

A Synthesis of the Results of the Third Round of External Quality Assessment in Higher Education: Rajabhat University Cluster in Thailand

Tatsirin Sawangboon¹ & Waraporn Erawan¹

¹ Department of Educational Research and Development, Faculty of Education, Mahasarakham University, Thailand

Correspondence: Tatsirin Sawangboon, Faculty of Education, Mahasarakham University, Talad, Mueang District, Mahasarakham, 44000, Thailand. E-mail: tatsirin.s@msu.ac.th

Received: March 18, 2022 Accepted: April 15, 2022 Online Published: May 2, 2022

doi:10.5539/hes.v12n2p146

URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v12n2p146>

Abstract

The objectives of this research were to synthesize the results of assessment and analyze strengths, weaknesses that should be developed from the results of the third round of quality assessment in the higher education level of Rajabhat University cluster. The target group of the research consisted of 40 reports of the third round of external quality assessment B.E. 2554-2558 (2011-2015) in higher education of the Rajabhat University cluster. Secondary data were obtained from the external quality assessment reports. The data were analyzed using frequency, percentage and the mean. The results were as follows:

- 1) The synthesis of the results of the third round of external quality assessment of Rajabhat Universities showed that all of the 40 universities had been accredited, with the overall quality in the good level (Mean = 4.22). Three universities (7.50%) were in the very good level and 37 universities (92.50%) were in the good level.
- 2) The strengths of Rajabhat universities were on the Aspects of Academic Services to Society and Preservation of Art and Culture. The weaknesses that should be developed were on the Aspect of Research and Creative Work.

Keywords: external quality assessment, Rajabhat University in Thailand, strength and weakness

1. Introduction

1.1 Introduce the Problem

Quality assurance system in higher education institutions are the activities offering quality services to satisfy the minimum needs of all parties benefiting from higher education facilities and giving them confidence such as inspection, evaluation and review (Karahana and Mete, 2014). Chapter 6 of the National Education Act B.E. 2542 (1999) and Amendments B.E. 2545 (2002) deals with standard and quality assurance of education. It stipulates that every educational institution shall receive external quality evaluation at least once every five years since the last exercise and the results of the evaluation shall be submitted to the relevant agencies and made available to the general public. The external quality assessment is conducted by the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (Public Organization) or the ONESQA (Office for national education standards and quality assessment, 2012). The ONESQA conducted the first round of external quality assessment from 2001 to 2005, the second round from 2006 to 2010, and the third round from 2011 to 2015. At present, it is the period of time for the fourth round (2016-2020). By retrieving information from the information system of the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (Public Organization) (Office for national education standards and quality assessment, 2020), it was found that only 3 higher educational institutions under the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) had been assessed. However, due to the Covid-19 outbreak, the Ministry of Education, as the parent organization of the ONESQA, recommended that the ONESQA postpone the fourth round of external assessment in order for the educational institutions to fully prepare themselves for organizing for learning and teaching in a new normal (Siamrath, 2020). Therefore, most of the higher educational institutions had not had the fourth round of external assessment.

Rajabhat Universities are higher educational institutions for local development which must receive external assessment from the ONESQA in the same way as other educational institutions. However, the fourth round of

external assessment was conducted in only 1 university. In the third round of external assessment all 40 Rajabhat Universities received external assessment. (Office for national education standards and quality assessment, 2012). The ONESQA stipulated that the 3 groups of external assessment indicators, namely, Basic Indicators, True Identity indicators, and Social Responsibility Indicators must be consistent with the National Education Act B.E. 2542 (1999) and Amendments B.E. 2545 (2002) and the Ministerial Regulation on the System, Criteria and Methods for Quality Assurance B.E. 2553 in Item 38 which stipulates that the ONESQA shall conduct external quality assessment in each educational institution in accordance with the national education standards, and the following standards must be covered: 1) the Standards of the Desired Educational Outcomes in each level and type of education, 2) the Standards of Educational Management, 3) the Standards of Organizing for Learner-centered Learning and Teaching, and 4) the Standards of Internal Quality Assurance (Office for national education standards and quality assessment, 2012)

