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ASEM DIALOGUE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE AND RECOGNITION

IN BRIEF

‘Quality Assurance and Recognition’ is one of the main agenda of the Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME) that supports mobility in higher education in Asia and Europe regions. The diversity in methods and systems used for quality assurance and recognition requires more platforms to be established for discussions and exchanges to strengthen understanding and transparency in its implementation.

Realizing its importance for nurturing confidence and facilitating academic recognition, acceptance and exchanges, a regular dialogue on quality assurance and recognition was reaffirmed during the ASEMME4 as it was seen as one of the strategies to fulfill the above objective in order to boost and strengthen the Asia-Europe education process.

This dialogue is an important medium for all ASEM stakeholders to further enhance the existing collaboration as well as to exchange ideas and provide feedback on current policies and ongoing initiatives in relation to recognition, quality assurance and cross-border higher education. It will also provide a platform for discussions on how both regions could establish a parallel quality, standards and outcomes in order to address the fast changing global trends as well as to look into the possibility of mutual recognition between both regions.

Hosted by the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) in cooperation with the Ministry of Education Malaysia (MOE), the ASEM Dialogue on Quality Assurance and Recognition which was successfully held on 25-26 August 2014 in Kuala Lumpur was interactively conducted based on 3 major themes:

1. Regional Quality Assurance Framework and Regional Qualifications Framework – Commonalities and Differences
2. Cross-Border Higher Education
3. Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives towards Facilitating Recognition
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INTERACTIVE ROUND TABLE 1

Regional Quality Assurance Framework and Regional Qualifications Framework
– Commonalities and Differences
Mr. Josep Grifoll
Vice President of ENQA cum Technical Director for Quality Assurance
The Catalan University Quality Assurance Agency, Spain

Regional Quality Assurance Framework – Interregional Recognition of Quality Assurance Agencies

European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)

Abstract

The ESG have been key to establishing the European Higher Education Area. Their success can be seen in the more than forty countries with full sovereignty over higher education that have been convinced to adopt them. Significant strengths of the ESG include their openness and flexibility, while new values are being embedded such as the transparency of information and the involvement of students and external actors in quality assurance; all of these elements are important in the modernisation of European universities. Nevertheless, new technologies that facilitate personalised access to knowledge give rise to new challenges that will need to be addressed in the ESG. The idea of student-centred learning is in fact included in the proposal to revise the ESG, although progress also needs to be made in the quality assurance of public policies to support and develop higher education.

Any system that is meant to train skilled and qualified labour, either for professional positions with high levels of responsibility or to carry out advanced research, is going to be highly complex.

I’m not just referring to matters of a technical nature, but also the complexity linked with the social and political dimension that is embodied in higher education. One can talk about how teaching and learning processes can be organised so that graduates acquire certain
skills (competences), although consideration also needs to be given to the structures that best sustain education as an equity-based service.

Although the sector of higher education is closely linked with research and innovation, it is still subject to certain limitations associated with old habits, protectionism and the clash between public and private interests.

The European standards and guidelines represent an important breakthrough in many ways. What are the most innovative aspects of the ESG?

- In the first place, they represent a proposal that offers broad leeway in terms of institutional autonomy and the design of provision (degrees and study programmes).
- The ESG are not product quality standards, they are standards that elicit correct product specification (education provision). This makes them very flexible and adaptable.
- They represent the modernisation of HEI management and lead to professionalism in the management of higher education at a time when the sector faces great challenges.
- They include the participation of external actors (society, employers, experts, etc.) in focusing on the quality of higher education and its improvement and enhancement through quality assurance.
- They are intended to mobilise students in quality assurance procedures.
- They incorporate new values, such as the independence of reviewers and the transparency of information (a key to self-regulation).
- As a tool, they are international in nature and their use is intended across and beyond the borders of the continent of Europe.
- I should finally add that the ESG are standards for democratic access and that their application is therefore fundamentally a matter of willingness on the part of whomever they are adopted by.
The ESG are one of the most important mainstays of the so-called Bologna Process. As such, however, they continue to be continually improved and updated to ensure they are applied more consistently by HEIs and external quality assurance agencies. What are the critical aspects of the ESG?

- The ESG are adopted by the political authorities in each country. This aspect, which is viewed positively in terms of national diversity, leaves room for some national authorities to continue to give preferential treatment to inputs (number of credits, profile of teachers, list of compulsory subjects, etc.) in their planning and development policies for the sector, thereby opening the door to the associated possibility of protectionism.

- The issues being faced by national authorities are in fact very complex and they are not totally resolved by the ESG. What kind of graduates should receive education at national universities, bearing in mind that these graduates will need to (find) work in a context that is becoming increasingly internationalised. Here we are talking directly about the quality of provision (product).

- The ESG do not solve the need for a framework for massive quality assurance systems. They are conceived as an individual prototype for quality assurance that can then be replicated in all units (programmes, departments, institutions). Some countries have begun to use designs according to their own logic that include incentives and affirmative action mechanisms that promote a quality culture, in contrast to a certain degree of bureaucratisation in the traditional model (which is cyclical and repetitive).

- Finally, it should be noted that an overly national perspective with regard to quality assurance methods limits the possibilities that internationalisation has to offer quality assurance procedures. Although the ESG recommend the involvement of international experts in quality assurance, one still hears international experts say that they “do not understand the national system”. There is broad agreement that graduates from one country need to be able to work in international contexts, although it would appear that international experts are not “good enough” to establish whether the university studies of these graduates have been adequately delivered or not.
I’d like to round off with the following thought: quality assurance as proposed in Europe focuses on HEIs, not on individuals. At the same time, new technologies are paving the way for individuals to manage learning outside of HEIs, or beyond the control of one sole institution. This new vision is contained in the proposal to modify the ESG in the referral to the importance of student-centred learning, although it is merely a first step.

Students are faced with an unprecedented range of courses, the diversity of which continues to grow, including at the opportunity cost level. The ESG will need to address this challenge. Thought now needs to be given to what higher education institutions (universities) should be in the future, as well as the effectiveness and efficiency of policies and instruments required for the education and training of people as professionals and as citizens. Maybe thought should now be given to some kind of procedure for the assessment of these public policies from the point of view of their actual usefulness to people.
The ESG: a key element in the modernisation of universities
ASEM Conference 2014
Kuala Lumpur
Josep Grifoll
AQU Catalunya (www.aqu.cat)

Higher Education (HE): a very complex service

Training skilled and qualified labour means “sophisticated technology”

HE needs incorporation of social values

HE producers are still subject to certain protectionism

Clash of interests between public and private spheres

The internationalisation (promoted by Bologna Process)
The European Standards a breakthrough (1)

1) Promote institutional autonomy
2) Encourage correct product specification
3) Modernise HE management
4) Invite external actors to say about quality

The European Standards a breakthrough (2)

5) Mobilise students in QA procedures
6) Adopt new values such as accountability
7) Facilitates international mutual understanding on quality assurance
8) Generates a “democratic” quality assurance
Critical aspects of ESG (1)

A European tool adopted by national authorities.
Learning outcomes yes but...
Do ESG allow preferential treatment to inputs?
Do national authorities make their main policies according inputs?

Critical aspects of ESG (2)

ESG is about quality assurance but... what kind of graduates should be trained in our national universities?
The labour market is becoming international.
Some international stakeholders look for something more than national QA.
Critical aspects of ESG (3)

ESG are about quality assurance for all.

ESG as a tool to be implemented programme by programme, institution by institution.

Do ESG need to consider systemic strategies on QA? Smart QA.

Critical aspects of ESG (4)

ESG are flexible and easy to be adapted to national contexts.

But why national QA systems become so complicated to international reviewers? What makes national systems difficult? Inputs? Process? Outputs?
Critical aspects of ESG (4)

ESG are flexible and easy to be adapted to national contexts.

But why national QA systems become so complicated to international reviewers? What makes national systems difficult? Inputs? Process? Outputs?

Looking into the future (2)

European students face an unprecedented range of new courses, growing internationally.

ESG need to consider new elements on:
- Cost-benefit analysis (including costs of opportunity)
- Shape of institutions in 2020 or 2030.
- Role of public policies
ESG a story of success

A solid building is there for institutions and stakeholders.

But quality is dynamic, also public policies for higher education.

The future of ESG is linked to their role in safeguarding the interests of our societies, and of course the citizens.

Thank you!
Regional Quality Assurance Framework – Interregional Recognition of Quality Assurance Agencies

ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework in Higher Education (AQAFHE)

Abstract

A key component in the pursue to establish the ASEAN Community by 2015 is the development of an ASEAN higher education common space, in which a common quality assurance framework will facilitate harmonization, enhance the quality of higher education and promote regional confidence. AQAN, the body who led the drafting of the ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework (AQAFHE), together with SEAMEO RIHED and AUN witnessed the approval of the Framework at the 2013 AQAN Roundtable Meeting in Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam. Appreciating the diversity and level of development within the region, the Framework declares the agreed objectives and principles for an effective quality assurance system – the external quality assurance, the external quality assurance standards and processes, the institutional quality systems and the qualifications framework. While these principles are vital and interconnected, acceptance and incremental implementation demand support and commitment from national key drivers and partners.
ASEM REGIONAL DIALOGUE
2014, KUALA LUMPUR

AN ASEAN QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK IN HIGHER EDUCATION (AQAFHE)

ASEAN QUALITY ASSURANCE NETWORK (AQAN)

Zita Mohd Fahmi
Executive Secretary
AQAN
POINTS:

- ASEAN Higher Education Common Space
- Formation of AQAN
- Importance of QA and AQAFHE to ASEAN Initiatives (confidence and recognition)
- AQAFHE Purposes and Characteristics
- AQAFHE – 4 quadrants
- Future Plans

ASEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY 2015

BACKGROUND:

- ASEAN agenda – ASEAN Economic Community by 2015


- 2008 Establishment of ASEAN Quality Network (AQAN) Kuala Lumpur Declaration
Establishment of EQAs in ASEAN

Importance of Quality Assurance to ASEAN Initiatives

- ASEAN Economic Community – Integration
- Capacity building-improving higher education
- ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF) (AANZFTA Project)
- ASEAN Student & Skilled Workers Mobility - Services
- Recognition of qualifications with ASEAN Partners
- SEAMEO RIHED, AUN and AGAN partnership common focus
Background of AQAN and AQAFHE

The 2011 5th Meeting of Director Generals, Secretary Generals and Commissioners of Higher Education in Nha Trang Vietnam agreed that:
- AQAN will promote on the benefits, capacity building & the development of the QA harmonisation Southeast Asian countries.
- Tripartite agreement with SEAMEO RIHED, AUN and AQAN 2011

Various AQAN Developmental Activities
- Information sharing
- Sharing practices
- Auditors workshop
- Dialogues
- Capacity building-
  - ASEAN QA Capacity Building Project with 6 partners (EQA-IQA) 3 years phase 1 & phase 2
  - IQA capacity building
- Future project
AQAFHE-purpose and characteristics

AQAFHE consists of 4 thematic interrelated principles

It is intended to serve as a common reference point for alignment by the quality assurance bodies, qualifications and higher education institutions

Improves consistency of quality assurance practices, provides clarity and builds confidence structure to facilitate recognition of qualifications

