The Role of Stakeholders in Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Students, Alumni, Industry, and Government

BODHISASTRA UNIVERSITY

Scientific Discourse Delivered at the Inauguration of the Professorship In the Field of Higher Education Management at Bodhisastra University of Florida USA, which was conducted in Bali, on September 21, 2026

By:

Prof. Joaninho Xavier Hei, Lic. CSH., M. Ed., Ph.D

Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Universidade da Paz (UNPAZ), TimorLeste

BODHISASTRA UNIVERSITY FLORIDA

UNITED STATE OF AMERICA

2026

The Role of Stakeholders in Quality Assurance in Higher Education: Students, Alumni, Industry, and Government

By:

Prof. Joaninho Xavier Hei, Lic. CSH., M. Ed., Ph. D

Greetings of health and prosperity to us all Om Swastiastu, Namo Buddhaya, Greetings of Virtue

First of all, let us together offer our deepest praise and gratitude to God Almighty for His abundant grace, guidance, and blessings, allowing us to gather in good health on this historic and blessed day for this noble academic forum. May blessings and peace always be poured out to God the Father in Heaven through the mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ, as well as upon the extended family of UNPAZ (Timor-Leste), friends, and all His people until the end of time.

Furthermore, within this esteemed Open Senate Session of Bodhisastra University Florida, USA (BOU) and on this joyous occasion, we wish to express our highest appreciation and gratitude to the honorable:

1. Prof. Dr. Sak Prasendee, CEO & Chancellor of Bodhisastra University Florida, USA (BOU);
2. Prof. Dr. Nathawut W, Emeritus Rector of Bodhisastra University Florida, USA (BOU);
3. Prof. Dr. H. Supari Muslim, Drs., M.Pd., PhD, in his capacities as: (1) Rector of Bodhisastra University Florida, USA (for Indonesia); (2) Professor at the State University of Surabaya (UNESA); (3) Chairman of the Board of Trustees of P-ADRI; (4) General Chairman of the Consortium of Higher Education and Archipelago Scholars (KPTCN); and (5) President Director of PT. Jasa Konsultan Pendidikan;
4. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jantamas Wongseri, Vice Rector for Management, BOU;
5. Prof. Dr. Chayarnithsarr Kanijor, International Network Representative, BOU;
6. The leadership of Bodhisastra University Florida, USA, present at this BOU Open Senate Session;
7. Government officials, religious leaders, community leaders, and invited guests present at this esteemed session;
8. Students, extended families, friends, and distinguished guests;

Let us offer our praise and gratitude to God Almighty, for by His grace and blessings, we are able to gather in good health for this noble academic forum. Allow me, on this auspicious occasion, to deliver a scholarly discourse titled:

"The Role of Stakeholders in Higher Education Quality Assurance: Students, Alumni, Industry, and Government."

I raise this topic because the quality of higher education is no longer merely an internal campus matter. Quality has become a link connecting the classroom to the workforce, the laboratory to the market, and campus policies to national policies. An excellent higher education institution does not emerge from working in isolation; it arises from the collaboration of various parties with a stake in its outcomes. Therefore, understanding the role of stakeholders students, alumni, industry, and the government in quality assurance are essential for anyone who wishes to see high-quality higher education in Timor-Leste.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Higher education in Timor-Leste stands at a critical juncture. On one hand, the gross enrollment ratio for higher education continues to rise, the number of higher education institutions is increasing, and new study programs are emerging in response to the evolving demands of the times. On the other hand, the business and industrial sectors frequently complain of a gap between graduate competencies and the

actual needs of the labor market. Year after year, employment surveys consistently show that a significant portion of open unemployment is comprised of higher education graduates a paradox that troubles the conscience of every member of the academic community.

This phenomenon cannot be separated from the issue of quality. In my view, higher education quality is not merely an accreditation rating listed on an institutional certificate, nor is it simply a series of performance indicators reported periodically to regulators. Quality is a promise that must be kept to the students who have entrusted their futures to the institution, to the parents who have saved to fund their children's education, to the industries that will employ the graduates, and to the nation that places great hope in its educated generation.

