSP	<i>Badan Nasional Sertifikasi Profesi</i> – National Professional Certification Agency
BSNP	<i>Badan Standar Pendidikan Nasional</i> – Board of National Education Standards
DGHE	Direktorat General of Higher Education
DIKLAT	<i>Pendidikan dan Pelatihan</i> – Education and Training
DLSA	Direktorat of Learning and Student Affairs – DGHE, and recently converted into the Directorate General of Learning and Student Affairs – DGLSA MoRTHE
HHRMA	Hotel Human Resource Manager Association
HKQF	Hong Kong Qualifications Framework
HKSAR	Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
IAI	Indonesian Association of Accountants
IAPI	Indonesian Institute of Certified Public Accountants
IQB	Indonesian Qualification Board
IQF	Indonesian Qualification Framework
KADIN	<i>Kamar Dagang & Industri Indonesia</i> - Indonesian Chamber of Commerce & Industry
KKNI	<i>Kerangka Kualifikasi Nasional Indonesia</i> – Indonesian Qualification Framework
LKP	<i>Lembaga Kursus dan Pelatihan</i> – Courses and Training Institute, accredited by MoEC
LPK	<i>Lembaga Pelatihan Kerja</i> - Skills Training Institute, accredited by MoM
LSP	<i>Lembaga Sertifikasi Profesi</i> – Professional Certification Bodies (PCB)
MoEC	Ministry of Education and Culture
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoI	Ministry of Industry
MoM	Ministry of Manpower
MoRTHE	Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education
MRA	Mutual Recognition Arrangement
NZQF	New Zealand Qualifications Framework
PCB	Professional Competency / Certification Bodies – <i>Lembaga Sertifikasi Profesi</i>
PHRI	Indonesian Hotel & Restaurant Association
PKBM	<i>Program Kegiatan Belajar Masyarakat</i> – Community Learning Program
PPNI	Indonesian Nursing Association
RPL	Recognition of Prior Learning
SKPI	<i>Surat Keterangan Pendamping Ijasah</i> – Diploma Supplement
SKKNI/NCS	<i>Standar Kompetensi Kerja Nasional Indonesia</i> – National Competency Standard
SISLATKERNAS	<i>Sistem Pelatihan Kerja Nasional</i> - National Skills Training System

1 Background and Rationale

1.1 Background

The call for Indonesia to immediately establish a national qualifications framework is driven by national needs, regional and global engagements.

- Various predicaments in human capital planning, development, and employment are national driving force to establish IQF. Quality disparities, critical mass disproportion, irrelevant supply to the stakeholders' needs are main problem in yielding professionals and skilled labors.
- In the ASEAN region, the ASEAN Economic Blueprint (ASEAN 2007) called for areas of cooperation, including the recognition of professional qualifications. Several Mutual Recognition Arrangements (MRAs) in the fields of engineering, nursing tourism, architecture, land surveying, medical practitioners, dental practitioners, and accountancy were created starting 2005 to support free flow of skilled labor through 'harmonization and standardization', particularly in preparation for the ASEAN Economic Community 2015. ASEAN is also linked to the Asia – Pacific region through cross membership of Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) and the Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN). As well, several ASEAN member countries that participated in an APEC Mapping of Qualifications Frameworks indicated in principle their support for the concept of a regional qualifications framework.
- In responding to global movements, Indonesia has ratified several international conventions in various sectors such as trades, economics, environment, and education. To name a few are GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services – April 5th 1994), WTO (World Trade Organization – January 1st 1995), AFTA (Asean Free Trade Area - 1992), Regional Convention, the Recognition of Studies, Diplomas and Degrees in Higher Education in Asia and the Pacific (December 16th 1983 and further renewed on January 30th 2008). The ratification was necessary for supporting Indonesian work forces mobility through four modes of supply,
 1. Mode 1 - Cross-border supply: the possibility for non-resident service suppliers to supply services cross-border into the Member's territory.
 2. Mode 2 - Consumption abroad: the freedom for the Member's residents to purchase services in the territory of another Member.
 3. Mode 3 - Commercial presence: the opportunities for Foreign Service suppliers to establish, operate or expand a commercial presence in the Member's territory, such as a branch, an agency, or a wholly owned subsidiary.
 4. Mode 4 - Presence of natural persons: the possibilities offered for the entry and temporary stay in the Member's territory of foreign individuals in order to supply a service.