However, although Rajabhat Universities had both external and internal assessments by several organizations, some Rajabhat Universities still had problems of quality of education. The problems might have been caused by the fact that they did not make use of the results of the assessment in upgrading the quality of education. Moreover, from analyses at the national level, it was found that the expansion of higher education institutions had been rapid. Curriculums that responded to the demand of the market and to the need for a degree of students were taught. Teaching staff used teaching techniques that were not up to date and they lacked self-development. They offered curriculums they were not good at. All of these resulted in low quality of graduates, lack of teaching staff's development in their fields of expertise, lack of clustering for budget allocation that suits each university's identity. In addition, the attempt to fit higher educational institutions into the same model and standard brought about the lack of strength of the body of knowledge. Universities focused very much on financial benefit. Thus, the quality of graduates dropped down and would affect the quality of the human resources in the long run. (Office of the higher education commission, 2018)

From the aforementioned situation, the researcher conducted a synthesis of the results of the third round of quality assessment in the higher education level of Rajabhat Universities, hoping that the results of the research would help the higher educational institutions in the Rajabhat cluster to scrutinize the results which are classified according to the standards of the ministerial regulation, indicator groups, and each individual indicator. And also, strengths and weaknesses that needed to be developed are presented to be considered in setting guidelines for upgrading the quality of education in Rajabhat Universities in the future.

1.2 Research Objectives

To synthesize the results of the third round of quality assessment in the higher education level of Rajabhat University cluster.

To analyze strengths, weaknesses that should be developed from the results of the third round of quality assessment in the higher education level of Rajabhat University cluster.

2. Method

Sources of Data: Reports on the third round of external quality assessment in the higher education level of Rajabhat University cluster, conducted from 2011 to 2015, in totally 40 or 100 percent of Rajabhat Universities.

The data for the synthesis were the scores from the assessment which appeared in the reports on external quality assessment, obtained from the ONESQA's database and were secondary data.

The framework of the results of the assessment was classified as follows:

- Assessment standards of the ministerial regulation which are classified as Standards on the Outcomes of Providing Education and Organizing for Learner-centered Learning and Teaching, Educational Management, and Internal Quality Assessment.
- Indicators which are classified as basic indicators, true identity indicators, and social responsibility indicators
- Eighteen external quality assessment indicators for the third-round assessment in the higher education level

The data analysis employed analysis of frequency, percentage, and the mean. The level of quality was interpreted from the mean according to the following ranges of the mean scores: the mean scores of 4.51 – 5.00 had the quality in the very good level, 3.51 – 4.50 had the quality in the good level, 2.51 – 3.50 had the quality in the fair level, 1.51 – 2.50 had the quality in the need improvement level, and 0.00 – 1.50 had the quality in the need urgent improvement level (Srisa-ard, 2017). For the strengths and weaknesses that should be developed, they were considered from the results of assessment in the fair, need improvement and need urgent improvement levels.

3. Results

3.1 The Results of the Synthesis of the Results of External Quality Assessment of Rajabhat Universities

The overview of the results of the synthesis of the results of external quality assessment of Rajabhat Universities revealed that all 40 Rajabhat Universities or 100 percent were accredited, having the overall quality in the good level (Mean=4.22), 3 Rajabhat Universities (7.50%) had the quality in the very good level, The other 37 Rajabhat Universities (92.50%) had the quality in the good level. The details are as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The overview of the results of the synthesis of the levels of quality and the results of quality assessment of Rajabhat Universities (N=40)

Type of Institution	Mean (Level of Quality)	Level of Quality					Quality Assessment Result		
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Need Improvement	Need Urgent Improvement	Accredited	Accredited with Conditions	Unaccredited
Rajabhat Universities	4.22 (Good)	3 (7.50%)	37 (92.50%)	-	-	-	40 (100.00%)	-	-

The results of the synthesis of the results of external quality assessment of Rajabhat Universities, classified by the standards of the ministerial regulation, revealed that the quality of the 3 aspects were in the good level. The standards on the outcomes of providing education and organizing for learner-centered learning and teaching had the highest mean (Mean=4.45), followed by the standards on internal quality assurance (Mean=4.31), and the standards on educational management had the lowest mean (Mean=3.64). One Rajabhat University was found to have the quality in the need improvement level. The details are as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. The results of the synthesis of the levels of quality of Rajabhat Universities, classified by the standards of the ministerial regulation (N=40)