The higher education quality assurance system in Timor-Leste as stipulated in the regulations of the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Culture, regarding National Higher Education Standards comprises two main pillars: the Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS), implemented by the higher education institutions themselves, and the External Quality Assurance System (EQAS), implemented through accreditation by the National Agency for Academic Assessment and Accreditation (NAAAA) pursuant to Decree-Law No. 21/2010 of December 1. Both systems operate within a cycle known as SIECE: the Setting, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Enhancement of standards.

However, a SIECE cycle that functions flawlessly from an administrative standpoint does not necessarily yield quality that is substantively experienced by its users. This is the fundamental issue I wish to highlight: quality assurance that remains confined within campus walls without actively involving those who are both the subjects and objects of the educational process itself tends to become trapped in mere formalities and administrative compliance. Such quality assurance is prone to becoming nothing more than an annual ritual of filling out forms, rather than a living culture of quality whose benefits are genuinely felt.

The notion that higher education quality must be collaboratively built by various parties aligns with the concept of multi-stakeholder governance, a framework long established in the literature on quality management and public policy. Within this framework, students are not merely objects of learning but active partners who provide feedback on their educational experience. Alumni are not simply graduates who have "finished" their journey, but living testaments to curriculum relevance and vital links between the campus and the professional world. Industry partners are not merely recipients of the educational "end product," but strategic allies who help formulate competency standards. Finally, the government is not merely a regulator overseeing from afar, but a facilitator providing the policy and funding frameworks that enable a quality ecosystem to flourish.

1.2 Problem Statement

Based on this background, there are several fundamental issues that warrant collective reflection. Firstly, why is student involvement in quality assurance often limited to completing end-of-semester learning evaluation questionnaires, lacking opportunities for more meaningful participation in academic decision-making? Secondly, why is alumni data which ought to serve as one of the most honest instruments for evaluating graduate quality still managed sporadically and rarely analyzed systematically to inform curriculum improvements? Third, why do industry partnerships often stall at the ceremonial stage of signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), without concrete follow-up actions such as involvement in curriculum design, the provision of field internship placements, or competency-based recruitment? Fourth, how can the government play a more optimal role as a facilitator of the quality ecosystem, rather than merely acting as an auditor that visits only once every few years?

1.3 Objectives and Benefits of the Scientific Discourse

This scientific oration aims to comprehensively outline how the four key stakeholders students, alumni, industry, and the government can and should play a role in higher education quality assurance, at both the conceptual and practical implementation levels. Through this discourse, I hope to contribute insights to policymakers within higher education institutions, educators, and the government to assist in formulating more participatory and sustainable policies for managing higher education quality.

The expected benefits of this scientific discourse are twofold. Academically, it is intended to enrich the body of literature regarding multi-stakeholder-based quality governance in higher education in Timor-Leste an area where literature remains relatively limited compared to that focused solely on standards-based quality assurance and accreditation. From a practical standpoint, this discourse is expected to serve as a reference for higher education institutions in designing mechanisms to engage students, alumni, industry, and the government more systematically, thereby generating a tangible impact on quality improvement.

2 CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION QUALITY ASSURANCE

2.1 The Concept of Quality in Higher Education

The concept of quality in the context of higher education carries a far more complex meaning than it does in the manufacturing or general commercial service sectors. In the industrial world, quality can be defined relatively clearly through a product's adherence to established specifications (conformance to specification). In higher education, however, the resulting "product" is not a homogeneous physical good, but rather a human being possessing inherent cognitive, affective, and psychomotor complexities.

Several experts in higher education quality management including Harvey and Green categorize the concept of quality into five perspectives: quality as exceptionality, quality as perfection or consistency, quality as fitness for purpose, quality as value for money, and quality as transformation. Among these five perspectives, the transformation perspective holds the strongest relevance to the essence of education, as education is fundamentally a process of transforming the learner encompassing knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

However, in practice, higher education quality assurance systems in many countries including Timor-Leste largely adopt a "fitness for purpose" perspective. This focuses on the extent to which higher education institutions meet standards and objectives established either internally (through their own vision and mission) or by regulators (through National Higher Education Standards). While this approach offers the advantage of measurability, it also has a potential weakness: the established standards may not be sufficiently responsive to the actual needs of stakeholders.

