REGULATION OF THE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION
NUMBER 23 OF 2022
CONCERNING
RECRUITMENT AND CODE OF ETHICS FOR ASSESSORS
OF THE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

BY THE GRACE OF GOD ALMIGHTY
THE BOARD OF EXECUTIVES OF THE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

Considering :

a. that in order to implement the Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2020 regarding the Accreditation of Study Programs and Higher Education Institutions;
b. that the assessment of Study Program Accreditation in the Onsite of Education by the Accreditation Council for Education conducted by Assessors;
c. that to enable Accreditation Assessors of Study Programs in Education under the Accreditation Council for Education to effectively and responsibly perform their duties and obligations, it is necessary to establish provisions governing the Recruitment and Code of Ethics for Assessors;

d. that based on the aforementioned considerations in points a, b, and c, it is deemed necessary to establish a Regulation of the Accreditation Council for Education concerning the Recruitment and Code of Ethics for Accreditation Assessors.

Taking Into Consideration : 1. Law Number 12 of 2012 on Higher Education (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2012 Number 158, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5336);

2. Regulation of the Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number 62 of 2016**,** concerning the Quality Assurance System for Higher Education;
3. Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 2020**,** concerning the National Standards for Higher Education (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2020 Number 47);
4. Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2020**,** concerning the Accreditation of Study Programs and Higher Education Institutions (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2020 Number 49);
5. Decree of the Minister of Research, Technology, and Higher Education of the Republic of Indonesia Number T/497/M/T.00/2019**,** regarding the Approval of the Minister for the Proposal to Establish the Accreditation Council for Education;
6. Decree of the Minister of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia Number AHU-0018765.AH.01.04 of 2019**,** regarding the

Ratification of the Establishment of the Legal Entity of the Accreditation Council for Education Foundation;

7. Decree of the Minister of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology of the Republic of Indonesia Number 186/M/2021, concerning Study Programs Accredited by the Independent Accreditation Agency.
8. Regulation of the National Accreditation Board for Higher Education Number 9 of 2020, concerning the Policy on the Transfer of Study Program Accreditation from the National Accreditation Board for Higher Education to the Independent Accreditation Agency;
9. Articles of Association of the Foundation for the Accreditation Council for Education Number 6 of 2019;
10. Bylaws of the Foundation for the Accreditation Council for Education Number 1/PEMB.LAMDIK/I/2021.

DECIDES

To enact : REGULATION OF THE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION CONCERNING THE RECRUITMENT AND CODE OF ETHICS FOR ASSESSORS OF THE ACCREDITATION COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

For the purposes of this Regulation of the Accreditation Council for Education, the following definitions shall apply:

1. Accreditation refers to the process of assessment conducted to determine the eligibility and quality of an Educational Study Program.
2. The Accreditation Council for Education, hereinafter referred to as ACE, is an institution established by the community with the mandate to independently conduct the accreditation of Educational Study Programs.
3. Accreditation of Educational Study Programs, hereinafter referred to as Accreditation, denotes the assessment process undertaken to evaluate and determine the eligibility of an Educational Study Program.
4. Code of Ethics for Accreditation Assessors of Educational Study Programs under ACE, hereinafter referred to as the Code of Ethics, constitutes a set of principles governing the conduct, behavior, and obligations binding upon assessors in the execution of their primary duties and functions.
5. Violation of the Code of Ethics refers to any form of speech, writing, or action by an assessor that is contrary to the provisions of the Code of Ethics.
6. Accreditation Status refers to the accreditation results issued by ACE, which consist of two categories: Accredited and Does Not Meet Ranking Requirements.
7. Accreditation Rating or Accredited Rating represents the accreditation results determined by ACE, classified into three levels: Excellent (Unggul), Very Good (Baik Sekali), and Good (Baik).
8. Adequacy Assessment, is an evaluation of Accreditation documentation submitted by Higher Education Institutions as part of the Accreditation Process.
9. Onsite Assessment, is an evaluation and verification of data and information contained in accreditation documents, conducted at the location of the Study Program as part of the Accreditation Process.
10. Assessor refers to an individual who, based on their expertise and competence, is appointed by ACE to conduct accreditation assessments of Study Programs.