Standard of the Ministerial Regulation	Mean (Level of Quality)	Level of Quality				
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Need Improvement	Need Urgent Improvement
1. The outcomes of providing education and organizing for learner-centered learning and teaching (indicator 1-11 and 16-18)	4.45 (Good)	11 (27.50%)	29 (72.50%)	-	-	-
2. Educational management (indicator 12 -14)	3.64 (Good)	-	28 (70.00%)	11 (27.50%)	1 (2.50%)	-
3. Internal quality assurance (indicator 15)	4.31 (Good)	15 (2.50%)	24 (60.00%)	1 (2.50%)	-	-

The results of the synthesis of the results of external assessment of Rajabhat Universities, classified by the indicator groups revealed that, on the whole the, the Basic Indicators group (Mean=4.04) had the quality in the good level. When each university was considered, 2 universities had the quality in the very good level, the other 38 universities had the quality in the good level. Regarding the True Identity Indicator group (Mean=4.62), the overall quality was in the very good level. When each university was considered, 28 universities had the quality in the very good level, the other 12 universities had the quality in the good level. Regarding the Social Responsibility Indicator group (Mean=4.96), the overall quality was in the very good level. When each university was considered, 37 universities had the quality in the very good level, the other 3 universities had the quality in the good level. The details are as shown in Table 3.

Table 3. The results of the synthesis of the levels of quality of Rajabhat Universities, classified by indicator group (N=40)

Indicator Group	Mean (Level of Quality)	Level of Quality				
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Need Improvement	Need Urgent Improvement
1. Basic Indicator group (Indicator 1-15)	4.04 (Good)	2 (5.00%)	38 (95.00%)	-	-	-
2. True Identity Indicator group (Indicator 16-17)	4.62 (Very Good)	28 (70.00%)	12 (30.00%)	-	-	-
3. Social Responsibility Indicator group (Indicator 18)	4.96 (Very Good)	37 (92.50%)	3 (7.50%)	-	-	-

The results of the synthesis of the results of external assessment of Rajabhat Universities, considering indicator by indicator, revealed that among the Basic Indicators, the indicator on Academic Services to Society that had

the highest quality was Indicator 8: *The results of applying knowledge and experience of academic services to learning and teaching development, and/or research* (Mean=5.00); and the lowest quality which was in the need improvement level was an indicator on institutional administration and development. That was Indicator 14: *development of the teaching staff* (Mean=2.19). Among the true identity indicators, the highest quality was in Indicator 16.1: *the results of institutional administration towards identity* (Mean=4.78); and the lowest quality was in Indicator 16.2: *The Results of Graduate Development in Accordance with the Identity* (Mean=4.35). Among the social responsibility indicators, the highest quality was in Indicator 18.1: *The results of guiding, preventing and solving social problems*, in the first issue: inside the institution (Mean=4.98). The details are as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The results of the synthesis of the levels of quality of Rajabhat Universities by each individual indicator (N = 40)