IQF is designed to respond the aforementioned national needs, regional and global movement as an integral part of the strategy to improve the quality of national human resources by acting as (i) a national reference to match and harmonize learning outcomes resulted from formal and non-formal education, or acquired through job experiences; (ii) as guidelines and reference for the development and improvement of the quality of national higher education and for workers, industry, business, and public institutions to plan and develop career paths; (iii) as a reference for the improvement of the quality of private and public training institutions; as well as for the professional associations to develop professional pathways. At the international level, IQF serves as a device to translate international workforce and students qualifications to meet the Indonesian qualification system".

Thus, Indonesian Qualifications Framework was established and legalized through a Presidential Decree Number 8, Year 2012.

1.2 Rationale of IQF

IQF was developed to respond the aforementioned national need and regional and global involvement. It is an integral part of the strategy to improve the quality of national human resources by acting as:

- (i) a national reference to match and harmonize learning outcomes resulted from formal and non-formal education, or acquired through job experiences;
- (ii) as guidelines and reference for the development and improvement of the quality of national higher education and for workers, industry, business, and public institutions to plan and develop career paths;
- (iii) as a reference for the improvement of the quality of private and public training institutions; as well as for the professional associations to develop professional pathways; and
- (iv) at the international level, the IQF serves as a device to translate international workforce and students qualifications to meet the Indonesian qualification system.

2 International experiences on NQF Implementation

While in the broadest terms, a qualifications framework can be simply an instrument for classification of qualifications according to a set of criteria for levels of learning achieved and relativity between these levels, this is no longer sufficient in a world rapidly adopting qualifications frameworks as part of their qualifications systems.

Mature national qualifications framework, like the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), has gone beyond simply the definition of qualifications and their relativity. AQF specifies how qualifications must be constructed and quality assured and requires them to be identified as being part of the AQF through the use of AQF logo on testamurs and by being listed on publicly available registers. It has policy requirements for protecting AQF qualifications from being wrongly or fraudulent used, for the titling and issuance of qualifications and for giving credit for previous learning. Australia is not alone in these requirements and in the report above, examples of other countries are provided. Australia is somewhat unique in that it provides all of this information in one comprehensive document that is readily accessible to all stakeholders: education institutions, qualification developers, quality assurance agencies, professional registration authorities, employers, students and parents. In this, it provides a model for documenting other national qualifications frameworks.

While comprehensive qualifications frameworks such as these have the potential to provide great benefits to nations – improving the quality of educational outcomes, access to qualifications through different learning pathways, and recognition of qualifications by the country, the labour market and internationally – they are challenging to implement because of the complexity and inevitable institutional resistance to change.

In the words of the Europeans, a qualifications system *is complex and can involve standards, criteria for assessment and assessment processes, official bodies, institutional infrastructure, curricula and programme design, funding regimes and many more contextual features dependent on the country and cultural setting. This broad panoply of policies, procedures and institutions is part of a qualifications system. We can define a qualifications system as all aspects of a country's activity that result in the recognition of learning. These systems include the means of developing and operationalising national or regional policy on qualifications, institutional arrangements, quality assurance processes, assessment and awarding processes, skills recognition and other mechanisms*

that link education and training to the labour market and civil society. Qualifications systems may be more or less integrated and coherent.¹

Successful implementation of a national qualifications framework is underpinned by robust quality assurance arrangements to provide credibility for the qualifications in the framework and users' confidence in qualifications awarded. Credibility and confidence are important both nationally and internationally if the qualifications are to be recognised as having value.

Qualifications developed within a qualifications framework will only have value if they are quality assured. Quality assurance ensures that the qualification standards are met. Quality assurance includes approval (commonly referred to as accreditation) of the program of study (also called a course) leading to the qualification and approval (often referred to as registration) of the provider based on its capacity to deliver and assess the qualification outcomes and to issue (often known as award) the qualification with integrity. The external approval processes are supplemented by parallel internal quality assurance processes which are typically a requirement in the quality assurance standards. Quality assurance is undertaken against agreed quality standards. Educational quality assurance may be complemented by external industry or professional approval (accreditation) of the program of study, particularly if holding the qualification is a requirement for employment in that industry. External quality assurance is critically important for successful implementation of a qualifications framework and must be in place.

Around the world, higher education tends to be characterised by a demarcation between the older established universities which traditionally are autonomous educational institutions, usually with the authority to approve their own programs of study, and newer higher education providers some of which have been granted university status. The former usually have a strong tradition of research, are often ranked highly in the prestigious international ranking tables and commonly attract the best national students as well as international students.