Article 2

(1) Accreditation constitutes an assessment activity conducted in accordance with the criteria established based on the National Standards for Higher Education, the Regulations of *BAN-PT*, and the Regulations of ACE.
(2) Accreditation serves as an external quality assurance system, which forms an integral part of the overall Higher Education Quality Assurance System.
(3) Accreditation is conducted with the following objectives:
    a. To determine the eligibility of Study Programs based on criteria that adhere to the National Standards for Higher Education;
    b. To ensure the external quality assurance of Study Programs in both academic and non-academic aspects, with the aim of safeguarding the interests of students and the wider community.
(4) Accreditation must be implemented in an independent, accurate, objective, transparent, accountable, impartial, credible, comprehensive, effective, and efficient manner.

ACCREDITATION ASSESSORS FOR EDUCATIONAL STUDY PROGRAMS

Article 3

(1) The assessment of accreditation shall be conducted by ACE Assessors, who are appointed upon fulfilling the necessary requirements to perform accreditation assessments within ACE.
(2) Each accreditation Assessor within ACE shall uphold the following fundamental values:
    a. Faith and devotion to God Almighty;
    b. Honesty;
    c. Fairness;
    d. Integrity;
    e. Responsibility;
    f. Discipline;
    g. Professionalism;

h. Objectivity;

i. Cooperation; and

j. Humility.

(3) To be appointed as an Assessor, a candidate must meet the established qualifications, competencies, and integrity requirements.

(4) The Qualification Requirements shall include:

a. Being a faculty member;

b. Holding a Doctoral degree (S3) or other academic qualifications (S1/S2) in the Onsite of education, or having a non-education background but serving as a permanent faculty member in an education-related study program for at least 10 years, with a minimum functional rank of Lecturer (Associate Professor);

c. Being from a study program accredited with the highest rating A/Excellent; if no such candidates are available and to ensure geographical distribution, candidates from study programs accredited with B/Very Good rating may also be considered;

d. Being in good physical and mental health, as evidenced by a medical certificate issued by a licensed physician or hospital.

(5) The Competency Requirements shall include:

a. Possessing expertise in the subject matter relevant to ACE's accreditation needs;

b. Having experience in higher education management, such as serving as an administrator at the University, Faculty, Institution, Bureau, Department, Study Program, Center, Education Development Team, or equivalent positions;

c. Having skills and experience in the development and implementation of higher education quality assurance systems;

d. Having proficiency in using computers, information technology, and communication tools;

e. Demonstrating the ability to provide constructive feedback for the quality improvement of study programs;

f. Possessing strong communication skills, both oral and written.

(6) The Integrity Requirements shall include possessing high integrity, as verified through psychological testing and interviews conducted by ACE.

RECRUITMENT OF PROSPECTIVE ASSESSORS

Article 4

The recruitment process for assessors shall be conducted based on meritocracy, ensuring fairness and the absence of conflicts of interest, and shall follow the following mechanisms:

1. Determination of Assessor Needs

   The determination of assessor needs shall be based on the requirements within each academic discipline, ensuring proportional distribution in accordance with the number of study programs per program type, while also taking into account the geographical representation of assessors.
2. Selection Invitation

   The selection process for prospective assessors may be conducted through an open invitation and/or nomination by credible entities, while ensuring strict adherence to the eligibility requirements as defined by ACE.
3. Selection of Prospective Assessors

   The selection process for prospective assessors shall be carried out in three stages, as follows:

   a. Administrative Selection, which involves: (a) evaluating applications submitted by candidates and/or nominations received by ACE, to ensure alignment with ACE's accreditation needs, academic disciplines, and study programs, while also meeting the prescribed qualifications and competencies, and considering geographical distribution; (b) ACE shall determine candidates who successfully pass the administrative selection and invite them to proceed to the psychological assessment stage.

b. Psychological Assessment/Test, which shall be undertaken by candidates who have successfully passed the administrative selection. The assessment shall be conducted by a designated assessment institution, in a transparent and accountable manner, to evaluate whether the candidates: possess integrity (honest and having strong moral principles); do not exhibit deviant behavior; demonstrate high motivation; exhibit strong empathy; have effective communication and teamwork skills.
c. Interview, which shall be conducted for candidates recommended based on the results of the psychological assessment/test. This stage aims to: clarify the psychological assessment results; assess the candidate's knowledge and experience (track record) regarding: higher education quality assurance systems; higher education management; ICT proficiency; ability to provide constructive feedback; and communication skills.