Indicator	Mean (Level of Quality)	Level of quality					Remark
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Need Improve-ment	Need Urgent Improvement	
Basic indicator group	4.04 (Good)						
Aspect of graduate quality	4.00 (Good)						
1. Bachelor's degree graduates employed or self-employed within 1 year	4.16 (Good)	11 27.50%	25 62.50%	4 10.00%	-	-	
2. Quality of master's and doctoral degree graduates according to Thai qualifications framework for higher education	4.28 (Good)	9 22.50%	31 77.50%	-	-	-	
3. Academic work of master's degree graduates that had been published or disseminated	4.33 (Good)	28 70.00%	3 7.50%	6 15.00%	1 2.50%	2 5.00%	
4. Academic work of doctoral degree graduates that had been published or disseminated	2.25 (Need Improvement)	-	3 15.00%	1 5.00%	12 60.00%	4 20.00%	No assessment 20 universities
Aspect of research and creative work	3.21 (Fair)						
5. Research or creative work that had been published or disseminated	2.24 (Need Improvement)	1 2.50%	1 2.50%	9 22.50%	24 60.00%	5 12.50%	
6. Research or creative work that had been utilized	4.17 (Good)	21 52.50%	11 27.50%	4 10.00%	4 10.00%	-	
7. Accredited academic work	3.22 (Fair)	10 25.00%	7 17.50%	8 20.00%	10 25.00%	5 12.50%	
Aspect of academic services to society	4.99 (Very Good)						
8. Results of applying knowledge and experience of academic services to learning and teaching development, and/or research	5.00 (Very Good)	40 100.00%	-	-	-	-	
9. Results of learning and empowerment of the community or outside organizations	4.98 (Very Good)	39 97.50%	1 2.50%	-	-	-	
Aspect of preservation of art and culture	4.95 (Very Good)						
10. Promotion and support for art and culture	4.95 (Very Good)	38 95.00%	2 5.00%	-	-	-	
11. Aesthetics development on the dimension of art and culture	4.95 (Very Good)	38 95.00%	2 5.00%	-	-	-	
Aspect of institutional administration and development	3.64 (Good)						
12. Compliance with the roles and duties of the university council	4.45 (Good)	18 45.00%	22 55.00%	-	-	-	
13. Compliance with the roles and duties of the university administrators	4.30 (Good)	10 25.64%	28 71.80%	1 2.56%	-	-	No assessment 1 university
14. Development of teaching staff	2.19 (Need Improvement)	-	-	2 5.00%	38 95.00%	-	

Indicator	Mean (Level of Quality)	Level of quality					Remark
		Very Good	Good	Fair	Need Improve-ment	Need Urgent Improvement	
Aspect of development and internal quality assurance	4.31(Good)						
15. Results of internal quality assurance assessment accredited by the organization of affiliation	4.31 (Good)	15 37.50%	24 60.00%	1 2.50%	-	-	
True identity indicator group	4.62 (Very Good)						
16. Results of development in accordance with the university identity							
16.1 Results of institutional administration towards identity	4.78 (Very Good)	31 77.50%	9 22.50%	-	-	-	
16.2 Results of graduate development in accordance with the identity	4.35 (Good)	12 30.00%	28 70.00%	-	-	-	
17. Results of development in accordance with the focuses and prominent points which are reflected as identity of the institution	4.73 (Very Good)	29 72.50%	11 27.50%	-	-	-	
Social responsibility indicator group	4.96 (Very Good)						
18. Results of guiding, preventing and solving social problems							
18.1 Results of guiding, preventing and solving social problems:	4.98 (Very Good)	39 97.50%	1 2.50%	-	-	-	
1st issue: inside the institution							
18.2 Results of guiding, preventing and solving social problems:	4.95 (Very Good)	38 95.00%	2 5.00%	-	-	-	
2nd issue: outside the institution							

Remark: Indicator 4 was not assessed by the institutions because there was no doctoral degree program or the students had not graduated. Indicator 13 was not assessed by the institution because its president was acting president pending royal appointment.

3.2 The Results of the Analysis of Strengths and Weaknesses that Should Be Developed of Rajabhat Universities

In the analysis of strengths and weaknesses that should be developed of Rajabhat Universities, the researcher considered the level of quality of each indicator. The strength indicators came from the results of assessment in the very good level. The weakness indicators that should be developed came from the results of assessment in the fair, need improvement and need urgent improvement levels. The research results indicated that the strength indicators of Rajabhat Universities were the indicators on the aspect of academic services to society and on the aspect of preservation of art and culture, comprising Indicator 8: *Results of applying knowledge and experience of academic services to learning and teaching development, and/or research*, Indicator 9: *Results of learning and empowerment of the community or outside organizations*, Indicator 10: *Promotion and support for art and culture*, Indicator 11: *Aesthetics development on the dimension of art and culture*. Furthermore, it was found that the strength of Rajabhat Universities was in the true identity indicator group and in the social responsibility indicator group, with the following indicators: Indicator 16.1: *Results of institutional administration towards identity*, Indicator 17: *Results of development in accordance with the focuses and prominent points which are reflected as identity of the institution*, Indicator 18.1: *Results of guiding, preventing and solving social problems: 1st issue: inside the institution* and Indicator 18.2: *Results of guiding, preventing and solving social problems: 2nd issue: outside the institution*.