Strives towards harmonisation amidst the rich diversity in ASEAN countries

AQAFHE - 4 interconnected quadrants

1. External Quality Assurance Agency
2. EGA policies, standards & processes
3. Institutional Quality Assurance System
4. National Qualifications Framework
1. External Quality Assurance Body

- Appropriately established competent body
- Functions
- Policies
- Resources
- Independence
- Information center

EQA bodies – differences (developing, established, Restructuring)
- Brunei: BDNAC
- Cambodia: ACC
- Indonesia: NAAHE
- Laos: ESQAC
- Malaysia: MQA
- Philippines: CHED
- Singapore: CPE
- Thailand: ONESQA
- Timor Leste: ANAAA
- Vietnam: GDETA
- Myanmar (developing)

2. EQA – Policies, Standards and Processes

- QA Principles
- Accreditation assessment, and audit
- Programme-based or institutional-based
- QA standards and applications – criteria
- Generic to specifics standards
- NQF related matters
- Quantitative and qualitative assessments

- Different levels of implementation
- Highly similar statements of standards
- Good practices
- Differences in approach
- Capacity development
- National needs
3. Institutional QA Principles

- Institutional responsibility for quality assuring programmes and other academic activities
  - Internal QA systems / processes
  - Generally reflects EQA's QA standards
  - Self assessment culture
  - Stakeholders involvement
  - Performance indicators

Findings
- Strength quality systems varies across institutions
- Generally reflects EQA requirements
- Capacity building projects

4. Qualifications Framework

- **Principles**: generic guides pertaining to the characteristics of a national qualifications framework or its sub systems
- Underpinned by National QA systems
- Information center

- **Key elements**
  - Levels (8)
  - Learning outcomes
  - Credits and student learning time
  - Learner centered

- **Countries and Systems**:
  - Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF-2007)
  - Thai Qualifications Framework (TQF-2009)
  - Indonesian Qualifications Framework (IQF-2013)
  - Brunei National Qualifications Framework (BNQF 2013)
  - Philippines Qualifications Framework (2013)
  - Cambodia Qualifications Framework (2014)
  - Laos (in progress)
  - Singapore (Workforce Skills Competency Certification)
  - Myanmar (developing)
  - Various Credit Transfer System ACTS UMAP CTS ACFTA
  - ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework 2014-2018
Future Plans of AQAFHE

Phase 1: Endorsement
To acquire formal endorsement from ASEAN Community (2014-2015)

Phase 2: Capacity Building
Organise capacity building for members, strengthening partnerships and dialogues

Phase 3: Referencing
Promoting the use of the Framework in development and reviews of QA systems

Phase 4: Adherence
Voluntary benchmarking exercise by national systems

Terima Kasih

Zita Mohd Fahmi
zita@mqa.gov.my
Mr. Jens Bjornavold
Senior Expert
European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP), Belgium
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European Qualifications Framework (EQF)

Complexities, demands and impacts of regional qualifications frameworks - the EQF case

Jens Bjornavold,

ASEM dialogue on quality assurance and recognition,
Kuala Lumpur 25-26 August 2014
The EQF facts

What is EQF about?

The EQF is a common reference point - a translation grid - for European qualifications.

EQF simplifies comparison and understanding of qualifications across European countries.

• facilitates cross-border transfer of qualifications

• enables linking and combination of qualifications from different institutions and sub-systems
The design of the EQF

EQF operates with 8 qualifications levels described on the basis of learning outcomes and specified through

- Knowledge
- Skills
- Competence (with a focus on autonomy and responsibility)

EQF covers all types and levels of national qualifications, from those achieved at the end of compulsory education to doctorates. The aim, on a longer term, is for the EQF to also cover private and/or international qualifications.

Political and institutional basis of the EQF

- In addition to the 28 EU member states, 8 additional European countries have joined the EQF cooperation
- Coordinated by the EQF Advisory Group (representatives from all countries, employer organisations, trade unions and civil society organisations)
- The European Commission, supported by Cedefop, provide technical and financial support
The original deadlines set for the EQF

• Countries to link their national qualifications systems/frameworks to the EQF by 2010
• Countries to introduce reference to EQF levels in certificates and diploma by 2012

Actual implementation slower

• August 2014, 25 countries have linked to the EQF
• A limited number of countries (for example Denmark, Lithuania, Germany) started to use EQF levels in certificates and diploma in 2013 and 2014
The impact of the EQF at national level

The EQF – a catalyst for national qualifications frameworks

- A decade ago, only 3 European countries with national qualifications frameworks
- Today, NQFs are being developed and implemented in all 36 countries cooperating on the EQF
- NQFs have mainly been introduced to increase transparency of existing qualifications
- NQFs are increasingly used to promote reform of education and training systems
- NQF developments are still work in progress, less than 20 NQFs are partially or fully operational
Design and development of frameworks (1)

This stage decides the NQF’s rationale, policy objectives and architecture. The involvement of stakeholders determines future credibility.

By the end of 2013, most of the 36 countries had agreed on the overall structure of their frameworks.
Design and development of frameworks (2)

- 28 countries have adopted eight-level frameworks like the EQF; the rest operate with 5, 7, 9, 10 and 12 levels.
- Level descriptors now exist for all countries - inspired by EQF but considerable national variation – in particular on ‘competence’

5 have introduced partial NQFs covering a limited range, but 30 are working on comprehensive NQFs, covering all types and levels of qualification.

Formal adoption

Involves adopting a formal mandate - for example in the form of an NQF law, amendments to existing laws, decree or some other form; initiatives have been weakened due to delays in this area.

So far - 26 frameworks have been formally adopted - most recently by Croatia and Romania

Finland and Sweden are examples of countries where progress now depends on a formal adoption.
The early operational stage

Following formal adoption, countries start work on practical arrangements, such as the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, and develop criteria and procedures for allocating qualifications to NQF levels.

We consider ten countries – for example Belgium (Flanders), Germany, Iceland, Luxembourg, Norway and Portugal – to be at this stage.

The advanced operational stage

- At this stage the NQF constitutes an integral part of the national qualifications system
- We consider the frameworks of six countries - Denmark, France, Ireland, Malta, the Netherlands and the UK – to belong to this category.

Denmark adopted a comprehensive NQF (8 levels) in 2009 and completed referencing to the EQF in 2011.
- By 2013 the framework had become well known to national stakeholders (70% of respondents to an external evaluation knew it well).
- In January 2013, Denmark started issuing VET qualifications with an explicit reference to national and European levels.
- NQF levels inform national databases on qualification, thus increasing the visibility of the learning outcomes approach.
- The NQF provides a reference point for designing qualifications
Redefinition and re-development...

- NOF developments a never-ending story
- Requires Continuous review and redevelopment
- The moment a NOF is considered 'finalised' (and forgotten) it is in grave danger
- More than anything else, a NOF is a platform for continuous cooperation and dialogue and needs to evolve

The UK

- The UK pioneered NOFs
- Scotland, England/Northern Ireland and Wales have chosen different strategies as regards the form and function of frameworks
- Question whether the current multiplicity of frameworks supports transparency and adds value

Have the National Qualifications Frameworks come to stay in Europe - and are they making a difference to education and employment policies and practises?

- An institutional basis has been created
- The jury is still out on their impact on policies and practises
- Experiences show they can make a difference – but this is not a given fact
The European level implementation – technical and conceptual challenges

The issue of MUTUAL TRUST

- For the EQF to work as a common reference point across borders, it must generate mutual trust.
- The quality of the linking – or ‘referencing process’ – is of critical importance.
- 10 ‘referencing criteria’ have been agreed to guide and orient what is in effect a voluntary process.
- Agreement that these criteria help to identify national strengths as well as weaknesses.
- There is agreement that EQF process will continue after all 36 countries have completed the first stage of the referencing and end 2014/early 2015.
Key challenge – the consistency of national and European level descriptors

- National and regional level descriptors fulfil different purposes; the 'dialogue' between them poses a problem.
- National level descriptors need to specify how achievements increase from level to level; only then is it possible to refer qualifications to EQF levels.
- National level descriptors must clarify how different learning dimensions (knowledge, skills and competence) are understood and distinguished in order to refer them to the EQF.
- The precision of level descriptors can still be improved.

---

Key challenge – the learning outcomes principle

- Learning outcomes have not been fully implemented in all European countries.
- The placing of qualifications is thus not only based on learning outcomes, but is frequently reflecting traditional institutional structure/status.
- The understanding of learning outcomes differs between different parts of education and training, potentially hindering transfer and recognition.
- In some cases the application of the learning outcomes approach has led to changes, for example the placing of the German Master craftsman at level 6.
Challenges – the ‘placing’ of qualifications

- The placing ('best fit') of qualifications to a NQF and EQF level must be trusted and is thus of critical importance.
- Countries tend to provide too little information on what lies behind the levelling decisions.
- A tendency to assign 'blocks' of qualifications (for example all higher education or all VET qualifications) to levels.
- Some countries have carried out extensive testing prior to levelling (for example Germany); this clearly strengthens trust.

Challenges – Quality assurance

- Transparent arrangements for Quality assurance is essential for EQF and for mutual trust.
- Only qualifications with explicit QA arrangements supporting them can be referred to the EQF.
- The role of quality assurance in relation to learning outcomes and certification is a challenge and is weakly addressed by countries.
- The role of EQF in supporting recognition depends on strong QA arrangements underpinning mutual trust.
Key challenge – the role of international and ‘non-state’ qualifications

- The EQF cooperation has so far been between national governments working with national qualifications.
- The increasing role played by international qualifications (for example in ICT and transportation) challenges the EQF.
- The EQF provides a good instrument for comparing all types of qualifications, including international ones, but
  - Who should be given the role of assigning levels to international qualifications?
  - Who will have the capacity to monitor this highly complex area?

A final word – the need to address learners and citizens and the importance of stakeholder involvement

- The period 2008-2014 represents the first preparatory stage of EQF implementation.
- The period from 2015 and onwards must ensure that the EQF becomes visible to learners and citizens.
- The inclusion of EQF levels in individual certificates and diploma is of critical importance and will make the framework visible to a wider public.
- The future success of the framework depends on the involvement and commitment of stakeholders, not so much on the technical design of the framework.
Mdm. Teresita R. Manzala  
Chair of the AQRF Task Force  
Professional Regulation Commission, Philippines
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ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

Abstract

The ASEAN Integration 2015 will bring new challenges to the ten ASEAN Member States. The ASEAN Charter, signed in 2007, aims to develop the human resources through closer cooperation, and to enhance the well being and livelihood of the people of ASEAN, and provide them with equitable access to opportunities of human development.

National qualifications frameworks play a very critical role in the development of qualifications of ASEAN Member States. At the present time, they are in different stages of development and implementation. They are either sectoral, covering TVET, or unified, covering all sectors of education and training,

The ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF) was designed to function as a common regional reference framework and to provide a device for comparison of qualifications across ASEAN countries. It will support recognition of qualifications, development of national approaches to validating learning gained outside formal education, worker and learner mobility, better understood and higher quality qualifications system. In a series of meetings, the structure, components, referencing procedure and criteria, have been finalized. It has been identified as one of the deliverables for 2015 ASEAN Economic Community.