Article 5

The selection of assessors shall be determined by ACE based on the following provisions:

1. Prospective assessors must successfully pass all three (3) selection stages.
2. The number of assessors accepted shall correspond to the required quota for each academic discipline and/or study program, with selection determined through a ranking of assessment results.
3. Prospective assessors who meet all eligibility requirements but have not been declared successful may be reconsidered and declared qualified if there is an urgent need for additional assessors.
4. The results of the assessor selection process shall be publicly announced via the official ACE website.

ASSESSOR ADMINISTRATION

Article 6

(1) Each assessor shall be assigned an Assessor Registration Number (NIRA) ACE.
(2) Each assessor must complete and continuously update their personal data in accordance with the format specified by ACE.
(3) Assessor personal data shall be stored in the ACE Assessor Database, which shall also include assessor performance evaluation records.
(4) The Assessor Database shall serve as the basis for the assignment and professional development of assessors.

ASSESSOR ASSIGNMENT

Article 7

The assignment of assessors for accreditation shall be conducted with due consideration of the following:

1. Peer Review Principle – The assessment of study programs shall adhere to the peer review principle, whereby assessors are selected based on their academic background and expertise relevant to the study program being assessed.
2. Number of Assessors – Each Study Program shall be assessed by at least two (2) assessors.
3. Assignment Location and Assessor's Institution – The assignment of assessors shall consider efficiency principles and shall not permit an assessor to evaluate a Study Program located in the same province as their home institution.
4. Alignment of Study Program and Assessor's Educational Background – The assessment of study programs shall be conducted by assessors with the following minimum qualifications:

a. Bachelor (Sarjana) programs shall be assessed by assessors holding at least a Doctoral degree;
b. Teacher Professional Education (Pendidikan Profesi Guru) programs shall be assessed by assessors holding at least a Doctoral degree;
c. Master's (Magister) programs shall be assessed by assessors holding at least a Doctoral degree;
d. Doctoral (Doktor) programs shall be assessed by assessors holding a Doctoral degree, with priority given to those holding the rank of Professor (Guru Besar).

5. Alignment of Study Program with Assessor's Institutional Background – The assignment of assessors shall be aligned with the type of institution from which they originate:

a. Bachelor (Sarjana) programs shall be assessed by assessors from higher education institutions that offer Bachelor Education Programs;
b. Teacher Professional Education (Pendidikan Profesi Guru) programs shall be assessed by assessors from higher education institutions that offer Professional Education Programs;
c. Master's (Magister) programs shall be assessed by assessors from higher education institutions that offer Master's Education Programs;
d. Doctoral (Doktor) programs shall be assessed by assessors from higher education institutions that offer Doctoral Education Programs.

ASSESSOR CODE OF ETHICS

Article 8

(1) The Code of Ethics aims to:

a. Enhance the discipline of assessors;

b. Ensure the maintenance of order and compliance;
c. Guarantee the smooth execution of duties and functions, as well as a conducive work environment;
d. Establish and uphold professional conduct and behavior; and
e. Improve the reputation and performance of ACE.

(2) Every Assessor is obligated to adhere to the Code of Ethics as stipulated in this ACE Regulation.
(3) The Code of Ethics sets forth the duties, prohibitions, and responsibilities of assessors in carrying out their functions, as well as the sanctions applicable for violations.