2.2 Internal and External Quality Assurance Systems

As mentioned in the introduction, the higher education quality assurance system in Timor-Leste comprises two complementary pillars. The Internal Quality Assurance System (IQAS) consists of systemic quality assurance activities carried out autonomously by each higher education institution to control and enhance the delivery of higher education in a planned and sustainable manner. The IQAS operates through the SIECE cycle mentioned earlier: Standard Setting, Standard Implementation, Evaluation of Implementation, Control of Implementation, and Standard Enhancement. This cycle is a closed-loop, continuous process, aligning with the principle of continuous improvement or *kaizen*, as it is known in Japanese quality management literature.

Meanwhile, the External Quality Assurance System (EQAS) consists of assessment activities conducted through accreditation to determine the eligibility and quality of higher education institutions and their study programs. EQAS is administered by NAAAA for both, institutional and study program accreditation, tailored to specific disciplinary fields. Accreditation instruments generally encompass nine criteria: vision, mission, objectives, and strategy; governance, leadership, management, and quality assurance; curriculum, teaching, and learning; academic culture; expected learning outcomes; program specifications, structure, and content; students and graduates; human resources, finance, infrastructure, resources, and information systems; research, community service, partnerships; and stakeholder feedback and satisfaction.

Ideally, these two systems IQAS and EQAS operate synergistically. IQAS establishes the foundation for a quality culture that permeates daily institutional life, while EQAS provides external validation and public accountability regarding the quality that has been cultivated. In practice, however, higher education institutions often treat EQAS as the ultimate goal; consequently, quality assurance activities surge only as re-accreditation approaches, only to subside afterward. This pattern requires collective correction, and one effective approach is to strengthen stakeholder engagement on a continuous rather than sporadic basis.

2.3 Why a Multi-Stakeholder Approach Is Necessary

There are at least three fundamental arguments for why a multi-stakeholder approach is essential in contemporary higher education quality assurance.

First, the epistemological argument. The quality of higher education cannot be fully assessed solely from the perspective of the education provider. Students possess firsthand knowledge regarding the quality of the learning processes they experience. Alumni have firsthand knowledge concerning the relevance of the competencies they acquired to the demands of the workforce. Industry holds firsthand knowledge of the competency standards required by the labor market. The government possesses aggregate data on employment trends and national development needs. Ignoring any of these sources of knowledge means constructing a quality system that is blind to certain aspects of reality.

Second, the legitimacy argument. In governance theory, the legitimacy of a decision is largely determined by the extent to which affected parties are involved in the decision-making process. Quality standards formulated without the involvement of students, alumni, industry, and the government are less likely to be accepted and earnestly implemented by all parties, as they would be perceived as unilateral decisions made by campus administrators.

Third is the argument regarding resource sustainability. Higher education institutions particularly in emerging nations like Timor-Leste often face resource constraints, whether financial or non-financial. Industry engagement can unlock access to additional resources such as practical training equipment, internship placements, practitioner-lecturers, and even funding for applied research. Government involvement can provide access to grant schemes, scholarships, and inter-ministerial collaboration programs. Alumni engagement can open doors to professional networks and educational philanthropy. Thus, a multi-stakeholder approach is not merely a matter of normative participation but is essential to the operational sustainability of the quality assurance process itself.

3 THE ROLE OF STUDENTS IN QUALITY ASSURANCE

3.1 Students as Subjects, Not Merely Objects

In much classical higher education literature, students are often positioned as passive recipients of educational services provided by institutions. Although long criticized, this paradigm still influences the perspective of some higher education administrators when

designing quality assurance systems. In reality, however, students are the ones who directly experience day in and day out the quality of the learning process, academic services, and the campus environment as a whole.

The paradigm shift from viewing students as objects to viewing them as subjects and partners in quality assurance aligns with the concepts of "student engagement" and "students as partners," which have gained significant traction in global higher education literature over the past decade. Within this framework, students are not merely asked to provide feedback; rather, they are actively involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of academic policies.

3.2 Mechanisms for Student Involvement in Quality Assurance

Higher education institutions can employ various mechanisms to engage students more meaningfully in quality assurance.

First, student evaluations of teaching should be conducted systematically, with results that are genuinely acted upon rather than merely archived. Ideally, these evaluations should assess not only administrative aspects such as punctuality but also substantive elements, including the clarity of material delivery, the relevance of the content to learning outcomes, and the effectiveness of the teaching methods employed.