The established universities are typically small in number in any country and work cooperatively to maintain the quality of education and research amongst their collegiate membership. The latter, because of their short histories, are rarely granted self-approval and monitoring status and are subject to external quality assurance by government-sponsored agencies. This distinction is so in the case study countries presented in this report and it influences the quality assurance arrangements in these countries.

Quality assurance arrangements are at different stages of development around the world as is the case with the varying stages of development and implementation of qualifications frameworks. However there is general consistency in how quality assurance is operationalised around the world in countries with qualifications frameworks as these cases studies illustrate.

- Australia reinforced its standards-based, compliance-focused approach to higher education quality assurance in 2011 with a shift from regionally-located government agencies to a single national government quality assurance agency. This reflects a mature qualifications system and the importance of uncompromising confidence in qualification outcomes given the strong link between qualifications and the labour market in Australia.
- Equally stringent but different arrangements are in place in New Zealand which has an equally mature qualifications system and significant international engagement.

¹ Mike Coles, *A Review of International and National Developments in the Use of Qualifications Frameworks*, European Training Foundation, March 2006 quoting from Coles and Werquin, *Moving mountains – the role of qualifications systems in promoting lifelong learning*, OECD, Paris, 2006

- The Republic of Ireland, one of the first European Union member states to implement a qualifications framework and to reference it against the European Qualifications Framework, provides an example of a different approach which relies more heavily on the individual involvement of its small number of universities.
- Hong Kong is an example of a country moving towards full implementation of its qualifications framework and provides a case study of a less mature qualifications system with a different methodological approach to the standard quality assurance processes.

Collectively these examples highlight the different levels of maturity of national systems, the similarity in arrangements but also the contrast in approaches. What is evident in these four examples is that they have moved beyond the use of collegiate and internal peer-based quality improvement methodologies for their quality assurance, although this remains an important additional tool for continuous improvement used by some for instance New Zealand and for others newer to external quality assurance like Hong Kong (see table 1).

This international overview looks at both the quality assurance processes put in place for higher education institutions and the quality assurance standards against which approval of programs of study and the providers that deliver them are assessed. Together the processes and the standards form the educational quality assurance arrangements required for a national qualifications system based on a qualifications framework.

Table 1: Comparison of quality assurance arrangements for higher education for case study countries: Australia, New Zealand, Ireland & Hong Kong

COUNTRIES	Approval (initial) of Institution*	Monitoring of Institution	Approval of Program of Study	Approval of Institution to Deliver Program of Study	Monitoring of Program of Study
Australia					
Autonomous Universities	Not applicable	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (national government authority) on regular cycle and on risk assessment	All have self-approval status; individual university internal processes required under TEQSA Act	All have self-approval status; individual university internal processes required under TEQSA Act	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency on risk basis; individual university internal processes required under TEQSA Act
Other HE Providers	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (national government authority established under legislation)	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (national government authority established under legislation)	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (national government authority established under legislation)	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (national government authority established under legislation)	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (national government authority established under legislation)
New Zealand					
Autonomous Universities	Not applicable	Universities New Zealand-owned Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities	Universities New Zealand-owned Committee on University Academic Programmes (delegated legal authority)	Universities New Zealand-owned Committee on University Academic Programmes (delegated legal authority)	Universities New Zealand-owned Committee on University Academic Programmes (delegated legal authority)
Other HE Providers	New Zealand Qualifications Authority (government authority established under legislation)	New Zealand Qualifications Authority (government authority established under legislation)	New Zealand Qualifications Authority (government authority established under legislation)	New Zealand Qualifications Authority (government authority established under legislation)	New Zealand Qualifications Authority (government authority established under legislation)
Ireland					

COUNTRIES	Approval (initial) of Institution*	Monitoring of Institution	Approval of Program of Study	Approval of Institution to Deliver Program of Study	Monitoring of Program of Study
Autonomous Universities	Not applicable	Universities-owned Irish Universities Quality Board	Individual university internal processes	Individual university internal processes	Individual university internal processes
Other HE Providers	Quality and Qualifications Ireland (government authority established under legislation)	Quality and Qualifications Ireland (government authority established under legislation)	Quality and Qualifications Ireland (government authority established under legislation)	Quality and Qualifications Ireland (government authority established under legislation)	Quality and Qualifications Ireland (government authority established under legislation)
Hong Kong					
Autonomous Universities	Not applicable	University Grants Committee Quality Assurance Council (government sanctioned non-statutory body)	Individual university internal processes	Individual university internal processes	Individual university internal processes
Other HE Providers	Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications (independent government agency established under legislation)	Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications (independent government agency established under legislation)	Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications (independent government agency established under legislation)	Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications (independent government agency established under legislation)	Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications (independent government agency established under legislation)

Note: *Approval processes and standards for the establishment of new universities is excluded from this summary.