Article 9

Every assessor shall have the following obligations:

1. Comply with the policies and regulations of ACE, as well as all applicable laws and regulations;
2. Act professionally and objectively, avoid conflicts of interest, and uphold the peer review principle;
3. Understand the duties and responsibilities of an assessor;
4. Be well-versed in the accreditation instruments;
5. Provide a written statement affirming the absence of any employment relationship or affiliation with the study program/higher education institution under assessment, to avoid conflicts of interest;
6. Obtain formal approval from their home institution before undertaking accreditation duties;
7. Decline offers to assess a study program that they have previously evaluated, for a minimum period of two (2) years following the issuance of the accreditation certificate;

8. Conduct assessment tasks within the peer review framework, ensuring objectivity irrespective of the reputation of the study program/higher education institution being assessed;
9. Be punctual in all assessment activities;
10. Observe and uphold etiquette, courtesy, and prevailing ethical standards;
11. Provide firm yet constructive feedback and recommendations for the improvement of the study program/higher education institution;
12. Be open to receiving and thoroughly considering any objections or appeals from the study program/higher education institution under assessment;
13. Maintain the confidentiality of all information, documents, and assessment results, except when disclosed to ACE;
14. Continuously update their knowledge on legal regulations and accreditation standards enforced by ACE.

Article 10

Assessors are strictly prohibited from:

1. Expressing personal opinions on behalf of ACE;
2. Gaining personal, familial, or group benefits from accreditation activities;
3. Soliciting or accepting gifts in any form that could be reasonably suspected to be related to their duties as an assessor;
4. Falsifying or engaging in data and information forgery related to accreditation;
5. Altering data or information, including assessment results that have already been submitted to ACE.

ADEQUACY ASSESSMENT

Article 11

Every assessor shall have the following obligations:

1. Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the accreditation proposal submitted by the Study Program under assessment;
2. Prepare questions and key issues that require further confirmation during the Onsite assessment;
3. Conduct coordination among assessors at the conclusion of the adequacy assessment, particularly to:
    a. Align perceptions on the substance and technical aspects of the Onsite assessment;
    b. Agree on the division of roles and responsibilities in gathering information during the Onsite assessment/visit;
    c. Finalize the topics for discussion and clarification;
    d. Prepare a set of consolidated comments from the assessors.

Article 12

Assessors are strictly prohibited from:

1. Gaining personal, familial, or group benefits from accreditation activities;
2. Accepting assessment assignments and/or site visits that exceed their capacity to perform the assessment effectively;
3. Leaving the assessment site during the adequacy evaluation process.

ONSITE ASSESSMENT

Article 13

Every assessor shall have the following obligations:

1. Arrive on time and fulfill all commitments;
2. Wear appropriate, polite, and neat attire, reflecting a professional and respectable image in accordance with their role as an assessor;
3. Manage received information proportionally;

4. Take detailed notes during every meeting and immediately record assessor comments;
5. Maintain a constructive, professional, and proportional attitude;
6. Treat the study program under assessment as peers;
7. Carefully listen to clarifications from the study program and request evidence and/or necessary data.

Article 14

Assessors are strictly prohibited from:

1. Requesting any services unrelated to the assessment process;
2. Expressing self-doubt regarding their role as an assessor;
3. Making comments unrelated to the context or substance of the assessment;
4. Providing preliminary conclusions on assessment results to the study program;
5. Making promises beyond the assessor's authority;
6. Using inappropriate language, such as referring to the study program representatives as "you all" (kalian) or "you" (kamu);
7. Engaging in discussions with a bossy attitude;
8. Dominating the assessment session or, conversely, being excessively passive;
9. Blaming fellow assessors;
10. Asking multiple questions at once, leading to confusion for the assessed study program;
11. Criticizing previous assessors involved in past assessments;
12. Acting in a condescending, self-centered, dismissive, or arrogant manner;
13. Creating an under pressure environment that disrupts a conducive discussion atmosphere;
14. Displaying negative emotions through behavior or body language;
15. Engaging in irrelevant, unspecific, or prolonged arguments on a topic;

16. Leaving the session during the Onsite assessment;
17. Failing to pay attention when the study program representatives are speaking or explaining;
18. Using unverified information as the basis for decisions or assessments;
19. Getting involved in internal conflicts within the study program under assessment;
20. Making unfounded negative judgments about the study program;
21. Getting caught up in repeatedly answering the study program's questions, making clarification ineffective;
22. Engaging in discussions that deviate from or are unrelated to the assessment;
23. Acting provocatively and/or using offensive language;
24. Interrupting another assessor's clarification in an improper manner;
25. Seeking faults or "judging" the study program under assessment.