Second, student involvement through student senate forums or student representative councils provides a formal channel for conveying views regarding academic policies to faculty or university leadership.

Third, student involvement in curriculum development teams specifically in curriculum review forums, which ideally take place every five years provides direct insights into study loads, course relevance, and the gap between taught material and practical field requirements.

Fourth, the engagement of students as internal quality auditors in a limited capacity, such as serving on teams that survey satisfaction regarding academic and non-academic services.

Fifth, the provision of a complaint handling system that is responsive and transparent, with clear resolution timelines, ensuring students feel their voices are genuinely heard and addressed by the institution.

3.3 Challenges of Student Involvement

Although the idea of student involvement sounds ideal, there are a number of real challenges in its implementation. The first challenge is the low level of student response to evaluation instruments, which is often caused by survey fatigue due to too many questionnaires having to be filled out in one semester without clear feedback on the results of previous fillings. The second challenge is the asymmetry of power between students and lecturers, which can make students reluctant to provide honest evaluations for fear of this impacting their academic assessment. The third challenge is the limited capacity of students in understanding the technical framework for quality assurance, so that provision and assistance is needed so that their involvement is substantive, not just a formality of attendance.

To overcome these challenges, universities need to build a culture of openness (transparency culture) where student evaluation results are communicated back in aggregate and anonymously, accompanied by concrete follow-up plans. This kind of closed-loop feedback mechanism has been empirically proven to increase the level of student participation in the next evaluation cycle, because students see concrete evidence that their input has an impact on improvement.

4 THE ROLE OF ALUMNI IN QUALITY ASSURANCE

4.1 Alumni as a Reflection of Graduate Quality

If students are witnesses to the educational process, then alumni are witnesses to the educational outcomes. Alumni constitute a unique stakeholder group because they have fully experienced the higher education process while also directly experiencing how the competencies they acquired are tested in the real-world labor market. Data regarding alumni ranging from the waiting period to secure a first job, the alignment between the field of work and the field of study, and employer satisfaction levels to career progression serve as some of the most valid and least manipulable indicators of graduate quality, as they are derived from labor market realities rather than solely from internal institutional assessments.

Alumni tracer studies have become a mandatory instrument within the external quality assurance system in Timor-Leste, as reflected in the criteria regarding outcomes and the achievements of the Three Pillars of Higher Education in the NAAAA accreditation instruments. However, in many instances, the implementation of tracer studies remains trapped in logic of administrative compliance: they are conducted shortly before an accreditation period with low response rates, and the results are rarely analyzed in depth to inform continuous curriculum improvement.

4.2 Optimizing the Role of Alumni in the Quality Assurance Cycle

Higher education institutions can take several strategic steps to optimize the role of alumni in quality assurance. First, they should establish a digitally integrated alumni tracking system that allows for continuous data updates, rather than relying on sporadic data

collection via annual surveys. Ideally, such a system would link with professional social media platforms and employment databases, thereby streamlining the data updating process.

Second, institutions should formalize alumni gatherings as periodic forums for curriculum evaluation, rather than treating them merely as social reunions. In these forums, alumni from various cohorts and professional fields can provide direct feedback regarding the competencies that were most relevant as well as those perceived as lacking during their studies when compared to the demands of their actual careers.

Third, involve alumni as guest lecturers, internship supervisors, or partners in developing new study programs that are responsive to industry trends. Fourth, establish an alumni association with a formal organizational structure and an adequate operating budget; this ensures that the alumni's role in supporting quality assurance does not rely solely on individual initiative but becomes an integral part of sustainable institutional governance.

4.3 Alumni as a Bridge to Industry

Beyond serving as a source of evaluation data, alumni play a strategic role as a bridge connecting the higher education institution with the industrial world. Alumni established in their careers often facilitate institutional partnerships between the campus and their employers whether through providing internship placements, absorbing new graduates, or collaborating on applied research. In my years of experience in vocational education, I have observed that the most enduring industry partnerships often originate from alumni's personal networks rather than from formal institutional approaches alone. Therefore, investing in strong relationships with alumni is essentially a long-term investment in building the institution's overall quality ecosystem.

5 THE ROLE OF INDUSTRY IN QUALITY ASSURANCE

5.1 Industry as a Determinant of Competency Relevance

The business and industrial sectors have a direct stake in the quality of higher education graduates, as they are the ones who ultimately employ and utilize the graduates' competencies. A mismatch between graduate competencies and industry needs imposes additional costs on companies such as expenses for re-training which in turn diminish both corporate and national competitiveness.