The presentation will focus on complexities, demands and impact involving the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework. The implementation of quality assurance mechanisms, benchmarked against established frameworks like the East Asia Summit TVET Quality Assurance Framework, and the INQAAHE and AQAN quality principles, will be most critical. The extent to
which these principles are actually implemented will determine the degree of confidence and trust countries will place on various qualifications from ASEAN Member States.

Another challenge is promotion of lifelong learning, premised on establishment of systems to recognize, validate and accredit formal, non-formal and informal learning. Some countries are way ahead of the other countries in this aspect, and a lot of capacity building will be needed to produce experts to implement lifelong learning. Definitely, the creation of a credit transfer system with the involvement of regulatory agencies, accrediting bodies, industry and academe will help the acquisition of qualifications.

There is also a need to understand the levels and the descriptors in both national qualifications framework and the regional reference framework. This will enhance mobility of learners and workers.

The referencing process based on the referencing criteria will need to be fully prepared for by the ASEAN Member States. Even though 2018 may still appear far away, pre-referencing processes may be conducted focusing on selected industry sectors in order to acquire the experience an expertise in the referencing procedure. Transparency and objectivity will make the process valid and acceptable to all.

The impact of the establishment of the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework will be discussed.
Regional Qualifications Frameworks: Complexities, Demands and Impacts

ATTY. TERESITA R. MANZALA
Chairperson, Professional Regulation Commission
Chairperson, Task Force ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework

ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

I. BACKGROUND

- Basis for an AQRF is derived from the ASEAN Charter signed by the 10 ASEAN Leaders in Singapore on 20 November 2007, where aspirations to become a single entity that is ASEAN Community was reinforced.

- ASEAN Charter aims:

  1. to develop human resources through closer cooperation in education and life-long learning, and in science and technology, for the empowerment of the people of ASEAN and for strengthening of the ASEAN Community and

  2. to enhance the well being and livelihood of the people of ASEAN by providing them with equitable access to opportunities for human development, social welfare and justice;
ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

Regional Context
ASEAN is a robust entity and has been active in building mutual economic and social cooperation between member countries.

The ASEAN region is typical of other regions in the patterns of NQF development across countries. Some have established National Qualifications Frameworks (NQFs), while others have a well established sectoral framework, and others are yet to develop or implement qualifications frameworks.

AQRF aims to accommodate different types of NQFs that are at different stages of development, ranging from those that are initial conceptual proposals to those that are fully developed, functioning NQFs.

GOVERNANCE

Composition of Task Force on ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework

- **Chair**: PRC Chairperson Teresita Manzana (Philippines)
- **Vice-Chair**: Megawati Santoso (Indonesia)
- **Members**: Representatives from ASEAN Member States (Ministry of Education, Ministry of Labour/Manpower, Development, other relevant Ministries and Qualification Agencies), Australia and New Zealand (non-voting members)

**Chairmanship**: 2012 - 2015
TASK FORCE ON AQRF

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE TASK FORCE ON ASEAN QUALIFICATIONS REFERENCE FRAMEWORK

☑ **Mandate:** to design an ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF) as a common reference framework for the region.

☑ **Functions:**

1. Promote and facilitate **peer dialogue**, sharing of knowledge and information, collective learning and support aimed towards developing mutual trust in NQFs and qualification systems between and among ASEAN Member States;

2. **Consult** with relevant public-private to arrive at a consistent and national position in the development of the draft AQRF.

3. **Regularly update the TF-AQRF**, including through inter-sessional discussions, on the outcomes of such consultations including comments and feedback on issues.

4. The Chair shall **report the outputs** and progress of the TF-AQRF’s work to the AANZFTA Committee on Trade in Services, SOM-ED and SLOM for information, input and coordination.
Finalization of the AQRF

- **Structure:**
  - Scope
  - Purpose
  - Principles
  - Quality Assurance

- **Components of the Framework**
  - Learning outcomes
  - Level descriptors
  - Credit or amount of learning
  - Linking national qualifications frameworks

- **Referencing**
  - Referencing procedure
  - Referencing criteria

ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

**SCOPE**

The ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework, a common reference framework, functions as a device to enable *comparisons of qualifications* across ASEAN Member States.

The AQRF addresses education and training sectors (incorporates informal, non-formal and formal learning) and the wider objective of promoting lifelong learning.
ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

PURPOSE
To enable comparisons of qualifications across countries that will:
1. Support recognition of qualifications
2. Encourage the development of qualifications frameworks that can facilitate lifelong learning
3. Encourage the development of national approaches to validating learning gained outside formal education
4. Promote and encourage education and learner mobility
5. Promote worker mobility
6. Lead to better understood qualifications systems
7. Promote higher quality qualifications systems

- will support and enhance each country’s NQFs or Qualifications System while providing a mechanism to facilitate comparison, transparency and higher quality qualification systems

ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

QUALITY ASSURANCE (QA)
- A component of quality management and focused on providing confidence that quality requirements will be fulfilled
- Requires countries to refer to one or more established QA frameworks as the basis for the agreed QA principles and broad standards
- Used as a benchmark for evaluating the QA systems for the relevant education and training sectors
- Promote QA of education and training across the region
- Underpinned by a set of agreed QA principles and broad standards related to:
  1. The functions of the registering and accrediting agencies
  2. Systems for the assessment of learning and the issuing of qualifications
  3. Regulation of the issuance of certificates
ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

LEARNING OUTCOMES

- Emphasize the results of learning rather than focusing on inputs such as length of study and support the transfer of qualifications, including credit transfer and recognition of non-formal and informal learning.

- To facilitate the linking of NQFs levels against the levels in the AQRF, NQFs or Qualification Systems should have qualifications demonstrably based on learning outcomes.

- A hierarchy of levels of complexity of learning which use learning outcomes as the metric for the hierarchy.

ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

- Aim to provide a reference point for the levels in NQFs and Qualification Systems.

- To facilitate the referencing process the AQRF is based on broad level of descriptors.

- Has 8 levels of complexity of learning outcomes expressed as descriptors.
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It includes:

- **Cognitive competence** involving the use of theory and concepts, as well as informal tacit knowledge gained experientially.

- **Functional competence** (skills or know-how), those things that a person should be able to do when they work in a given area.

- **Personal competence** involving knowing how to conduct oneself in a specific situation.

- **Ethical competence** involving the possession of certain personal and professional values.

ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

Level Descriptors include two domains

1. Knowledge and skills
2. Application/responsibility
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 1</th>
<th>Knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Application and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is basic, general knowledge</td>
<td>involve structured routine processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involve simple, straightforward and routine actions</td>
<td>involve close levels of support and supervision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 2</th>
<th>Knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Application and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is general and factual</td>
<td>involve structured processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involve use of standard processes</td>
<td>involve supervision and some discretion for judgement on resolving familiar issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 3</th>
<th>Knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Application and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>includes general principles and some conceptual aspects</td>
<td>are stable with some aspects subject to chance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involve selecting and applying basic methods, tools, materials and information</td>
<td>involve general guidance and require judgement and planning to resolve some issues independently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 4</th>
<th>Knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Application and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is technical and theoretical with general coverage of a field</td>
<td>are generally predictable but subject to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involve adapting processes</td>
<td>involve broad guidance requiring some self direction, and coordination to resolve unfamiliar issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 5</th>
<th>Knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Application and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is detailed technical and theoretical knowledge of a general field</td>
<td>are often subject to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involve analytical thinking</td>
<td>involve independent evaluation of activities to resolve complex and sometimes abstract issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL 6</th>
<th>Knowledge and skills</th>
<th>Application and Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is specialized technical and theoretical within a specific field</td>
<td>are complex and changing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involve critical and analytical thinking</td>
<td>require initiative and adaptability as well as strategies to improve activities and to solve complex and abstract issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Application and Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 7</strong></td>
<td>• is at the forefront of a field and show mastery of a body of knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• involve critical and independent thinking as the basis for research to extend or redefine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge or practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• are complex and unpredictable and involve the development and testing of innovative solutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to resolve issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• require expert judgement and significant responsibility for professional knowledge,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practice and management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEVEL 8</strong></td>
<td>• is at the most advanced and specialised level and at the frontier of a field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• involve independent and original thinking and research resulting in the creation of new</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge or practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• are highly specialised and complex involving the development and testing of new theories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and new solutions to resolve complex, abstract issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• require authoritative and expert judgement in management of research or an organization and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significant responsibility for extending professional knowledge and practice and creation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of new ideas and or processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)**

**Credit or amount of learning:**
- no specification for credit or amount of learning defined in the AQRF. However, such measure could facilitate comparisons across member states that is complementary with the goals of regional qualifications frameworks.
- Countries could develop a credit or amount of learning measures within their own NQF and utilize this measure for recognition process.
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REFERENCING PROCESS:

- For those countries with a NQF, identify in a broad sense the best fit of levels of the national frameworks to that of the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework.

- For those countries without a NQF, identify for national qualification types or for key qualifications the best fit to the level of the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework.

- Include confirmation that the accrediting and registering agencies meet agreed quality principles and broad standards.

The referencing process includes a single report that is approved by major stakeholders.
ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

Concept of Best Fit (Principle of benchmarking or comparability)

- Finding harmony between two sets of data (in matching NQF and AQRF level descriptors)
- It means that a qualification is not required to comply with all the descriptions of one level, but that it is positioned where the qualification best fits;
- It requires a common judgement from a range of stakeholders so that there can be confidence in the outcome of the approximation;

ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

REFERENCING PROCESS: requires that each country sets up a REFERENCING PANEL of key stakeholders.

Panel:
1. at least 1 international representative/expert
2. observer from one of the other ASEAN Member States

International expert: Qualifications
- Could be external to the ASEAN member States or internal to the ASEAN member States
- And should not be a representative of the referencing country or the observer’s country
ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)

REFERENCING PROCEDURE:
Aims to:
1. Describe a common structure for linking NQFS to the AQRF
2. Ensure that the linking process undertaken is robust and transparent
3. Provide a common reporting structure for the referencing report

- Using referencing criteria: to optimize consistency and to make the process of referencing transparent as agreed upon by the ASEAN Member States

REFERENCING PROCESS

1. Implementation of NQF
2. Documentation of processes, QA mechanisms
3. Referencing process (Proposed date: 2018)
4. Each country forms referencing panel
5. Panel includes international expert and one observer from another ASEAN country
Referencing Criteria

1. The structure of the education and training system is described.

2. The responsibilities and legal basis of all relevant national bodies involved in the referencing process are clearly determined and published by the main public authority responsible for the referencing process.

3. The procedures for inclusion of qualifications in the national qualifications framework or for describing the place of qualifications in the national qualification system are transparent.

Referencing Criteria

4. There is a clear and demonstrable link between the qualifications levels in the national qualifications framework or system and the level descriptors of the AQRF.

5. The basis in agreed standards of the national framework or qualifications system and its qualifications is described.

6. The national quality assurance system(s) for education and training refer(s) to the national qualifications framework or system are described. All of the bodies responsible for quality assurance state their unequivocal support for the referencing outcome.
Referencing Criteria

7. The process of referencing has been devised by the main public authority and has been endorsed by the main stakeholders in the qualification system.

8. People from other countries who are experienced in the field of qualifications are involved in the referencing process and its reporting.

9. One comprehensive report, setting out the referencing and the evidence supporting it, shall be published by the competent national bodies and shall address separately and in order each of the referencing criteria.