3 IQF Implementation Road Map in Higher Education

While there has been significant activity in higher education related to implementation since the promulgation of the IQF in 2012, there remains significant work that must be undertaken as a priority to formally commence the process of implementation, to ensure that all national stakeholders understand their obligations under the IQF and understand its benefits, and to build the credibility of the IQF on the international stage.

The road map consists of two parts i.e. preparation stage that focus on establishing all resources required for IQF to be implemented and implementation stage. In order both junctures effectively implemented, the government should determine an implementation starting date and timetable for transition to the IQF.

Implementation of the IQF can commence when all core requirements are in place. Most importantly, the quality assurance arrangements for the IQF must be ready to start operation. An official government-endorsed start date needs to be determined and formally published for the information of all stakeholders but especially the institutions. A timetable for implementation needs to be developed by the MoRTHE. Finally, transition dates for approval of study programs and institutions against the IQF requirements needs to be agreed and published.

3.1 Structure of the IQF

IQF is a **unified** national framework that can be utilized by all sectors in Indonesia.

The Presidential Decree Number 8, Year 2012 defines the framework's as

...a framework of competency qualification leveling which corresponds, equalize and incorporate educational fields with work training fields and work experience in order to provide work competency recognition according to the work structure in various sectors.

IQF consist of nine levels of qualifications with the ninth level qualification is the highest. The number of levels is **unique** for Indonesia and designed to suit common needs among various sectors. Therefore, the ninth level qualification does not automatically denote higher than level 7 at HongKong QF or level 8 of EQF nor lower than level 10 of New Zealand QF.

IQF implies **equality**, thus acts as a national reference to mutually recognize learning outcomes resulted in any form of education and serves as a device to translate international workforce and students qualifications to meet the Indonesian qualification system.

IQF level descriptors are based on **learning outcomes**, determined through a comprehensive mapping of the current condition of Indonesian workforce and derived from two-way need of supply-push and demands-pull approach. Each description reflects scientific and skill aptitudes as well as the nation attitudes towards commitment to acknowledge diversities on religion, ethnic group, culture, language as well as nation uniqueness rooted in Pancasila, Constitution, NKRI (national integration), and Bhineka Tunggal Ika.

IQF should be underpinned by **robust quality assurance system** to provide credibility for the qualifications in the framework and users' confidence in qualifications awarded

3.2 Implementation Strategy

In higher education sector, there are three major implications of IQF policy:

- (a) Positioning and sanctioning all degrees (qualifications) produced by higher education towards IQF levels. Hence, accountability of providers and their quality assurance system in delivering degrees (qualifications) should be validated and improved accordingly.
- (b) Mutually recognized outcomes of various higher education types (academic, vocational, professional, specialist) and comprehend the multi entry and multi exit system.
- (c) Cultivating and flourishing acknowledgement of various pathways (non formal and in formal) by higher education providers as part of lifelong learning.

To undertake these propositions, the Presidential Decree 8/2012 on IQF was further elaborated for the higher education sector. Article 29 of the Law 12/2012 on Higher Education explicitly stipulates that the NQF should be referred in developing qualification. This article is elaborated further in the following regulations:

- MoEC Regulation 49/2014 on the National Standards on Higher Education, particularly the article that regulates minimum learning outcomes (currently in the process to be revised). This regulation rule accountability of providers in delivering degrees (qualifications) in accord with their IQF levels.
- MoEC Regulation 81/2014 on Diplomas, Competency and Professional Certification in Higher Education. This regulation supports mutually recognize outcomes of various higher education types (academic, vocational, professional, specialist) as well as accountability of provider in the form of diploma supplement publication.
- MoEC Regulation 73/2013 on the Implementation of IQF in Higher Education. This regulation facilitate acknowledgement of various pathways (non formal and in formal) by higher education providers as part of lifelong learning in the form of Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL).