The concept of "link and match" between education and the workforce is not new to Timor-Leste’s education policy; however, its implementation has often remained superficial. Many industry partnerships stall at the signing of a memorandum of understanding, failing to translate into concrete programs. Yet, meaningful industry involvement in quality assurance should span the entire spectrum: from the upstream stage defining competency standards and curricula to the downstream stage, encompassing recruitment and the evaluation of graduate performance in the workplace.

5.2 Forms of Industry Involvement in Quality Assurance

There are several forms of industry involvement that can substantively strengthen higher education quality assurance systems. First is involvement in curriculum development and review through industry advisory boards that meet regularly to ensure the curriculum remains relevant to technological advancements and labor market needs. Second is the provision of practitioner lecturers or guest lecturers from the industry who bring direct field experience into the classroom, complementing the theoretical knowledge imparted by permanent faculty members.

Third is the provision of structured field placements or internships, featuring competent field supervisors and clear performance evaluation systems, ensuring that the internship experience genuinely adds value to student competencies rather than serving merely as a formality to fulfill required work hours. Fourth is involvement in competency certification schemes, whether through professional certification bodies (LSP) established jointly with the industry or through the recognition of industry certificates as part of graduate learning outcomes (recognition of prior learning).

Fifth, collaboration on applied research and product development (R&D) involving lecturers, students, and industry experts yielding not only academic outputs such as scholarly publications but also practical outcomes like prototypes, patents, and production process innovations that can be immediately utilized by industry partners. Sixth, graduate absorption through fast-track recruitment channels for graduates of partner study programs whose competence has been proven via certified internship programs.

5.3 The 8+i Partnership Model as a Benchmark for Best Practices

In recent years, my team and I have developed a concept for a comprehensive industrycollaboration curriculum model, which we term the "8+i" model or the "eight-plus-i" link-andmatch model. This model expands upon the government-initiated "eight-plus-i" link-and-match policy and comprises eight key elements: industry-collaborative curriculum design; learning based on real industry projects (project-based learning); instruction partially delivered by industry practitioners; mandatory field internships lasting at least one semester; graduate competency certification; lecturers or instructors with industry experience; applied research aligned with industry needs; and a commitment from the industry to absorb graduates. Added to this is the "i" component, representing the innovation and digitalization that permeate all these elements.

When implemented consistently, this type of model demonstrates that industry involvement in quality assurance must not stop at the input level (curriculum) alone; rather, it must extend to the process level (instruction) and the output level (certification and graduate absorption). This is what I mean by meaningful industry engagement, as opposed to mere tokenism.

6 THE GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN QUALITY ASSURANCE

6.1 The Government as Regulator and Facilitator

The government's role in higher education quality assurance involves a dual function that requires balance: acting as a regulator that establishes standards and monitors compliance, and acting as a facilitator that provides the policy framework, incentives, and resource support enabling higher education institutions to meet and exceed those standards. An imbalance between these two roles for instance, when the government acts predominantly as a strict regulator while offering minimal facilitative support tends to result in administrative compliance without substantive improvement in actual educational quality.

Through the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Culture (MESCC) and its subordinate directorates-general, the government has established various strategic policies regarding quality assurance. These include the National Higher Education Curriculum Standards and the creation of a National Qualifications Framework (*Quadro Nacional de Qualificações*) aligned with ASEAN and regional standards, as well as the development of national higher education policies and an accreditation framework (implemented via an evaluation and accreditation body established under the MESCC).