Referencing Criteria

10. The outcome of referencing is published by the ASEAN Secretariat and by the main national public body.

11. Following the referencing process, all certification and awarding bodies are encouraged to indicate a clear reference to the appropriate AQRF level on new qualification certificates, diplomas issued.
Referencing Report

The Report should include:

1. Information on the state of the report (first version, updated one)

2. Executive summary (related to 11 criteria and procedures)

3. Description of the national qualifications system and the NQF

Referencing Report

4. Background information

5. The eleven criteria and procedures for referencing national qualifications levels to the AQRF

6. Further information (plans, intentions, next steps, challenges, expected impact, plans for revising decisions presented in referencing report)

7. Annexes
Complexities, Demands, Impacts

Complexities

- Challenge: application of the concepts and principles contained in the AQRF to NQF’s of the various ASEAN Member States
- Example: Quality Assurance
- Different QA frameworks and arrangements utilized by different countries
- Bringing it down to the level of all stakeholders in different sectors
- Use of international/regional benchmarks
Lifelong Learning

- Countries to develop systems to recognize, validate, and accredit formal, non-formal, informal learning
- AMS in different stages of development
- Need for capacity building for a number of countries

Credit Transfer

- Pathways and equivalencies need to be defined
- Credit assignment made clear
- Establish credit transfer system, both national and regional
- Involvement of relevant institutions (academe, industry, etc)
Levels and Descriptors

- Understanding and interpreting the different levels and their corresponding descriptors
- Determining process of assigning learners/workers to certain levels
- Consultation mechanisms involving stakeholders

Quality Assurance

- Description of the QA systems for education and training
- Involvement of all agencies/institutions that participate in implementation and maintenance of QA
- Benchmarked on established frameworks like the East Asia Summit, INQAAHE, AQAN
Referencing Process

- Requirement:
  1. Full implementation of a sector or several sectors

  2. Documentation, participated in by qualification agencies, regulatory agencies, accrediting bodies, industry, academe, stakeholders

Referencing Criteria

- Adopted from the European Qualifications Framework

- Applied to national and regional conditions and context

- Transparency is observed
International Alignment

- Done at different levels
  1. Education and training
  2. Practice
  3. Competency assessment
  4. Awarding of qualifications
  5. Continuing professional development

Enhancement of Mobility

- AQRF: device to enable comparisons of qualifications across ASEAN Member States

- Each worker/learner will have:
  - NQF Level
  - AQRF Level

- Qualification recognition process easier to implement
Enhancement of Qualifications

- Qualifications agencies look at qualifications frameworks from two perspectives
  
  1. National
  
  2. Regional
  
Impact

Areas:

1. Facilitation of mobility
   Learners
   Skilled workers
   Professionals

2. Promotion of lifelong learning
   Recognition, validation, accreditation of all kinds of learning
3. Quality of national qualifications frameworks and systems

4. Quality of learners / workers

5. Development of national approaches to validation of non-formal and informal learning

6. Enhanced regional cooperation at different levels

7. Acceptable “zone of trust” among all ASEAN Member States

8. Acceptance and utilization of the AQRF by all ASEAN Member States
Summary

- The regional situation has been discussed with the status of development of qualifications frameworks
- The AQRF has been presented with the structures, components and referencing process
- Challenges were identified
- Impact assessment based on areas identified related to the purposes of the AQRF

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR KIND ATTENTION!
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Cross-border Higher Education
Cross-border Higher Education

Evolution of Transnational Education

Abstract

Transnational Education (TNE) is a component of the wider phenomenon of the internationalisation of education and grew rapidly since the 1980s (OECD, 2005). The general principle of TNE is to enable students to study towards a foreign qualification without leaving their home country. While robust data are generally lacking, available evidence suggests that TNE is continuing to evolve and expand. This paper provides a synopsis of the evolution of TNE with a slant towards the perspective of a host country. It provides the challenge to find a definition and ends with some questions to determine the future direction of TNE. In the main, it presents a small section of the finding of a 2013 study reported in The Shape of Things to Come - The Evolution of Transnational Education: Data, Definitions, Opportunities and Impact Analysis by the British Council.

1.0 Introduction

TNE, as is currently understood, is not a new phenomenon and one of the earliest forms is the movement of students to the country/region of award. From the concept of education as an export where students travelled to the country/region of award, the waves of internationalisation gave education a global business characteristic where degrees became products that can be franchised and universities became business entities with offshore branches. There are a number of underlying factors that account for the increasing prevalence of TNE programmes, including rising income levels in developing countries, improvements in technology and the increasing intercultural skills requirements of an increasingly globalised and interdependent world. At the country level, the drivers and rationales for TNE are often different for sending and host countries, for example sending countries are often interested in
generating revenue or developing international research linkages, while host countries are often interested in expanding domestic capacity or developing new academic programmes and administrative processes.

However, there exist many challenges for the advancement of TNE. Ensuring that TNE programmes are of a high quality and that qualifications are recognised by employers and the further education sector is of critical importance to the success of TNE. The challenge for the sending country/HEIs is to understand the local operating environment and the various approaches adopted by host countries to facilitate and manage TNE. The challenge for the host country/HEIs is to understand what they want to achieve from TNE and how to maximise the benefits that it offers. In practice, local environments and host country objectives differ markedly across countries.

Underlying these challenges are the varying definitions to what is TNE. Tables 1 and 2 provide selected definitions of TNE developed by the various multi-lateral agencies and jurisdictions, respectively. The jurisdictional definition is of particular interest as it largely reflects the in-country cultural and practical variations in TNE. For example, TNE definitions in Australia and New Zealand reflect its sending country status while China’s reflects a host country perspectives.

2.0 TNE in Practice
While TNE definitions vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, there are some similarities in the way it is delivered. In total six modes are identifiable (Table 3) and these are international branch campus, franchise arrangements, articulation, double or dual awards, joint awards and articulation agreements. For the current purpose, TNE practices such as distance learning, teaching centre arrangements, and fly-in-fly-out arrangements are categorised as ‘Others’. Apart from the delivery modes, some clear distinction can be drawn in terms of sending (Table 4) and host (Table 5) countries. Sending countries are the traditionally ‘developed’ countries with a strong presence in the export of education and for international students, while the host countries are largely ‘developing’ countries with large younger population.
3.0 Discussion

There are some general observations that can be drawn from the preceding paragraphs and information in relation to evolution of TNE, some of which are discussed here in brief. The first is that programme movement are largely North to South or from developed English speaking nations to developing countries. This is largely due to the fact that these developed nations are traditionally seen as higher education destinations for the elite and leaders of most developing nations. Secondly, the varying terminologies and definitions reflect the cultural sensitivities and nature of the relationship between the host and the sending countries. Thirdly, the most popular delivery modes reflect national TNE definitions which in turn reflect the national policies which are developed according to country needs. Finally, there is an ad-hoc move to quality assure TNE and this largely is due to the lack of a globally acceptable definition of what is and is not TNE. To a greater extent, today, after numerous meets and discourse, one can identify with some certainty what is not a TNE but as to what is, it is still an on-going debate. The difficulty to define TNE with some certainty is due to its creative nature. As a concept strongly linked to entrepreneurship, it is highly agile and evolutionary and will continue to develop.

This nature of TNE also poses great challenge in quality assurance of this sector. The main concern is that of jurisdiction, i.e. identifying the right QA authority is important. Apart from the jurisdictional issues, one of the fundamental challenges in TNE is variation of learning and business culture. Often sending institutions lack an in-depth understanding of the business and learning culture in the host countries and vice versa. This creates a dichotomy which in some cases brings the otherwise good relationship to an end. Another challenge is the lack of TNE regulation in some countries. While most TNE-developed countries did not regulate the sector in the initial stage, today TNE practice is so sophisticated that a lack of regulation will cause more damage than good to the country. Commercialisation of education and consequently TNE requires a gatekeeper and often the question is who should be the gatekeeper – the institutions, the policy makers or quality assurance agencies. Can common business practices like that of KFC and McDs’ be relied upon to ensure healthy practices in TNE? Finally the most subtle challenge is the impact on branding. With more students opting for TNE, there is a growing debate as to the quality of the awards in comparison to home awards.
4.0 Conclusion

To conclude this short brief, irrespective on how one views TNE; the catalyst or retardant for the development of higher education, the future of TNE is dependent on the recognition of a few basic facts. The first being ‘TNE is here to stay’. Sole reliance on recruitment of students for in-country study is no longer sustainable. Second, TNE at its very core is an entrepreneurial activity and that the access agenda is reflected today in supply and demand equation. Thirdly, research and development will not form the core of any TNE development though it will be an added benefit to TNE either through sharing of expertise or staff mobility. Finally with greater technological access and reliance virtual school or a blend there-of (depending on learning cultures) will be the future of TNE.

References:


### Appendices

**Table 1: TNE Definition by Multi-lateral Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Alliance for TNE (GATE)</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>‘Transnational Education denotes any teaching or learning activity in which the students are in a different country (the host country) to that in which the institution providing the education is based (home country). This situation requires that national boundaries be crossed by information about the education, and by staff and/or educational materials’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Europe ‘Lisbon Recognition Convention’</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Defines TNE as ‘All types of higher education study programmes, or sets of courses of study or educational services (including those of distance education) in which the learners are located in a country different from the one where the awarding institution is based’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO/OECD ‘Guidelines for quality provision in cross-border education’</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>‘Cross-border higher education includes higher education that takes place in situations where the teacher, student, programme, institution/provider or course materials cross national jurisdictional borders. Cross-border higher education may include higher education by public/private and not-for-profit/for-profit providers. It encompasses a wide range of modalities, in a continuum from face-to-face (taking various forms such as students travelling abroad and campuses abroad) to distance learning (using a range of technologies and including e-learning)’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INQAAHE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>TNE ‘includes distance education courses offered by higher education providers located in another country, joint programs offered between a local provider and a foreign institution, franchised courses offered with or without involvement of staff members from the parent institution, and foreign campuses of institutions developed with or without local partnerships’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: British Council, 2013, page 12
Table 2: TNE Definition by Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Institution</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China Ministry of Education</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>TNE defined as ‘Those foreign corporate, individuals, and related international organisations in cooperation with educational institutions or other social organisations with corporate status in China, jointly establish education institutions in China, recruit Chinese citizens as major educational objectives, and undertake education and teaching activities.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Department of Education and Science</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>‘Australian transnational education and training, also known as offshore or cross-border education and training, refers to the delivery and/or assessment of programs/courses by an accredited Australian provider in a country other than Australia, where delivery includes a face-to-face component... As distinct from education and training provided in a purely distance mode, transnational education and training includes a physical presence of instructors offshore, either directly by the Australian provider, or indirectly through a formal agreement with a local institution/organisation.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education New Zealand Trust</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>TNE defined as ‘the delivery of New Zealand formal educational qualifications by New Zealand providers outside New Zealand shores’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>DAAD emphasises the issue of academic responsibility in its definition of transnational education. Accordingly, in German TNE projects, the German university acts as educational provider and sets the standards for curricula and academic quality benchmarks, within an otherwise mutually cooperative frame-work (sourced from DAAD document).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from British Council, 2013, page 13

Table 3: Main Delivery Modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery Mode</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International branch campus</td>
<td>The sending HEI establishes a stand-alone satellite operation known as an international branch campus (IBC) in the host country and is responsible for all aspects of recruiting, admission, programme delivery and awarding of qualification. In addition to faculty employed from the parent institution, the IBC may employ local and/or international faculty to assist with teaching. Quality assurance of the programme is responsible of the sending HEI and is often subject to additional accreditation processes by the host country.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Franchise/twinning programmes

A sending HEI authorizes a host HEI to deliver its (sending HEI) programme, with no curricular input by the host institution. The qualification is awarded and quality assured by the sending institution. The host HEI has primary responsibility for delivery of the programme but the sending HEI may assist with delivery of the programme by providing flying teaching faculty. Recruitment of students and provision of facilities (library, classrooms, IT) is provided by the host HEI. Franchise programmes are typically 3+0 or 4+0 with all study taking place in the host country. Where the student completes the study in the sending country, e.g. 2+1, this is commonly known as a twinning programme.

