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Quality of cross border higher education

- Who should be responsible for quality of cross-border higher education?
- What roles should governments play in quality assurance of CBHE?
- If national QA agencies should, do they have capacity to operate the review activities over CBHE?
- If international accreditors can, will they threaten national sovereignty?
- What kinds of assessment tools and approaches can be used to measure the quality of cross-border education?
- How can local accreditors collaborate with exporting accreditors in assuring quality of CBHE?
Challenges for QA of CBHE

- Limited knowledge on CBHE
- Following importing countries’ standards or exporting countries’ standards?
- National accreditors’ capacity and experiences on the review of CBHE
International Branch Campuses

- IBCs is one type of CBHE
  - 300 in 2017
- largest source countries
  - US 78
  - UK 25
  - Australia 14
- China and Singapore and Malaysia were three top host countries of international branch campus in Asia
  - 52 in China
  - 18 in Singapore
  - 9 in Malaysia.
Quality regulation in importing countries

- Liberal regulation with minimal quality assurance
- Liberal regulation with comprehensive assurance
- Restrictive regulation and minimal quality assurance model
- Restrictive regulation and comprehensive quality assurance
I. Internal quality assurance and autonomy of international branch campuses

- International branch campuses in four nations have developed a sound internal quality assurance mechanism.
- International branch campuses have greater autonomy over student admission and faculty recruitment than curriculum and student learning assessment.
  - Integrate Asian experience into curriculum.
II. External QA approaches

- different policies including exemption, redundancy, international accreditation and home accreditation.
- Korea and Singapore tend to be in the category of *Liberal regulation with minimal quality assurance*
- Malaysia and China are more likely to be in the category of *Liberal regulation with comprehensive assurance*
III. Divergence or Convergence: Who should take QA responsibility?

- **Convergence Model for Internal QA**
  - Most branch campuses in Asia implemented home campus’ system and rules into their internal quality mechanism, particularly quality manual use, curriculum approval, teaching materials import, the same faculty qualification, etc.
  - lead to a loss of autonomy of branch campus as an independent institution in the host country.

- **Divergence Model of External QA**
  - Quality assurance agencies at exporting and importing countries both tend to believe that the home accradiator should take major responsibility
  - **Collaboration between home and host accreditors**, including information sharing, is a recent development.
IV. Role of international quality assurance networks

- UNESCO/ OECD, APQN Guidelines
- CHEA “Seven Principles” (2015)

  Toolkit “practical advice to quality assurance agencies, regardless of their specific approach to quality assuring cross-border higher education, on how they may be able to realize the mutual understanding, trust, and cooperation required to facilitate the quality assurance of cross-border provision”
Conclusion

- Both home and host countries are required to share responsibility for ensuring the quality of international branch campuses.
- Conducting a joint review is considered as one of the best strategies.
- Developing “trust” among quality assurance agencies of home and host countries will take time and require greater effort in the future.
- Over-reliance on sending countries and local accreditors’ lacking international capacities are big challenges.
2018 INQAAHE Capacity Building Project

“Comparisons of QA systems, Review standards and Procedures, and Transparency in Taiwan and Indonesia: Capacity Building for Mutual Recognition of Joint Programs”

- BAN PT and HEEACT

- Intended outcomes
  - Comparability between HE and QA systems
  - Developing a joint accreditation model for dual / joint degree programs
    - Apply ECA model
  - Mutual Recognition over review decisions
Mutual Recognition Agreements

- MQA and HEEACT in 2012
- MQA and NZQA in 2012/2015
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