The weakness indicators that should be developed were indicators on the aspect of research and creative work, comprising Indicator 5: *Research or creative work that had been published or disseminated*, and Indicator 7: *Accredited academic work*. In addition, there were indicators on other aspects that should be developed. They were Indicator 4: *Academic work of doctoral degree graduates that had been published or disseminated*, and Indicator 14: *Development of teaching staff*. The details are as shown in Table 5.

Table 5. *The results of the analysis of strength indicators and weakness indicators that should be developed*

Indicator Group	Mean (Level of Quality)	Strength and Weakness Indicators	
		Strength	Weakness
1. Basic indicator group	4.04 (Good)		
1) Aspect of graduate quality	4.00 (Good)	-	4
2) Aspect of research and creative work	3.21 (Fair)	-	5, 7
3) Aspect of academic services to society	4.99 (Very Good)	8, 9	-
4) Aspect of preservation of art and culture	4.95 (Very Good)	10, 11	-
5) Aspect of institutional administration and development	3.64 (Good)	-	14
6) Aspect of development and internal quality assurance	4.31 (Good)	-	-
2. True identity indicator group	4.62 (Very Good)	16.1, 17	-
3. Social responsibility indicator group	4.96 (Very Good)	18.1, 18.2	-

Remark The strength indicators came from the results of assessment in the very good level. The weakness indicators that should be developed came from the results of assessment in the fair, need improvement and need urgent improvement levels

4. Discussion

The research results revealed that the results of the synthesis of external quality assessment results of Rajabhat universities, classified by the standards of the ministerial regulation, the Standard of Educational Management had the lowest mean. It was found that 1 Rajabhat university had its quality in the need improvement level. In this standard and in the Standard of Internal Quality Assurance, 1 university had its quality in the fair level. This was partially caused by the change of high-ranking administrators and the appointment was underway; the administrators were merely acting administrators. The situation affected the Standard of Internal Quality Assurance which lacked mobilization from administrators of the organization. This is consistent with the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (2012) which states that external quality assurance is the assessment of providing education in order to examine the quality of the educational institution by agencies or persons outside of the educational institution, aiming at development of the quality and standard of education of the educational institution. To begin the process, the educational institution has to have an internal quality assurance system in order to plan and develop its own quality, to take action in quality improvement, to monitor the quality, and to have a self-assessment system. After that the educational institution receives external quality assessment by the ONESQA. The ONESQA considers and audits the results of the internal quality assessment of the educational institution. Internal quality assurance and external quality assurance, therefore, should be consistent and be in the same direction, as both aim to move towards the standard or quality that the learner is expected to achieve. Attempts to implement quality assurance in higher education successfully are not only found in Thailand but also in other countries. The report from SEAMEO (Southeast Asian Ministries of Education Organization, 1998) revealed that quality assurance is a key issue for higher education for the Asian and Pacific countries. The governments in these countries have attempted to implement quality assurance but little progress appears to have been made.

The results of external quality assessment, classified by indicator groups, revealed that the Basic Indicator Group in most educational institutions had the quality in the good level. Meanwhile, the True Identity Indicator group and the Social Responsibility Indicator group in most educational institutions had the quality in the very good level. The reason was that the True Identity Indicators and the Social Responsibility Indicators were the indicators that each educational institution requested to be assessed and seen that they were consistent with the identity and things that they wanted to promote. In different educational institution these indicators were different, depending on the strengths and focuses of the institution. Therefore, most institutions were able to perform their work in these indicators well. This is consistent with a research by Masiki (2011 as cited in Potjanajruwit, 2016) on the matter of university's identity and the leader's planning for operation. The research findings showed that academic identity of a university, such as curriculum prominence and curriculum diversity, or an emblem which can convey the uniqueness of the university, will affect the perception and learning of students and stakeholders who are involved in the process of decision making. Moreover, the university's outstanding academic identity and emblem also reflect the efficiency of the leadership of the organization.