Articulation agreements

Allow host country students who have completed a specified curriculum (award not of the sending HEI) to apply to a sending country programme (either being taught in the sending or host country) and enrol with ‘advanced standing’. (These agreements are sometime considered as a mechanism to recruit international students, but are included here as TNE due to the input the sending HEI has into the pre-articulation curriculum studied at the host HEI).

Double/dual programmes

Two or more partner institutions in different countries collaborate to design and deliver a common programme. Mobility of students and faculty between the partner HEIs varies by programme. The student receives a qualification from each partner institution. This results in a student receiving two or more qualifications for completion of one programme.

Joint degree programmes

The joint degree programme is similar to double/dual programme in that two or more HEIs collaborate to design and deliver a new programme. The sole difference is that students receive one qualification which includes the badges of each partner institution on the award.

Validation programmes

The process by which a sending HEI judges that a programme developed and delivered by a host HEI is of an appropriate quality and standard to lead to a degree from the sending HEI. The host HEI can develop a programme to meet local needs with the sending HEI contributing its quality assurance processes.

Others

Access/feeder programmes, credit transfer/study abroad programmes, short-term or partial credit programmes, distance learning programmes/virtual universities, tuition providers/teaching centres, bi-national campuses, independent campuses, corporate training and intermediary agencies.

Source: British Council, 2013, page 15

Table 4: Primary Sending Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TNE Data</th>
<th>Top Partners for TNE Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA)</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>1,395 ‘TNE programmes’ plus 73 ‘overseas campuses’; 454,473 ‘TNE students’ enrolled (ex DL)</td>
<td>Malaysia, Singapore, Pakistan, China and Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>TNE Data</td>
<td>Top Partners for TNE Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Australian Education International (AEI)</td>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>394 ‘TNE programmes with 140 ‘local HEIs’; 80,458 ‘off-shore students’ enrolled (ex DL)</td>
<td>China, Singapore, Malaysia, Vietnam and Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>200 ‘Double degrees, two ‘IBCs’ and six ‘German backed universities’; estimate 20,000 ‘TNE students’ enrolled</td>
<td>US, China, Russia, Canada and South Korea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: British Council, 2013, page 16

**Table 5: Main Host Countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>TNE Data</th>
<th>Top Partners for TNE Programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>730 ‘co-operative education programmes’ and 55 ‘co-operative education’</td>
<td>UK, US, Russia, Australia and Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Education Bureau</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,144 ‘non-local programmes’</td>
<td>UK, Australia and US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>563 ‘accredited foreign programmes’ and 8 ‘IBCs’</td>
<td>UK, Australia and US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Tertiary Education Commission</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>254 ‘programmes awarded by foreign providers’</td>
<td>UK, France and India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Higher Education Commission</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>128 ‘collaborative degree programmes’</td>
<td>China, Germany, Australia and Canada</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: British Council, 2013, page 17
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Introduction

- Existed for a long time - in varying forms
- Rapid growth from 1980s (OECD, 2005)
  - University College of Cardiff & Monmouthshire from inception, 1883 to 1893 – entered students for the University of London Programmes
  - Post-independence Malaya/Malaysia – skills and technical programmes – City and Guilds, Pitman.
- Internationalisation gave education global business characteristics – and we call it TNE

The Need for TNE

Sending Country
- Rising income levels in developing countries
- Improvements in technology
- Rising cost and competitive funding
- Increasing intercultural skills requirements

Host County
- Increase access
- Develop human capital
- Build expertise
- Improve graduate/staff mobility/recognition
- Enhance R & D
- Support internationalization
Ensuring that TNE programmes are of a high quality and that qualifications are recognised by employers and the further education sector is of critical importance to the success of TNE.

**Challenges to TNE**

- For the sending country/HEIs - to understand the local operating environment and the various approaches adopted by host countries to facilitate and manage TNE.
- For the host country/HEIs - to understand what they want to achieve from TNE and how to maximise the benefits that it offers.

**Definitions of TNE**
Developing a robust definition for TNE is no easy task

How to strike a balance?

TNE in Practice: Main Delivery Modes

1. International branch campus
2. Franchise/twinning programmes
3. Articulation agreements
4. Double/dual programmes
5. Joint degree programmes
6. Validation programmes
7. Others
TNE in Practice: Main Sending and Host Countries

**Sending Country**
- The United Kingdom
- Australia
- Germany

**Host County**
- China
- Hong Kong
- Malaysia
- Mauritius
- Thailand
- Vietnam

Observations

1. movement largely North to South or from developed to developing countries
2. varying definitions reflect the cultural sensitivities and nature of the relationship between the host and the sending countries
3. most popular delivery modes reflect national TNE definitions which in turn reflect the national policies which are developed according to country needs
4. TNE is highly agile and evolutionary and will continue to develop
Critical Factors for Success

1. Identifying the right QA authority & gatekeeper
2. Acknowledging variations in learning and business cultures
3. Having the right amount of TNE regulations
4. Sustaining brand quality

Conscious effort required...

... or should nature take its course?

Ministry to aid Pugsom students
Talks ongoing after John Hopkins pulls out

By Prity Bala

The Education Ministry will work with Perdana University to resolve problems faced by its students at the Perdana University Graduate School of Medicine (Pugsom). It was reported in an online portal yesterday by the Academic Medical Centre Sdn Bhd (AMC), a subsidiary of Chase Perdana Sdn Bhd. Pugsom is one of the two medical schools under Perdana University, with the other being the Perdana University Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland (RCSI). The university is currently operating from its temporary campus near the Mardi headquarters in Sepang.
Conclusion

The future evolution of TNE is dependent on the recognition that:

1. sole reliance on physical recruitment of students for in-country study is unsustainable
2. TNE is an entrepreneurial activity
3. the access agenda is now reflected in ‘supply and demand’ equation
4. research and development is the added benefit to TNE
5. virtual schooling or its variation is the future of TNE

Terima Kasih
rozilini@help.edu.my
Cross-border Higher Education

New Approaches to Regulating the Quality of Transnational Education

Abstract

This paper provides a snapshot of transnational education (TNE) in the UK, and discusses the outcomes of the 2014 UK consultation on the future quality assurance of TNE and the key principles to be taken forward for TNE review. It also references the current European project on the ‘Quality Assurance of Cross-border Higher Education’ (QACHE), which will report to the European Commission by January 2016. Finally, it reflects on questions for consideration about future approaches to TNE quality assurance, such as whether a single set of international standards might become an imperative, how we can facilitate greater co- between international agencies, and whether international standards will become more aspirational and focused on excellence in the future.

Overview: UK transnational education

In 2012-13, official statistics showed that there were 598,925 transnational education (TNE) students studying with UK higher education providers, with 78% of UK higher education institutions operating some form of TNE, across more than 200 countries. This table shows the top ten countries (by student number) for UK TNE in 2012-13.

Top 10 countries for UK TNE (2012-3, student numbers)

i) Malaysia
ii) Singapore
iii) China
iv) Pakistan
v) Hong Kong
vi) Nigeria
vii) Ghana
viii) United Arab Emirates
ix) Ireland
x) Trinidad & Tobago

Source: Higher Education Statistics Agency

UK reviews of transnational education

UK higher education providers are responsible for the academic standards of their awards, whether delivered inside or outside of the UK. QAA conducts reviews of transnational education according to the same principles and processes as its review methods for higher education institutions: a peer review, evidence-based process. QAA's TNE reviews have been conducted for a number of years, historically on an annual, country-by-country basis in locations including China, Hong Kong, Cyprus, India, Greece, Malaysia, the United Arab Emirates and Singapore.

There are a number of typical outputs from QAA’s TNE reviews, including country overview reports, individual review reports on each provider involved in the review and case studies on particular aspects of TNE provision. QAA's approach was highlighted in a report by the European Commission last year, as an example of good practice:

‘The only example of data gathering of overseas provision collected in a systematic way was found to be the country reviews conducted by the UK’s QAA... ‘The UK's QAA approach to auditing the exports of UK providers is a good practice.’

QAA’s TNE review work is also underpinned by international engagement and partnerships with other quality assurance agencies around the world, which will be increasingly important to give adequate coverage in future.

UK consultation: future quality assurance of TNE

In December 2013, a UK consultation, Strengthening the Quality Assurance of UK Transnational Education was opened, jointly managed by QAA and the UK Higher Education International Unit. A core question underpinning the consultation was ‘what is needed to
strengthen the quality assurance of TNE? and the presumption at the outset was that some strengthening of the present arrangements would be necessary, in order to ensure robust quality assurance for the future, safeguarding the world class reputation of UK higher education and students globally.

The consultation closed in March 2014 and analysis of the results has helped to shape plans for the review methodology to be adopted for the future quality assurance of UK TNE.

Themes emerging from the consultation responses included:

- TNE and UK institutional review processes should be complementary and closely aligned
- There should be improved linkages between the reports and recommendations of TNE review and institutional review processes, sharing findings, features and recommendations in future reviews
- There should be a flexible and proportionate approach to TNE review, able to identify areas which require future attention
- An improved database should be developed on UK TNE, which would inform plans for future quality assurance activity
- Desk-based analysis is an essential preliminary step in the quality assurance of TNE
- The TNE review process should continue to include international visits, which should also be used to highlight excellent provision as much as to investigate provision where potential risks have been indicated
- The quality assurance of TNE should include the UK approach to student engagement, unless there are compelling reasons not to do so

Detailed plans are now being taken forward by an Implementation Group, comprising representatives from higher education providers across the four nations of the UK (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales) and from other interested parties.

Future opportunities and challenges
It will be interesting to read the outcomes of the current European project on ‘Quality Assurance of Cross-border Higher Education’ (QACHE). The project is examining in detail the different ways in which European quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions
address the accreditation and quality assurance of the programmes delivered outside their countries, and will make its final report to the European Commission by January 2016.

