

QUALITY REGULATION OF
INTERNATIONAL BRANCH CAMPUSES IN
ASIAN NATIONS: COLLABORATION
BETWEEN QUALITY ASSURANCE
AGENCIES AND UNIVERSITIES

Angela Yung Chi Hou, Ph.D.

Executive Director, Higher Education Evaluation &
Accreditation Council of Taiwan

Professor, Department of Education, National Chengchi
University

Oct 30, 2018

Quality of cross border higher education

- ① Who should be responsible for quality of cross-border higher education?
- ② What roles should governments play in quality assurance of CBHE?
- ③ If national QA agencies should, do they have capacity to operate the review activities over CBHE?
- ④ If international accreditors can, will they threaten national sovereignty ?
- ⑤ What kinds of assessment tools and approaches can be used to measure the quality of cross-border education ?
- ⑥ 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

Hou, Angela Yung Chi, Hill C., Chen, K. H.J.,
Tsai, S.(2018). **A Comparative Study of
International Branch Campuses in Malaysia,
Singapore, China and South Korea: Regulation,
Governance and Quality Assurance. Asia Pacific
Education Review (on-line)**
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-018-9550-9>
(SSCI)

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 accreditor 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)
- ENQA “Quality Assurance of Cross-border Higher Education (QACHE) “ (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

- ① “Comparisons of QA systems, Review standards and Procedures, and Transparency in Taiwan and Indonesia: Capacity Building for Mutual Recognition of Joint Programs”
- ① BAN PT and HEEACT
- ① 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

- Hou, Angela Yung-chi & Fahmi, Z. M. (2014). Mutual Recognition of Quality Assurance Agencies in Asia: A Case Study of HEEACT and MQA. Higher Education Evaluation and Development 8:2 (December 2014): 69-84

Thank you for your attention

Higher Education Evaluation &
Accreditation Council of Taiwan

National Chengchi University

APQN/ INQAAHE