The obviously outstanding points of Rajabhat universities are academic services to society and preservation of art and culture. These outstanding points might have been caused by the intention as specified in Section 7 of the Rajabhat University Act B.E. 2547 (Rajabhat University Act B.E. 2547, 2004) that the university is a higher education institution for local development in order to help reinforce national intelligence, revive the learning force, promote local wisdom, create artistry for secure and sustainable prosperity of the people, take part in managing, maintaining, utilizing natural resources and environment on balance and sustention basis under the objectives of providing education, enhancing advanced knowledge and professionalism, providing lessons,

researching, providing academic services to society, improving, transferring, and developing technology, maintaining arts and culture, generating teachers and enhancing the academic standing of teachers. The outstanding points are consistent with a study by Chankoung (2015) on performance of educational quality assurance of Rajabhat universities in Bangkok Metropolis which reveals that in the round of the academic year 2010 – 2012, the highest average score during these 3 years which was one of the results of the internal quality assurance was that of Factor 6: Preservation of art and culture.

Furthermore, it was found that the True Identity Indicator group and the Social Responsibility Indicator group were regarded as outstanding points of Rajabhat universities and other higher educational institutions that had external assessment in the third round. The reason is that the indicators in these indicator groups were stipulated by the educational institution to be in congruence with characteristics of each institution. And this is consistent with the framework of the fourth round of external quality assessment which was designed to solve the problem of one size fits all or one size shirt for the whole country. That is to say, the ONESQA will not stipulate standards or indicators, but educational institutions must design their own standards of providing education to be consistent with the authentic conditions and the context. What is special is that every educational institution can present their prominence on different aspects they have. This will be beneficial and a good opportunity to disseminate and publicize their outstanding points and potentials to society (Office for national education standards and quality assessment, 2018). This is consistent with research by Boonkoom (2004) suggests a management strategy for implementing the model of quality assurance for Rajabhat Institutes. These need to be applied flexibly not just for RaJabhat Institutes but also other higher education institutions that aim to implement quality assurance.

The weaknesses of Rajabhat universities that should be developed were research and creative work, particularly Indicator 5: *Research or creative work that had been published or disseminated*, and Indicator 7: *Accredited academic work*. The important causes of the weaknesses were the lack of the budget for research and the ability to have research articles published in the international level. This is consistent with a study by Somboon *et al.* (2014) on models of management of knowledge from researches conducted by the teaching staff of Rajabhat Universities and found that management of knowledge from researches conducted by the teaching staff of Rajabhat Universities on each aspect was in the low level. For example, management of knowledge from researches for publication and dissemination in the national and international levels, as well as utilization of research findings. Moreover, one indicator of the aspect of graduate quality should be developed; that is Indicator 4: *Academic work of doctoral degree graduates that had been published or disseminated*. This is consistent with the Office of the Higher Education Commission which stated that the number of publications Rajabhat Universities and Rajamangala Universities of Technology was in the low level. The universities in these two clusters preferred to disseminate their research work in the form of research report without going through a peer review system (Office of the higher education commission 2018). Regarding the Aspect of Institutional Administration and Development, the indicator that is important and should be developed is Indicator 14: *Development of teaching staff*. The cause of weakness also came from the lack of budget for further education or self-development of the teaching staff. The problem affected the teaching staff's ability to develop their academic work for academic ranks. A study by Kundalaputra *et al.* (2019) indicated that, as seen from the current state of the teaching staff, the teaching loads of most of them were too heavy. In addition, they had work assigned by the faculty and the program, and family responsibility. Regarding buildings and grounds, they lacked laboratory. Regarding their professional matters, they had incomprehension in rules and regulations, and problems of motives. They also had problems from administration of the faculty and the university, which were the problem of personnel administration that lacked personnel with the right qualification, the problem of coordination among different curriculums, and problems at the university level which were the problem about good governance and the problem of supporting personnel to enter academic ranks; such support was not good enough. This is consistent with Jarunopatham & Kenaphoom (2015) who studied guidelines for promoting and supporting academic staff to enter higher academic ranks and found that there were 2 factors as follows: (1) On the part of the staffers who worked for academic rank, they had to have inspiration, understanding on the mechanism of entering academic ranks, courage to submit the academic work for an academic rank, ability to create academic work, and strategizing for moving towards the academic rank; (2) On the part of the supporting agency, the agency should stipulate result-based promoting and supporting strategies and develop a system of supporting mechanism.