6.2 Government Policy Instruments for Promoting Quality

There are several policy instruments that the government has utilized and can continue to optimize to foster higher education quality through a multi-stakeholder approach. First, government funding instruments serve as vital tools for enhancing higher education quality in Timor-Leste; these include public subsidy funds administered through the *MESCC/CUIS* (supporting private higher education institutions), research funding via the INCT, and the Human Capital Development Fund (FDCH). Public subsidy funds support the strengthening of infrastructure, administration, and human resources within higher education institutions; the INCT fosters scientific research and innovation; and the FDCH supports human resource development through scholarships and training in areas of national strategic importance. Moving forward, these funding schemes could be further optimized by fostering partnerships among higher education institutions, the government, industry, research bodies, alumni, and the community to drive high-quality national development in Timor-Leste. Second, regulatory instruments mandating the involvement of external stakeholders in the accreditation process for instance, by requiring the inclusion of data from alumni tracer studies and graduate user satisfaction surveys within accreditation dossiers. Third, institutional facilitation instruments, such as the organization of national or regional industry-academia forums facilitated by the relevant directorate general to connect higher education institutions with sectoral industry associations. Fourth, data and information instruments, achieved through the development of a higher education database (DGDETL) integrated with national labor market data, enabling both institutions and prospective students to access information on graduate employability as a factor in selecting study programs. Fifth, autonomy policy instruments, under which higher education institutions with State University with Legal Entity status are granted greater flexibility to design industry partnership schemes, including the management of collaboration funds and the commercialization of research outcomes.

6.3 Challenges of Inter-Ministerial Coordination

One structural challenge I must candidly address in this discourse is the suboptimal coordination among ministries and agencies regarding the development of vocational education in Timor-Leste. Vocational education is not solely the responsibility of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education, Science, and Culture; it also requires the involvement of the State Secretariat for Professional Training and Employment (SEFOPE) in training and competency certification, as well as the Ministry of Commerce and Industry in identifying workforce needs within the business sector.

If not managed well through effective coordination mechanisms, such fragmentation of authority can lead to policy overlaps and resource inefficiencies. Therefore, I believe it is essential to strengthen the inter-ministerial coordination forum specifically to address the alignment of higher education policies with employment and national industrial policies so that the government's role as a facilitator of the quality ecosystem can be carried out in a more integrated manner.

7 SYNERGY AND MULTI-STAKEHOLDER COLLABORATION MODELS

7.1 The Quadruple Helix Collaboration Framework

To integrate the four stakeholder roles I have outlined students, alumni, industry, and government into a coherent collaboration framework, I propose adopting the "quadruple helix" approach for higher education quality assurance governance. The helix concept in policy innovation originated as the "triple helix" model, involving three actors: academia (higher education institutions), business (industry), and government. This model subsequently evolved into the quadruple helix by incorporating civil society; in the context of higher education quality assurance, this element is represented by students and alumni, who are the direct users of educational services.

Within this quadruple helix framework, the four actors do not operate linearly or hierarchically but rather in a circular, mutually influential manner. Students provide feedback to higher education institutions regarding the quality of the learning process. Institutions adjust their curricula based on this feedback as well as input from the industry. The industry absorbs graduates and provides feedback on their workplace performance. Alumni serve as a bridge, connecting their industry work experiences back to their alma mater. The government provides the regulatory framework and incentives that drive this entire cycle to operate sustainably.

7.2 Proposed Practical Collaboration Model

Drawing on years of experience guiding and supporting various vocational curriculum development and study program accreditation initiatives, I propose a practical collaboration model that higher education institutions can adopt. This model is structured as an annual cycle comprising four stages.

The first stage is the needs assessment, conducted at the beginning of the academic year through a joint forum involving student and alumni representatives, industry partners, and representatives from relevant government agencies or ministries to identify current competency gaps.

The second stage is the design and adjustment phase, where the results of the needs assessment from the first stage are translated into curriculum adjustments, semester lesson plans, and concrete collaborative programs such as adding practicum modules based on current industry cases or aligning student final project topics with the needs of industry partners.

The third stage is the implementation and monitoring phase, where the designed programs are carried out throughout the semester, accompanied by periodic monitoring via smaller, more frequent multi-stakeholder forums for instance, monthly coordination meetings between study program coordinators and industry partner representatives.

The fourth stage is the evaluation and reporting phase, conducted at the end of the academic year to assess the extent to which the implemented program successfully bridged the competency gaps identified in the first stage, while also serving as a data source for the needsmapping cycle of the following year. Thus, these four stages constitute a multi-stakeholder version of the SIECE cycle one that is more dynamic and responsive than the conventional SIECE cycle, which tends to operate solely within internal confines.