The key performance indicator of a successful IQF implementation is the recognition and acceptance of Indonesian workforces' qualifications by stakeholders around the world. Consequently, scope of IQF implementation should not be limited to Indonesia, but should include other countries as well, as illustrated in figure-1.



Figure-1: Implementation scope and road map

At national level, mutual recognition of qualifications among producers (higher education institutions and training centers) as well as employers (government and industries) should be engaged. Graduates from higher education institutions and trainings should hold IQF qualifications recognized by each other reciprocally, by their counterpart in other countries, as well as by global users. Qualifications required by the government and industrial sectors should be described by referring to IQF level descriptions and be recognized by their overseas counterpart as well.

In order to achieve mutual recognition, a robust quality assurance system should be imposed in all sectors. This initiative in due course will improve accountability of qualifications' holders at each sector and lead to the IQF acknowledgment as a meaningful standard system of qualifications.

At global scope, IQF qualifications should be benchmarked to regional qualifications such as Asean Qualifications Reference Framework or European Qualifications Framework in addition to specific relevant countries. This proposition will bring about recognition from international society towards Indonesian workforces' qualifications.

The comprehensive road map of IQF implementation is implied as functions and task of IQB. This section will cover only the IQF implementation map in higher education sector.

3.3 Implementation Stages

The implementation stage regarding RPL (point c) will be deliberated in Chapter 6, hence the following implementation stages explain the aforementioned points a and b.

3.3.1 Promoting Accountability In Delivering Degree Programs

Under MoEC Regulation 49/2014 on the National Standards on Higher Education, the higher education ministry has undertaken a pilot program to develop more than 100 degree programs in order to produce nationally-agreed learning outcomes of the qualifications. Once the nationally-agreed learning outcomes in accordance with certain levels of IQF are established, they need to be incorporated into the IQF official publication for higher education and published on the IQF higher education website.

These field of study-specific learning outcomes will not be static, unlike generic non-discipline-specific qualification type descriptors, because field of study requirements change with advances in knowledge and changes to skill demands. Because they will have a limited shelf life, a process for their ongoing renewal and subsequent dissemination to users is required.

To ensure sustainability of these learning outcomes, consistency in their use by institutions, and acceptable by users, the development process including the involvement of employers and industry stakeholders, the ongoing maintenance and renewal requirements, and their storage and availability requirements should be formalized for transparency and accountability. This could be dealt with by the development of a Ministry policy prior to adoption by the IQB.

These nationally-agreed learning outcomes developed in accordance with the Ministerial Regulation 49/2014 also function as quality assurance in higher education. The quality assurance agencies (BAN-PT and the LAMs as they are established) have the authority to audit the higher education institutions in producing the specified learning outcomes.

3.3.2 New Qualification Types And Definitions

Qualification types can be developed by any sector, each with definitions that detail the knowledge, skills and competence, regardless of the sector in which they are offered. There is no limit to the number of qualification types nor the number of qualification types at a level, although the more there are the less understood they become.

As the qualification types are owned by the IQF, leadership from the proposed IQB is required. Should any of the qualification types be shared by two or more sectors, the governance agency would be the coordination point for agreement. It is critical that only qualification types that have been decreed and defined are accepted as part of the IQF. As higher education is a stakeholder of qualification types in the IQF, whether or not they are offered by the sector, the MoRTHE should contribute to the development process for any new qualification types and their definitions.

3.3.3 Respectable Quality Assurance System

Implementation of a national qualifications framework requires robust, government-sponsored quality assurance arrangements that include fit for purpose standards and a respected external agency to approve and monitor study programs and institutional capability and which apply to all. The arrangements must be guided by the principles of transparency, accountability, fairness, objectivity, reliability, effectiveness (or fit for purpose), efficiency and affordability.

Qualifications that have not been quality assured by the agreed quality assurance arrangements for the qualifications framework cannot be accepted as part of the IQF. The arrangements must have the support and confidence of national stakeholders and they must be trusted internationally so that graduates' qualifications are accepted globally. Without this, implementation of a national qualifications framework cannot commence.

The quality assurance must cover the following:

- the approval processes of qualifications themselves (usually referred to as accreditation);
- the approval of providers authorized to deliver and/or assess the qualifications (commonly referred to as accreditation or registration).