VIOLATIONS AND SANCTIONS

Article 15

(1) A Code of Ethics violation refers to any statement, written communication, or action by an assessor that contravenes the provisions outlined in Articles 3 to 8.
(2) Violations of the Code of Ethics are classified into three categories: minor, moderate, and severe violations.
(3) Minor Violations, include:
   a. Failure to perform tasks or submit reports within the timeframe set by ACE;
   b. Preparing reports that do not comply with the applicable accreditation guidelines;
   c. Failing to attach a letter of approval from their superior when undertaking accreditation assignments;

d. Involving external parties (e.g., family members or assistants) in the execution of accreditation tasks;
e. Making inaccurate judgments on minor aspects of the assessment;
f. Failing to maintain objectivity and transparency when assessing a program under accreditation;
g. Neglecting to stay updated with new information affecting their performance.

(4) Moderate Violations, include:

a. Inability to collaborate professionally with a co assessor during assignments;
b. Lack of sensitivity towards differences in norms and local culture;
c. Resigning from or cancelling an assignment without a valid reason (force majeure excluded);
d. Both assessors failing to be present at the site visit simultaneously;
e. Assigning inaccurate scores to a substantial portion of assessment criteria;
f. Failing to adhere to the scheduled site visit without prior notice to the assessed entity;
g. Conducting a site visit during working hours or teaching schedules, unless in cases of force majeure;
h. Conducting multiple Onsite assessments at the same time without a justifiable reason;
i. Failing to complete assessment tasks by omitting recommendations in the report;
j. Breaching confidentiality by disclosing accreditation results to unauthorized parties;
k. Making personal statements on behalf of ACE.

(5) Severe Violations, include:

a. Soliciting or accepting facilities, accommodations, transportation, money, or gifts that could influence accreditation results;

b. Engaging in transactional activities concerning accreditation status;
c. Conducting accreditation assessments within their own institution or institutions where there is a potential conflict of interest;
d. Duplicating or misusing documents from the assessed institution for purposes outside of ACE's accreditation process;
e. Bringing unauthorized individuals to stay at the same accommodation as other assessors;
f. Failing to submit assessment reports without a justifiable reason;
g. Falsifying data or engaging in document forgery related to accreditation.

(6) Sanctions for Minor Violations, include:

a. A written warning detailing the nature of the violation;
b. If a minor violation is committed three (3) times, the third violation will be escalated to a moderate violation.

(7) Sanctions for Moderate Violations, include:

a. Formal reprimand with an explanation of the violation;
b. Suspension from assignments for up to one (1) year;
c. Postponement of opportunities to participate in ACE competency enhancement training;
d. If a moderate violation is committed three (3) times, the third violation will be classified as a severe violation;
e. If both a minor and moderate violation occur simultaneously, the imposed sanction will follow the moderate violation category.

(8) Sanctions for Severe Violations, include:

a. Permanent dismissal as a ACE Assessor;
b. Ineligibility for reassignment as a ACE Assessor.

(9) Legal Consequences

The imposition of sanctions does not exempt the assessor from potential criminal or civil liability.

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

Article 16

(1) The initial batch of assessors shall be recruited from *BAN-PT* assessors and those assigned before the enactment of this regulation.
(2) Future assessor recruitment shall comply with the stipulated regulations, except for those recruited from *BAN-PT*, who will not be required to undergo a psychological assessment/test.

CLOSING PROVISIONS

Article 17

This ACE Regulation shall come into force on the date of its enactment.

Enacted in Jakarta
On January 31, 2022
Chairperson,

Muchlas Samani