As we look to the future for global higher education, there are a number of interesting questions to consider. As quality assurance becomes increasingly international, is a single set of international standards becoming an imperative? If so, what might we use as reference points (for example, the Standards & Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area or INQAAHE’s Guidelines of Good Practice)? Also, in the future, how can we facilitate greater co-operation, reciprocal arrangements and mutual recognition between international agencies, to give us all greater coverage for quality assurance, working with the resources we have? And finally, with growing arguments for international standards becoming more aspirational and identifying criteria for excellence, where will this take us next in the context of transnational education?
New approaches to regulating the quality of transnational education

Anthony McClaran
Chief Executive
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, UK
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Some of QAA’s main UK activities today

Review programmes for universities, further education colleges and alternative providers of higher education

Advisor to Privy Council on applications for degree-awarding powers and university title

Provider of Educational Oversight, on behalf of the Home Office

UK Quality Code for Higher Education and other key documents for quality and standards

Access to HE

UK transnational education (TNE): quality assurance today
A snapshot of UK TNE

Students studying for UK awards in over 200 different countries

598,925 students (2012-13): +13% on the previous year

78% of UK higher education institutions now involved in some form of TNE.

Top 10 countries for UK TNE (2012-13, student numbers)

1) Malaysia
2) Singapore
3) China
4) Pakistan
5) Hong Kong
6) Nigeria
7) Ghana
8) United Arab Emirates
9) Ireland
10) Trinidad and Tobago

Source of data: HESA (2012-13)

UK TNE review activity

- Malaysia 2010
- Hong Kong 2007
- Singapore 2011
- United Arab Emirates 2014
- Republic of Cyprus 2004
- India 2008
- China 2006 and 2012

QAA
Typical TNE review outputs

‘The only example of data gathering of overseas provision collected in a systematic way was found to be the country reviews conducted by the UK’s QAA.’

‘The UK’s QAA approach to auditing the exports of UK providers is a good practice.’

Delivering Education Across Borders in the European Union
(European Commission: July 2013)

UK TNE: United Arab Emirates (2014)

Focused on Dubai

Two particular themes:

Branch campuses of UK providers

Delivery of business administration programmes

Close partnership with local Agency, KHDA

Reports published in June 2014
### International networks:

- INQAAHE
- ENQA
- apqn

### International partnerships:

- Australia (TEQSA)
- China (CDGDC)
- Hong Kong (HKCAAVQ)
- Ireland (QQI)
- Japan (NIAD-UE)
- Malaysia (MQA)
- Singapore (CPE)
- South Africa (CHE)
- UAE (KHDA)

---

**UK consultation:**

future quality assurance of transnational education
UK consultation

‘QAA and the Higher Education International Unit will consult the sector on how to strengthen the quality assurance of higher education delivered overseas.’

International Education Strategy (HM Government, 29 July 2013)

Key themes emerging

- Improved links between TNE and UK institutional reviews
- Proportionate, flexible approach
- Need for improved information base for UK TNE
- Desk-based analysis, plus review team visits where appropriate:
  - Investigate risks
  - Highlight excellence
- Approach to student engagement
Next UK TNE review: Caribbean (2014)

Trinidad & Tobago

Possible other location(s)

Particular theme – distance learning

International recognition of distance learning

Incorporating changes following UK consultation

Future opportunities and challenges
European project: Quality Assurance of Cross-border Higher Education (QACHE)

'Between 1 October 2013 and 31 December 2013, the project will look closely into different ways in which European quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions address the accreditation and quality assurance of the programmes delivered outside their countries.'

Project members:
- ENQA (lead)
- European agencies (including QAA)
- TEQSA (Australia)
- Arab Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ANQAHE)
- Asia-Pacific Quality Network (APQN)

Final report to European Commission by January 2016

Other considerations

Do we want or need a single set of international quality standards?

What would be their reference points or frameworks?

Facilitating greater international co-operation for TNE quality assurance in the future

A global market for quality assurance services?

Moving from threshold standards to excellence
Anthony McAllan
Chief Executive
Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, UK

@AnthonyMcAllan
@QAAtweets
www.qaa.ac.uk

Registered charity numbers 1082746 and SC037735
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Abstract

Based on the cross-border quality assurance network in higher education (CBQAN) in Asia and Europe, this paper discuss the current situation of cross-border education and quality assurance (QA), challenges they face, founding background of CBQAN and problems to be solved. Furthermore, this paper puts forward the working plan, including membership development of CBQAN and Standards and Guidelines for Cross-border Higher Education QA formulation, which can promote the efficient developments of mutual recognition of qualifications based on QA between different regions.

Among cross-border education mobility, quality assurance as the core issue influencing the mobility quality and sustainably development, has attracted general attention from educational exporting and importing countries. In recent years, cross-border higher education has rapidly developed, gaining lots of experiences which deserve to be concluded and learnt. Meanwhile, it comes across challenges, such as:

The actions each education exporting country takes on cross-border education varies greatly, some countries (like QAA in UK, USA, TEQSA in Australia, etc) take evaluation as the supervising method on exporting education which a large number of other countries ignore.
Be lack of communication among QA agencies in cross-border education cooperation, especially in the aspect of sharing quality assurance achievements between exporting and importing countries.

Difficulties exist in the mutual recognition in credit, course and degree between exporting and importing countries.

In order to improve cross-border higher education communication and substantial cooperation in quality assurance, at the 4th Asia-Europe Meeting of Ministers for Education (ASEMME4), China proposed to establish a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN), which had been included in the Chair’s Conclusions of the ASEMME4 and gained common recognition.

Presently, the construction of CBQAN has been promoted actively. In December, 2013, CBQAN Secretariat was established in The First Meeting (Inaugural Assembly) of the Working Group on Implementing ASEM Recognition Declaration, being based in China Academic Degree and Graduate Education Development Center (CDGDC). CDGDC is responsible of performing the functions of the Secretariat with coordination of Britain and Malaysia, and it calls for cooperation of other nine member countries. In May, 2014, before the 5th ASEMME Senior Official Conference, on the basis of suggestions from UK, Malaysia and other nine members, CBQAN Secretariat has compiled the draft of Organizational Charter of CBQAN, as the following:

1. Backgrounds, referring to the background of CBQAN’s establishment;
2. Purpose, mentioning the work direction of CBQAN;
3. Mission, meaning the contents of CBQAN;
4. Framework and Mechanism, including the working mechanism, secretariat, membership, finance and conference; and
5. Other matters, which contains the review and revise of charter.

CBQAN Secretariat has reported the Organizational Charter of Cross-border QA Network in Higher Education (CBQAN) in Asia and Europe (Draft) to the 5th ASEMME Interim Senior Official
Conference and represented CBQAN’s website framework, which received great support from other countries.

CBQAN welcomes more ASEM members to join. Recently, CBQAN Secretariat will seek ASEM members’ advice and increase the range of CBQAN members. During the First Senior Official Conference of ASEMME5 in November, 2014, Secretariat will discuss the issues of holding the First General Assembly of CBQAN. According to the consensus of the ASEMME4 and CBQAN’s charter (draft), CBQAN Secretariat will devote to formulating the standards and guidelines for CBQAN, constructing the information platform, and carrying out comparative study, etc, so as to provide better service to more ASEM members’ cross-border higher education communication.
Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN)

LIN Mengquan, CBQAN (Secretariat)
China Academic Degrees & Graduate Education Development Center (CDGDC)

MALAYSIA, Aug. 25, 2014

Outline

I. Background of CBQAN

II. Organizational Charter of CBQAN (Draft) & Information Platform

III. Process and Project of CBQAN

Appendix: QA Information on the Platform—Take China for Example
1. Background of CBQAN

1. Growing Student Mobility

The Number of International Students Studying in China in 2012

- Oceania: 438
- Africa: 27,952
- Asia: 207,555
- Europe: 54,453
- America: 84,882

In 2012, more than 300,000 international students studying in China

The Number of Chinese Students Studying abroad

- 2014: 11.4
- 2015: 14.41
- 2016: 17.68
- 2017: 22.93
- 2018: 28.47
- 2019: 33.17
- 2020: 29.7
- 2021: 41.29

In 2013, more than 410,000 Chinese students studying abroad

2. Challenges that Cross-Border Quality Assurance Face

- The actions each exporting country takes on cross-border education QA varies greatly
- Lack of communication and cooperation among QA agencies in cross-border education cooperation
- Difficulties exist in the mutual recognition in credit, course, and degree between exporting and importing countries

Solution—CBQAN

- Build a platform, increase the communication and cooperation in cross-border education mobility
- Promote QA agencies to play a role in cross-border QA
- Provide qualification mutual recognition with quality assurance
I. Background of CBQAN

3. Reach a Consensus on CBQAN in ASEMME4

Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education

"The Ministers also welcomed China’s initiative to establish a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN)." (ASEMME4 Chairs Conclulsion, May 2013)

II. Charter of CBQAN (Draft) & Info. Platform

1. Contents of Organizational Charter of CBQAN (Draft)
II. Charter of CBQAN (Draft) & Info. Platform

2. Mission and Characteristic of the Charter

**Mission**
- Construct a communication and cooperation platform for CBQAN members
- Promote high quality communication and personnel exchange
- Facilitate healthy and sustainable development of cross-border HE in Asia and Europe
- Explore the formation of a platform for international cross-border HE quality assurance collaboration

**Characteristic**
- Focus on the cross-border QA cooperation, promote the communication and cooperation in bilateral and multilateral education
- Combine the qualification mutual recognition with quality assurance, promote the high-quality qualification mutual recognition

---

II. Charter of CBQAN (Draft) & Info. Platform

3. Organizational Charter of CBQAN—Task

- **Comparative Study**
  Conduct comparative studies in qualification framework and quality assurance, construct the learning and cooperation platform
- **Formulate Standards and Guidelines**
  Formulate standards and guidelines, carry out cross-border quality assurance activities, promote international cross-border HE efficient cooperation, provide support for academic and student mobility
- **Promote Program Mobility**
  Provide advisory information services on the cross-border education policy, quality assurance regulations, and cooperation programs for the purpose of providing help to cross-border higher education institutions, experts and students in Asia and European related countries.
- **Propose Possible Solutions**
  Analyze the difficulties and challenges and propose possible solutions.
II. Charter of CBQAN (Draft) & Info. Platform

4. Organizational Charter of CBQAN—CBQAN's Working Mechanism

1. Draft announcements and documents.
2. Organize and hold international conferences.
3. Set up cooperative programs, prepare action plans.
5. Build specialized website, provide CBQAN information for members via "ANICs website".
6. Manage the membership fees and report on the usage to the general assembly.

1. Related functions' organizations and individuals of ASEAN members, which support the charter.
2. Regional or international organizations can be invited as observers if needed.
3. Members should conduct substantial cooperation and share information on cross-border education.

5. "CBQAN website" which is a part of ANICs
II. Charter of CBQAN (Draft) & Info. Platform

6. Information Platform (website)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional System</th>
<th>Dynamic Issue</th>
<th>Comparative Studies</th>
<th>Evaluation &amp; Accreditation</th>
<th>Working Situation</th>
<th>About CBQAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally introduce the policies &amp; regulations, systems and frameworks</td>
<td>Provide up-to-date policy and method information about cross-border higher education</td>
<td>Compare the studies and characteristics internally and externally</td>
<td>Introduce the evaluation systems and activities</td>
<td>Exhibit various events of CBQAN</td>
<td>Charter, Mission, Secretariat, Membership, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Process and Project of CBQAN

1. Latest Developments

2013.12.10, The First Meeting (Inaugural Assembly) of the Working Group on Implementing ASEM Recognition Declaration:
1. Established the working group, consist of 5 Asian countries and 7 European countries.
2. Established the secretariat, based in China, in the charge of China, Britain, and Malaysia.