Currently most of the quality assurance arrangements are in place in Indonesia, with some exceptions, however quality assurance against the requirements for the IQF have not yet commenced.

a) Quality Assurance Standards

The new quality assurance standards for the IQF (Ministerial Regulation 49 2014) are a sound mix of requirements for the approval of study programs and institutional review. However they need to be strengthened to build into the standards the relationship between the quality assurance standards and the IQF so that once their use commences, it is mandatory for study programs to meet the requirements of the IQF. Without closing this loop, the quality assurance agency will not have the authority to enforce the use of the IQF and hence the uptakes of IQF-compliant study programs. The standards, not yet implemented, are currently being reviewed to make other minor amendments so this recommended change needs to be made at the same time.

Once the changes to the standards are settled, it is imperative that the standards and processes are documented into one comprehensive document in a manner that is accessible to all users and they

are disseminated widely to all stakeholders. There must be a version in English (the official language of ASEAN), in addition to Bahasa, so that they are accessible to both the ASEAN nations as well as the broader international community as a means of building international knowledge of and trust in Indonesian qualifications. As well as this publication being available on the BANPT website, it should be referenced and linked on the IQF higher education website.

A period of stability for the standards is required to support the successful implementation of the IQF in a reasonable timeframe.

b) Quality Assurance Agency

The quality assurance agencies need to ready itself to assess and approve study programs and institutions against the standards. It needs to develop timelines for the implementation of IQF, so that it could develop resources, processes, and assessors into a nationally and internationally respected quality assurance standards. An immediate assessment needs to be made of the adequacy of its establishing legislation and funding to ensure its ongoing existence without undue influence of changing priorities of the Ministry under which it sits. Similarly, it needs to review its own processes to ensure that there is obvious objectivity and externality built into its evidence gathering requirements to counter any potential criticism of its current process of peer review by existing university staff.

Quality assurance agencies must be subject to some form of external assessment to demonstrate that it meets universally accepted standards². This would ideally occur once the agency is ready to commence operation under the IQF requirements so that a baseline is established against which improvements may be monitored as the system improves. This could be undertaken at least every 5 years but consideration should be given to the second assessment occurring after 3 years with the intent of building trust in quality assurance as quickly as possible.

All institutions need to be subject to external assessment. For international credibility, autonomous universities must replicate the quality assurance standards and processes accepted for the nation as part of their internal quality assurance. Their internal arrangements should be subject to scrutiny by stakeholders through a requirement to publish their processes and reports on their outcomes on their websites. The MoRTHE could provide assistance to speed up the process.

c) Quality Assurance in professional stream

The creation of a second form of approval for study programs for the professional stream in higher education with the establishment of the LAMs creates an added level of complexity in a system trying to establish itself.

A shift away from the educational quality assurance of study programs, particularly in the early phase of implementation of the IQF, carries with it the risk of potential variance in quality across the qualification types in higher education with the introduction of a dual and split system for quality assurance. At the very least there needs to be a relationship between approval by the LAM and approval by BAN-PT. The confusion should be resolved through the IQB regulations.

If a LAM takes on the function of approval of study programs for the professions, it is a quality assurance agency and needs to be subject to the same controls and accountability as the prime

² Use of the INQAAHE principles for quality assurance agencies provide an ideal set of standards and an assessment team of international quality assurance specialists. The IQB could acquire the assistance of external agencies, such as INQAAHE or APQN, in developing standard norms and procedures for BAN, as well as audit its operations.

quality assurance agency. It must have agreed standards and processes for approval and these needs to be documented and published in Bahasa and English. Its assessors need to be trained and perform their functions consistent with the BAN-PT assessors. It needs to be subject to external assessment against internationally agreed standards for quality assurance agencies the same as BAN-PT, otherwise international credibility will emerge as an issue.

A risk to the IQF is the branding of the qualifications awarded as a result of this quality assurance process. A decision needs to be made about who is responsible for putting the study program approved by the LAMs on the IQF register and who is responsible for authorizing the institution to use the IQF logo on the testamurs of completed study programs approved by the LAMs.

3.3.4 Official Documentation

It is important to bring together all official documents regarding IQF in the higher education sector as one comprehensive document system and make it easily accessible to all stakeholders.