7.3 The Role of Higher Education Leadership

The success of this multi-stakeholder collaboration model is very dependent on higher education leadership which has a strong and consistent commitment. Higher education leaders, from the level of chancellor, dean, to head of study programs, must have a leadership orientation that is open to external input (boundary-spanning leadership), not leadership that is defensive and closed to criticism. An effective leader in this context is a leader who is able to translate the aspirations of various stakeholders whose interests sometimes conflict with each other into policies that are balanced and mutually acceptable, without sacrificing scientific autonomy and academic freedom which is the spirit of higher education.

8 IMPLEMENTATION CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES

8.1 Implementation Challenges in the Field

Although the multi-stakeholder collaboration framework I have outlined appears conceptually ideal, its implementation in the field is not without various real-world challenges.

The first challenge is the limitation of human resources and time within higher education institutions particularly small- and medium-scale private institutions which often lack dedicated personnel to manage partnerships in a professional and sustainable manner.

The second challenge is the gap in interests among stakeholders. Industry, for instance, tends to be short-term oriented, focusing on securing a workforce ready for immediate employment, whereas higher education institutions hold a long-term mandate to build students' critical thinking skills and foundational academic knowledge attributes that do not always bear direct or immediate relevance to labor market needs. Such tension requires careful mediation to ensure that higher education institutions do not lose their identity as centers of learning while remaining responsive to the needs of the professional world.

The third challenge concerns the financial sustainability of partnerships; many collaborative programs thrive during their initial stages, thanks to government grants but stall once the funding period ends, often because no sustainable financing mechanism was established from the outset. The fourth challenge involves the digital and infrastructure gap, particularly for higher education institutions in underdeveloped, frontier, and outermost regions; these institutions face limited access to industry partners and the information technology infrastructure needed to develop effective alumni tracking systems.

8.2 Strategies for Addressing Challenges

To address these challenges, I propose the following implementation strategies:

First, strengthening the institutional capacity of the partnership and alumni relations unit at the higher education institution level. This entails establishing a clear organizational structure, ensuring adequate human resources, and securing an operational budget that is regularly allocated within the institution's annual work plan and budget, rather than relying on ad-hoc funding.

Second, developing a cost-sharing scheme involving higher education institutions, industry, and the government for strategic partnership programs, thereby ensuring that program sustainability does not depend entirely on a single funding source.

Third, the digitalization of partnership information and alumni tracking systems using affordable online platforms such as by utilizing existing national platforms or developing simple email- and social media-based systems for higher education institutions with limited information technology resources.

Fourth, strengthening the capacity of faculty and administrative staff to manage multistakeholder relationships through partnership management training an area often overlooked in faculty professional development, despite being just as crucial as teaching and research skills in the context of contemporary higher education.

Fifth, establishing clear and measurable partnership performance indicators within institutional strategic plans, ensuring that stakeholder engagement is no longer a voluntary activity driven by individual initiative, but rather an integral part of institutional performance accountability subject to periodic evaluation.

8.3 The Role of Technology in Supporting Multi-Stakeholder Collaboration

Advancements in digital technology offer significant opportunities to strengthen multistakeholder collaboration in quality assurance. Online learning platforms (Learning Management Systems) can be utilized not only for content delivery but also for gathering continuous, realtime student feedback, thereby replacing static annual survey methods. Professional social media platforms can be leveraged to build and maintain alumni networks more efficiently than conventional data collection methods. Database-driven partnership management information systems (dashboards) can assist higher education leadership in centrally monitoring the progress of each industry partnership, including program implementation status, the number of participating students, and achieved outcomes.

However, the utilization of this technology must be accompanied by the awareness that technology is merely an enabler, not an end in itself. Adopting technology without a shift in institutional culture one genuinely oriented towards quality and openness to external feedback will result in nothing more than the digitization of formalities, rather than a substantive transformation in higher education quality governance.

9 CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

9.1 Conclusions

Distinguished guests, based on the extensive overview I have presented, there are several key conclusions I wish to reiterate.

First, the quality of higher education is not the sole responsibility of higher education institutions; rather, it is a shared responsibility involving students, alumni, industry, and the government as an integrated and interdependent ecosystem. Second, each stakeholder plays a distinct role that cannot be fulfilled by others: students as witnesses to the process, alumni as reflections of the outcomes, industry as the determinant of relevance, and the government as the ecosystem facilitator.