2014.5.7, The Fifth ASEMME Senior Official Conference:
1. Report the draft of organizational Charter of CBQAN
2. Exhibit the "CBQAN website" which is a part of ANICs
III. Process and Project of CBQAN

2. Future Working Plan (preliminary)

2014.07- Invite other ASEM member countries to join the CBQAN membership

2014.09 - Ask for advanced feedbacks on CBQAN's Charter; accomplish formulating standards and guidelines

2014.11 - Report CBQAN's results to the second working group meeting and ASEMME5 Senior Official Conference; ask for further advice on CBQAN's charter and discuss the next working plan

2014.02 - Consult CBQAN’s members, hold the First General Assembly of CBQAN

2015.05 - Report the achievements of CBQAN to the ASEMME5 Senior Official Conference

Appendix: QA Information on the Platform—Take China for Example

1. Cross-Border Quality Assurance Practice—CFCRS

International Rules
Government: Establish, or encourage the establishment of a comprehensive capacity for reliable quality assurance and accreditation of cross-border higher education provision, recognizing that quality assurance and accreditation of cross-border higher education provision involves both sending and receiving countries.

Chinese Policies
◆ "Implementing Measures of CFCRS Regulations of the PRC" (2004)
◆ "CFCRS Regulations of the PRC" (2003)
◆ "Regulations of Overseas Running Schools(provisional)" (2003)
## Appendix: QA Information on the Platform—Take China for Example

### 2. Cross-Border Quality Assurance Practice—CFCRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cooperation Agreement</th>
<th>Government’s Approval</th>
<th>Regular Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sign a cooperation agreement according to the policies and regulations in cooperation countries. (course recognition, degree awarding recognition, management and decision-making mechanism, etc.)</td>
<td>Get approval from Ministry of Education (MOE) before running a school.</td>
<td>Evaluate the schools and programs regularly considering the advice of quality assurance institutions of sending countries like QAA, TEQSA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Welcome to Co-construct CBQAN!**

**Contact Us:**

- LIN Mengquan director of Evaluation Dep., CDGDC
- CHENG Yongjun director’s assistant, CDGDC
- DONG Xiaoyu program officer, CBQAN Secretariat (dongxy@cdgdc.edu.cn)

- E-mail: cbqan@cdgdc.edu.cn
- Website: www.cdgdc.edu.cn
INTERACTIVE ROUND TABLE 3

Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition
Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition

ASEM Bridging Declaration – The Proposed Implementation

Abstract

Introduction to the Qualification Recognition and Quality Assurance of Cross-border Education in China, as well as the three initiatives proposed by the Working Group for Implementing the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration.

1. The Chinese Context

Ever since the 1980s, the Chinese government has long been upholding the policy of Reform and Opening up to the outside world. It is regarded as the basic state policy. And China has made tremendous success in this regard. President Xi Jinping reiterates that Reform and Opening-up are the driving forces for China’s social progress, and play a key role in determining the destiny of contemporary China.

In the process of reform and opening-up, China’s education also witnessed unprecedented changes. In line with opening-up policy, a full-scale, multi-layered, and wide-range education cooperation and exchanges has been formed. At the National Education Conference 2013, the Chinese Education Minister-Yuan Guiren pledged to advance educational reform through raising the level of openness to the outside world. At present, students going abroad and coming to China to study have become a very significant part to enhance internationalization of China’s Education.

Thanks to the economic globalization and rapid growth of China’s economy, the living standards of Chinese citizens have been greatly improved. Along with these, the demands for high-quality
education of many developed countries have become increasingly higher. Besides, the appreciation of Chinese currency (RMB) further facilitates the Chinese people’s access to go abroad to study.

According to the statistics of China’s Report on Outbound Study 2013, from 1978 to 2013, the total number of outbound-study students reached 3.06 million. 90% of them are self-funded students. The increase rate between 2007 to 2012 is nearly 20%. The number of outbound-study students in the year of 2013 alone exceeded 410,000.

China is now the No. 1 country for providing international students.

With the active mobility of education providers and rapid growth of inbound and outbound students, issues such as qualification recognition and quality assurance of cross-border education become more and more prominent.

1.1 Qualification Recognition
As for the issue of recognition, in China, I think it involves recognition of two stages.

The first is how to evaluate and recognize qualifications held by Chinese students when they are applying for overseas colleges and universities. We have discussed this issue with many officials of international recruitment department. They tend to think that the evaluation work is not only time- and energy-consuming, but also somehow incapable to verify the authenticity of those submitted documents, given the facts that there are large amount of applications, and China has a vast education system, with complex education types and levels, as well as diversified qualifications.

Meanwhile, fabrications in transcripts and certificates are found. In recent years, the scandal of fraudulent documents not only damaged China’s education credibility, but also brought negative impacts to the student mobility and even bilateral relations. These are regarded as hindering factors to the healthy development of student mobility.
It is believed that the agents for overseas study played a disgraceful role behind all these cases. However, the fundamental reason is lack of transparency in education information and inadequate communication and collaboration among recognition competent bodies.

In China, in order to strengthen administration towards qualifications, combat fraudulent qualifications, protect the legitimate rights of the holders, safeguard China’s education reputation, and also guarantee the quality of students mobility, since the year of 2000, China Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Development, entrusted by Chinese Ministry of Education and the Academic Degrees Committee of State Council, has undertaken the tasks of verifying Chinese Qualifications and providing counseling for comparability between Chinese and Foreign qualifications.

This effort, to some extent, has deterred Chinese students to apply overseas universities with fabricated qualifications. Of the 410,000 outbound students in 2013, 150,000 have come to CDGDC to have the educational background checked before applying for overseas colleges and universities.

The other aspect of recognition is recognition of overseas qualifications when students come back to China. Regarding to this, Deputy Director-General, Mr. Gong Wan from China Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE) will elaborate with more details at a later session.

1.2 Quality Assurance of Cross-border Education

Another prominent aspect concerning education mobility is quality assurance. Responding to this, the Chinese Government has issued a number of policies and has taken a series of measures.

In the past decades, with the internationalization of higher education, cross-border education has become one of spotlights in this arena. In China, the Sino-foreign Jointly Run Schools and Programs are the typical type of Cross-border education. The Chinese government boosts its development, and makes introducing high-quality overseas education resources as the requirement, improving competitiveness as the core priority, and cultivating talents with global
perspectives as the guiding principle, so as to meet the needs of Chinese people toward high-quality and diversified education.

In the past 10 years, the joint schools and programs have witnessed development with expanding scales and more diversified patterns, which has gradually become a fresh form of international cooperation, and a new approach of cultivating urgently-needed talents.

Currently, the number of government-approved joint schools and programs reaches a little more than 1800, with 40 joint schools and 800 joint programs offering courses leading to the Bachelor’s degree and above, involving educational partners coming from more than 20 countries and regions. All these make China become the biggest country in terms of the scale of cross-border education.

Meanwhile, problems also emerged, accompanying its rapid growth, such as setting up schools or providing programs without government accreditation, low-level duplication, too profit oriented, inadequate management and unsatisfactory overall quality.

Thus, in order to improve the overall situation and guarantee their healthy development, the Chinese Government decided to conduct a comprehensive review or evaluation to all the currently operating joint schools and programs which offer undergraduate education and above. The results of the evaluation will be publicized so as to welcome the supervision from the general public at home and abroad. If any severe problems are found, the Chinese government will demand them to correct within a certain period of time, or even cancel the schools and programs.

Quality monitoring of Sino-foreign Jointly Run Schools and Programs is also one of CDGDC’s major functions. The comprehensive quality review or evaluation is conducted by the Evaluation Department of CDGDC.

This is current situation in Chinese context. And I believe, in this globalized world, all the other countries are experiencing a similar or more or less the same situation. Responding to these, a
number of measures have been put in place. One is to promote a free mobility; two is to guarantee its quality. This is also true in the ASEM context.

2. The Three Action Plans

It is not long since CDGDC’s participation in the ASEMME platform. However, CDGDC has been involved in the whole process when the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration was drafted.

In December 2011, CDGDC was entrusted by the Chinese Ministry to participate in the Expert Group of Drafting the Convention on the Recognition of Qualification in Higher Education in the Asian and European Regions.

The original plan of the expert group was to explore to draft a regional convention on recognition of qualification in higher education between the Asian and European regions. However, after in-depth discussion, the expert group concluded that, since the Lisbon Convention of Europe, Asia-Pacific Convention and later revised Tokyo Convention basically have the same content and promote the same recognition principles. There might be no practical significance to establish a new regional convention over-arching the two regions. What is urgently needed is to set up a bridging mechanism for cooperation to clear the obstacles and barriers in the process of recognition practices.

In line with this, the Second expert group meeting held in Beijing, China in September 2012, drafted the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration. The Declaration advocates: firstly, the same recognition principles and rules shall be adopted among the ASEM member countries, in order to guarantee the balanced and quality-assured personnel mobility; secondly, national information centers of Asian member countries, as well as the network in the Asian region are urged to be set up. At the same time, a close communication mechanism among those centers and also between the two networks shall be forged, aiming to carry out concrete cooperation regarding the qualification recognition. This Declaration was endorsed in the ASEMME4 held in Kuala Lumpur, 2013.
In accordance with the Chair's Conclusion of ASEMME4, China led a working group to this end. And the Chinese Ministry entrusted this work to CDGDC.

In July, 2013, CDGDC in cooperation with China-ASEAN Center, held a workshop called “CDGDC-ASEAN Day”. In this one-day workshop, education officials from embassies of ASEAN countries were invited to discuss how ASEAN countries and China could strengthen cooperation and information exchange in the field of quality assurance and qualification recognition.

In September, 2013, CDGDC held the Seminar on China-ASEAN Education Integration, Qualification Recognition and Quality Assurance on the 6th China-ASEAN Education Cooperation Week. In this seminar, the plans to set up an Asian website for national information centers and to build CBQAN were discussed. The seminar also encouraged China and ASEAN countries shall cooperate in comparative research into national qualification frameworks and in collaboration in qualification recognition.

In December 2013, the working group was constituted, which was composed of representatives from 5 Asian countries (China, Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia and Republic of Korea), and 7 European nations (Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, UK). The first working group was held in Kunming, China.

In the first meeting, the working group proposed the three action plans, namely:

- To build a website for National Information Centers in Asian region;
- To establish Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN);
- To draft the Handbook of Guidelines, Principles and Good Practices on Recognition

2.1 Action Plan on Building a Website for the Asian NICs

For the first Action Plan, the working group argued: Currently, there is a big regional difference in terms of education integration. Since the 1980s, a series of reforms have been put in place, to forge the European Higher Education Area. A unified degree system, study length of three cycles and credit system are established. Cooperation among professional QA bodies and QR centers are encouraged to closely collaborate. In this process, education diversity as well as uniformity
have been given equal considerations. Thus, a number of accomplishments have been achieved in the education integration process.

In comparison with Europe, though Asian countries in recent decades have intensified communication and cooperation in political, economic, cultural and educational fields, yet Asia as a whole hasn’t developed such a deep integration roadmap.