- The IQF must be known and trusted by all in the community and its use must be encouraged and this can only occur if it is fully understood. Transparency and accessibility, both nationally and internationally, is needed. In higher education, all elements of the qualifications framework and most of the quality assurance requirements have been designed and decreed but access to the detail remains difficult. The IQF requirements, currently in multiple legislative instruments, must be brought together in one document and made accessible to all. Users should not have to search multiple documents to find information; not only this is a disincentive for use, it creates a high risk that users will not find some of the requirements.
- An immediate task is to document all components of the IQF for higher education into one comprehensive written publication in a manner that is accessible to all users. This includes the structure and definitions of the qualifications framework levels and qualification types, the rules for and protection of qualifications, the quality assurance arrangements including the standards, processes and agencies that are in place, and the relationship with other agencies such as the professional standards-setting agencies
- The IQF higher education publication needs to be published in Bahasa for national use and in English for international use. An English language version is essential because it is the official language of ASEAN and Indonesia is a member of the ASEAN Economic Community and a signatory to the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework.
- A glossary of terminology needs to be included in the IQF publication because in some cases the terminology used by Indonesia differs from that used internationally and that may lead to confusion. In most cases, the terminology is defined in the decrees; where it differs from internationally agreed or commonly used terminology, a reference to the international language should be included in the glossary of terminology.
- In the long term, maintenance of the publication could become the responsibility of the proposed IQB as a way of promoting cohesion and integrated of the IQF across each sector. However because implementation of the IQF in higher education appears to be more advanced than in the other sectors, this should be the responsibility of the Ministry responsible for higher education in the short and this Ministry must take on the immediate function of development and maintenance.

3.3.5 IQF Higher Education Website

In parallel with the production of an IQF publication for higher education, an IQF higher education website needs to be built to facilitate ready access to information on the implementation of the IQF in higher education. The website will provide the best repository for all of the IQF publications.

3.3.6 IQF Logo And Register

Once implementation commences, the integrity of the qualifications framework needs to be protected by ensuring that qualifications awarded under the IQF are branded as IQF qualifications.

The following actions are required to ensure integrity:

- First, the testamurs awarded to graduates of qualifications that meet the IQF requirements must include an IQF logo which brands them as qualifications approved within the IQF. As the IQF logo must apply to qualifications in all sectors, the development of the logo, rules for its use, and ongoing monitoring of its correct use should be a function of the proposed IQF governance agency and recommendations about this are included in the section of the report about governance. However, its application in higher education must also be described in the IQF publication for higher education and explained on the IQF higher education website.
- Second, study programs and institutions approved against the quality assurance arrangements for the IQF need to be identified as IQF-compliant on the database of higher education qualifications and institutions. Immediate action needs to be taken to ensure that this database can serve as the IQF register. In the short term, this can be achieved by modifying the existing database to include a notation of the study programs and institutions that are approved under the IQF.

In addition, a diploma supplement can be used to supplement the branding of qualifications issued under the IQF. This document, given to graduates along with their testamurs, needs to explain the IQF, the nature of qualification type awarded and the quality assurance arrangements applied to the study program and the institution. While it serves as an addition means of branding and explaining the IQF, it cannot include the logo which must be preserved for the testamur only.

3.4 Engagement strategy

An engagement strategy needs to be initiated to inform and encourage the implementation of IQF. All stakeholders nationally need to have enough information about the benefit and other details on IQF and how to use it. This is required to encourage the uptake of IQF qualifications by employers seeking qualified employees, as well as students and their parents seeking qualifications specified or defined by employers. Ultimately broader engagement activities for the IQF are one of IQF governance agency's roles, once it is established. However this does not negate the importance of the Ministry responsible for higher education to disseminate the IQF benefits nationally and internationally to all stakeholders.

Providing information on the IQF in higher education, in addition to seminars and workshops, could be through the official higher education website and TV/newspaper media. Social media (e.g. Facebook and Twitter) are other options.

Use of an official higher education website with easy links for public access and social media are engagement strategies suitable for Indonesia. Internet usage in 2010 reached 45 million users, and mobile phone penetration in the same year of over 211 million users [Lim 2011:4]. These options are cost efficient with a wide potential reach.

Some countries have spent considerably in launching their qualifications frameworks. Others use less expensive approaches. Scotland for example uses a more affordable strategy which has proved to be successful where recognition of the Scottish qualifications framework is well known. Publications target different groups including employers and students through information brochures which are readily available on its website (see for example the following brochure for

students (<http://scqf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/05/Achievement-Counts-FINAL-WEB-Feb-2015.pdf>).

Consideration should also be given to developing a publication especially for providers to assist them with internal professional development of their staff. This is particularly important for staff with the responsibility for implementing the IQF and the primary target group for this is the universities' internal quality units.