Third, the success of multi-stakeholder-based quality assurance requires a paradigm shift from administrative and sporadic quality assurance toward a substantive and sustainable approach one embodied in clear institutional mechanisms rather than merely individual initiatives driven by fleeting enthusiasm. Fourth, the quadruple helix framework can serve as a conceptual reference that integrates these four stakeholder roles into a circular, mutually reinforcing cycle of collaboration, following the four-stage model I have outlined: needs mapping, design and alignment, implementation and monitoring, and evaluation and reporting.

9.2 Recommendations

Based on these conclusions, allow me to offer several recommendations. To higher education leadership, I recommend strengthening the institutional capacity of units handling partnerships and alumni relations positioning them as strategic entities rather than merely administrative ones supported by adequate and sustainable resource allocation. To educators and study program administrators, I recommend having the courage to create opportunities for more substantive participation by students and alumni in every curriculum review cycle, going beyond the mere formality of completing evaluation instruments.

To industry partners, I urge you to view partnerships with higher education institutions not merely as corporate social responsibility activities, but as strategic, long-term investments in building a competent future workforce. To the government, I recommend strengthening interministerial and inter-agency coordination in formulating policies that link education with the world of work, as well as developing stronger incentive mechanisms for higher education institutions that successfully establish tangible and measurable multi-stakeholder partnerships.

9.3 Concluding Remarks

Distinguished guests, as I conclude this academic address, allow me to state that the journey toward establishing genuine quality in higher education is a long one a journey that never truly ends. Quality is not a destination that, once reached, can be considered complete; rather, it is a process of continuous improvement that demands consistent collaboration among all stakeholders over time. Students who actively voice their aspirations, alumni who steadfastly maintain ties with their alma mater, industry partners committed to the learning journey of the younger generation, and a government acting as a wise facilitator the collaboration of these four elements will ultimately shape the future of higher education in Timor-Leste.

I hope this address offers a contribution of ideas however modest to our collective effort to build a higher education system in Timor-Leste that is of high quality, relevant, and dignified. I extend my deepest gratitude to you all for your attention and patience in following this discourse.

Terima kasih banyak, obrigado barak, thank you very much

Bali, September 21, 2026

Signature

Prof. Joaninho Xavier Hei, Lic.CSH., M. Ed., Ph.D

Reference

Agência de Avaliação, Qualidade e Garantia da Educação Superior de Timor-Leste (AQAESTL). (2023). Guia de Instrumentos de Acreditação da Educação Superior e dos Cursos em Timor-Leste. Dili, Timor-Leste: AQAES-TL.

Aprovada Lei de Bases do Ensino Superior de Timor-Leste n.º 6/2024, de 17 *de julho, que também altera parcialmente a antiga Lei de Bases da Educação (Lei* n.º 14/2008).

Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Vokasi. (2022). *Panduan Kerja Sama Perguruan Tinggi Vokasi dengan Dunia Usaha dan Dunia Industri*. Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.

Etzkowitz, H., & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). The dynamics of innovation: from National Systems and "Mode 2" to a Triple Helix of university-industry-government relations. *Research Policy*, 29(2), 109–123.

*Governo de Timor-Leste. (*2011). *Timor-Leste strategic development plan* 2011–2030. https://timor-leste.gov.tl/wp-content/uploads/2011/07/Timor-Leste-Strategic-Plan2011-20301.pdf

Governo de Timor-Leste. (t.t.). IX *Constitutional Government*. Portal Pemerintah Timor-Leste. https://timor-leste.gov.tl/

Harvey, L., & Green, D. (1993). Defining quality. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 18(1), 9–34.

Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi. (2020). *Buku Panduan Merdeka Belajar-Kampus Merdeka*. Jakarta: Kemendikbudristek.

Ministério da Educação de Timor-Leste. (2011). *National education strategic plan 2011–2030. Ministério da Educação.*

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia Nomor 53 Tahun 2023 tentang Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan Tinggi.

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia Nomor 3 Tahun 2020 tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan Tinggi.

Regime juridico dos estabelecementos de ensino superior (RJEES), estabelecido pelo DecretoLei n.o 8/2010, de 19 de Maio

República Democrática de Timor-Leste. (2008). Lei n.º 14/2008, de 29 de outubro: Lei de Bases da Educação. Jornal da República.

Trowler, V. (2010). Student Engagement Literature Review. York: Higher Education Academy.