5. Recommendations

5.1 Recommendations for Utilization of the Research Results

The results of the assessment of the Rajabhat university cluster, on the whole, should be considered in order for each Rajabhat university to use them in the analysis of the strengths and weaknesses that should be developed in

their respective university, and also use them in planning their operation for raising the quality of education which can be regarded as preparation for the next round of external quality assessment. The weaknesses that should be developed were on the aspect of research and creative work. The important causes of the weaknesses were the lack of the budget for research, so the government should support this.

5.2 Recommendations for Future Research

There should be a synthesis of recommendations of external assessments, divided into types of institutions, in order to move forwards to making policy recommendations for concerned agencies. There should be a synthesis of the results of assessments from every concerned agency such as the Office of the Public Sector Development Commission (OPDC), OHEC and ONESQA for confirmation of the data and obtainment of data useful for educational institutions and other concerned agencies.

Acknowledgments

This research article is a part of the research report in the project of Synthesis of the Results of the Third Round of External Quality Assessment (B.E.2554-2558) at the half-cycle period, in the higher education level. The research received a research grant from the Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (Public Organization).

References

- Boonkoom, C. (2004). *A study of quality assurance in Rajabhat institutes in Thailand* [Doctoral's Dissertation]. University of York.
- Chankoung, P. (2015). The Development of Strategies for Developing Educational Quality Assurance at Rajabhat Universities in Bangkok. *Academic Journal Phranakhon Rajabhat University*, 6(2), 116-127.
- Jarunopatham, J., & Kenaphoom, S. (2015). Factors Influencing the Academic Positions Accession of the Academic Personnel, Rajabhat Mahasarakham University. *Governance Journal*, 4(2), 208-231.
- Karahan, M., & Mete, M. (2014). Examination of total quality management practices in higher education in the context of quality sufficiency. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 109, 1292-1297.
- Kundalaputra, C., Surasawadee, P., Buakhao, S., Binbai, S., Intarapadung, A., ... Jjindanil, K. (2019). A Study of Problems and Guidelines for Academic Staff Promotion of Phranakhon Rajabhat University. *Academic Journal Phranakhon Rajabhat University*, 10(1), 1-12.
- Office for national education standards and quality assessment. (2018). ONESQA is Ready to Assess the Fourth Round of External Quality Assessment immediately. *ONESQA Pamphlet*, 18(4), 11.
- Office for national education standards and quality assessment. (2012). *The manual of the Third Round of External Quality Assessment Results in Higher Education*. Samutprakan: Offset plus Co., Ltd.
- Office for national education standards and quality assessment. (2020, July 25). *Automated QA*. Retrieved from <https://aqa.onesqa.or.th/>
- Office of the higher education commission. (2018). *Higher education 20 years Long-term plan B.E. 2556-2580*. Bangkok: Prigwhan Graphic Co., Ltd.
- Potjanajruwit, P. (2016). The Corporate Branding Strategy of Rajabhat University in Thailand. *Journal of Graduate School of Commerce Burapha Review*, 11(1), 17-49.
- Rajabhat University Act, B.E. 2547. (2004). *Government Gazette*. Book number 121. pp. 1-24.
- Siamrath. (2020, June 26). *ONESQA announced to stop evaluating round 4 after "MOE." ordered brakes*. Siamrath online. Retrieved from <https://siamrath.co.th/n/165465?fbclid=IwAR04TmnDtiCrn8yJMi6NRT8AcD7ZuofNbQ5nqRLpwrveVPCf33hTM9bFb0>
- Somboon, L., Piromjitpong, S., & Srisa-ard, B. (2014). A Model of Knowledge Management from Researches of Rajabhat University Instructors. *Sakon Nakhon Rajabhat University Journal*, 6(12), 129-139.
- Southeast Asian Ministries of Education Organization. (1998). *Quality assurance for higher education in Asia Pacific, SEAMEO regional centre for higher education and development*. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- Srisa-ard, B. (2017). *Basic Research* (10th ed.). Bangkok: Suveriyasan.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).