To be more specific for qualification recognition, national information centers have been widely set up in Europe. And a network called ENIC-NARICs has been formed to facilitate collaboration among those centers. In contrast, currently, there are only a few Asian countries which are in process of establishing national information centers. And so far there is no regional cooperative network in Asia. One of the major functions of NIC, we believe, is to present education information, including the background information of qualifications of all types and levels. Since there is no efficient mechanism in place, it is hard to enhance the transparency of education and qualification information. Thus, lack of transparency and differences in education integration have brought obstacles and barriers for recognition.

Given all these, the working group proposed to build a website. The objective is to reinforce the information exchange among Asian countries, so as to improve information transparency. With the establishment of National Information centers, this website will provide an online platform for the future network in the Asian region, in order to forge a constant and instant communication and collaboration mechanism among QR bodies in Asian region and between the Asian and European regions.

So far, the web pages have been designed according to the information modules agreed by the working group. Information concerning China’s education has been collected and uploaded. At present, China is asking the Asian member countries to nominate country coordinators to help the website to collect and upload education information of their own countries. And we are expecting to make an official launch of the website by the time of ASEMME5.
2.2 Action plan on establishing the Cross-border Quality Assurance Network in Higher Education (CBQAN)

As mentioned above, China has become the largest country in terms of outbound-study students, and also the biggest countries in terms of the scale of cross-border education. These two facts imply that China still doesn’t possess adequate education resources. That’s why China still has to introduce the high-quality education resources to China and send students for oversea study. The education mobility in the ASEM region shares the same pattern. Comparatively speaking, European countries have richer education resources. Therefore, more Asian students go to Europe to study and more European education providers come to Asia to offer programs.

During this process, some education providing countries adopt very responsible approaches to their off-shore courses by monitoring the quality with the education receiving countries. But there are some other providing countries that are not sensible.

In the ASEM region, education ministers encouraged a balanced mobility. This balanced mobility should be achieved not only in scale or the numbers of students exchanged, but more importantly in equally-matched education quality. That’s why it is important to conduct exchange and cooperation in methods and approaches of quality assurance for cross-border education.

To this end, CBQAN was suggested to be set up. Unlike other QA networks like INQAAHE, CBQAN has a specific concern on cross-border education, aiming to raise the awareness of quality assurance of both providing and receiving countries.

In the education field, provider mobility is advocated. The ultimate result of this mobility is whether the awarded qualification can be recognized. The reason the working group wanted to put CBQAN into its work domain, is based on the fact that, it is a universally agreed quality assurance is the pre-condition for qualification recognition. Without quality assurance, recognition is baseless.

Besides, the issue of recognizing the third-party qualification (Education provider of Country A come to Country B to deliver a program, and a student of country C is awarded a qualification
after completion of all courses) appears more difficult. This type of recognition requires information sharing not only between education providing country and country where the program is offered, but also the country from which the student is originated.

In addition, in many countries, quality assurance and qualification recognition are two separated segments. There is little communication and exchange, let alone to have a mutually supporting mechanism, which can guarantee the free personnel mobility and safeguard the quality in this process.

Thus, the mission of CBQAN is to build a platform among QA bodies, as well as between QA and QR bodies to know, to understand and learn from each other, to enhance information sharing and experience exchange for all the parties involved through activities like conferences, workshops, and online networking, so as to raise the quality awareness and to facilitate recognition of cross-border education.

2.3 Action Plan for Drafting the “Handbook of Guidelines, Principles and Good Practices on Recognition in the ASEM Region”

The purposes of compiling this handbook is to inform recognition professionals, policy makers, higher education institutions about the principles, criteria and procedure of qualification recognition and to recommend good practices, in addition to provide relevant information for qualification holders seeking for recognition.

The working group agreed that the Lisbon Convention and Asia-Pacific Convention are the fundamental guiding documents. But a handbook is greatly needed to translate those guiding principles into operational practices. So far, Europe has the Revised Recommendations on Criteria and Procedures for Assessment of Foreign Qualifications, and Asia-Pacific region has the Toolkit for the Recognition of Foreign Qualifications: A Reference for Asia-Pacific Practitioners. In order to avoid duplication of work, the working group plans to compare the two regional tools, absorb the same contents and work out the solution for those different parts if there are any.
So far, the contents structure has been drafted. The first edition will be reviewed in the second working group meeting in Latvia. The Handbook is planned to complete and to be submitted to the ASEMME5 for approval. Hopefully, if it is endorsed by the ministers, it can be disseminated among the ASEM member countries.

There are our considerations for proposing the Three Action Plans by the working group. So far, the three action plans have all proceeded in accordance with each agreed speed. In the process, all the members of the working group have given their considerable efforts and significant inputs. The second meeting of the working group is scheduled to be held in Riga, Latvia in November 2014, at which the Working Group will gather again to inspect how the three Action Plans proceed. Some modifications might be made after in-depth discussion, in order to achieve a successful and desirable completion of the three Action Plans by the time of ASEMME5 in 2015.

To sum up, the Website is communication platform, the Handbook is the guiding tool and CBQAN is the support. All the three plans together aim to enhance information sharing, deepen mutual trust, and promote the establishment of effective collaboration mechanism for qualification recognition in the ASEM region, so as to facilitate a free, balanced and quality-assured mobility.
Quality Assurance and Recognition in China, and Three Action Plans for Implementing ASEM Bridging Declaration

Wang Lisheng, Deputy Director-General (CDGDC)
ASEM Dialogue on Quality Assurance and Recognition
August 26, 2014

The Chinese Context

✦ China’s Reform and Opening-up: since 1978

President Xi Jinping reiterates:

“Reform and Opening-up are the driving forces for China’s social progress, and play a key role in determining the destiny of contemporary China.”
The Chinese Context

◆ Int’l Cooperation and Exchanges of China’s Education
  ✓ full-scale, multi-layered, and wide-range

◆ National Education Conference 2013
  Education Minister Yuan Guiren pledges:
  “to advance educational reform through raising the level of openness to the outside world.”

The Chinese Context

◆ China’s Report on Outbound Study (2013)
  ✓ Outbound-study students:
    1978-2013: 3,058,600
    2013 alone: 413,900

  ✓ Increase Rate (2007~2012): nearly 20% annually

China: the largest number of outbound-study students
The Chinese Context

Issues accompanying education mobility:

✓ Qualification Recognition
✓ Quality Assurance for Cross-border Education

The Chinese Context

◆ Recognition in China:

✓ recognition when applying for overseas universities
✓ recognition when coming back to China with overseas qualifications
The Chinese Context

◆ Recognition when applying for overseas universities:
  ✓ Vast education system;
  ✓ Complex education types and levels;
  ✓ Diversified qualifications
  ✓ Fraudulent transcripts and certificates

The Chinese Context

◆ Fraudulent qualifications:
  Agents—profit-driving

◆ Fundamental factors:
  ✓ Lack of transparency in educational information;
  ✓ Inadequate communication between competent bodies;
The Chinese Context

♦ China: to verify Chinese education qualifications since 2000 (CDGDC) Credential Report ≈ Diploma Supplement

✓ to strengthen qualification administration;
✓ to combat counterfeit qualifications;
✓ to protect China’s education reputation;
✓ to safeguard quality of students going-aboard

♦ In 2013: 150,000 out of 410,000 verified more than 1/3

The Chinese Context

♦ Recognition when coming back to China with overseas qualifications

✓ China Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE)
The Chinese Context

✦ Cross-border Education in China (Typical)

Sino-Foreign Jointly Run Schools and Programs

The Chinese Context

✦ Scale of joint schools and programs: 1800

✦ Offering courses leading to Bachelor degree and above:
  ✓ around 40 joint schools
  ✓ around 800 joint programs
  ✓ educational partners from more than 20 countries
The Chinese Context

◆ Problems in Joint Schools and Programs:

- without government accreditation;
- low-level duplication;
- too profit-oriented;
- inadequate management;
- unsatisfactory overall quality

The Chinese Context

◆ Comprehensive Quality Evaluation (CDGDC)

- Target: government-approved schools and programs offering courses leading to bachelor degrees and above
- correction within a fixed time period; or cancellation of the schools or programs
The Three Action Plans

◆ ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration

✓ Drafted at the 2nd Working Group Meeting in Beijing

✓ Endorsed in the ASEMME4

The Three Action Plans

◆ ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration

✓ to apply the same recognition principles to holders of qualifications;

✓ to strengthen cooperation between national information centers, as well as between networks of NICs.
The Three Action Plans

◆ CDGDC-ASEAN Day: July, 2013  
  (in cooperation with China-ASEAN Center)

◆ Seminar on China-ASEAN Education  
  Integration, Quality Assurance and Recognition:  
  September, 2013  
  (the 6th China-ASEAN Education Cooperation Week)

The First Working Group Meeting

◆ Working Group (12) established:

✓ Asia (5): Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia,  
  China, and Republic of Korea

✓ Europe (7): Austria, Belgium, Estonia, Germany,  
  Latvia, Lithuania, and United Kingdom
Three Action Plans

◆ **Action Plan 1:**
To build a **Website** for the Asian NICs;

◆ **Action Plan 2:**
To establish a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network (CBQAN)

◆ **Action Plan 3:**
To draft a **Handbook** of Guidelines, Principles and Good Practices on Recognition;

---

**Action Plan 1: To build a Website**

◆ **Europe:**
European Higher Education Area

✓ **Education Integration:**
Degree system, Study length, Credit system
Cooperation among QA bodies
Collaboration among QR bodies
**Action Plan 1: To build a website**

**Europe: Recognition**
- National Academic Recognition Information Centres
- National Information Centres
- Network of ENIC-NARICs

**Asia: in the process of establishing NICs**

---

**Action Plan 1: To build a website**

**Objectives of website:**
- Enhancing transparency of Asian Education
- Urging Asian countries to establish NICs
- Laying foundation for Network of Asian NICs
- Effective communication platform
Action Plan 1: Website

- **Schedule**
  - Report to ASEMEES, 2015
  - Uploading Information of Asian Countries May-Oct., 2014
  - 2nd Working Group Meeting in Riga, Latvia

- **Launch**
  - 1st Working Group Meeting in Kunming, China QR experts 10 Dec., 2013

- **Solicit opinions**
  - China-ASEAN Education Exchange Week QR & QA professionals
  - 16 Sep., 2013

- **Web design**
  - ISQM of ASEMEES 8-9 May, 2014

- **Official**

---

Action Plan 2: To establish CBQAN

- China: Lack of high-quality education resources

- ASEM region: imbalanced mobility
  - More Asian students to Europe;
  - More European Education providers to Asia
Action Plan 2: To establish CBQAN

- Balanced mobility in ASEM region
  - Balanced scale;
  - Equally-matched quality

Important: methods and approaches of QA for cross-border education

Action Plan 2: To establish CBQAN

- Specific concern on cross-border education
- Raise the awareness of quality for providing and receiving countries
**Action Plan 2: To establish CBQAN**

- CBQAN in the work domain of the working group
- QA: pre-condition
- Third-party qualifications
- QA and QR: separated

---

**Missions of CBQAN**

- Information sharing and experience exchange
- Raise the quality awareness
- Facilitate recognition of qualification awarded in cross-border education
Action Plan 3: To draft a **handbook**

- **Objectives:**
  - To give references on recognition principles, criteria, procedure
  - To recommend good practices on qualification assessment
  - To provide practical information for qualification holders

---

**Fundamental Guiding Documents (Conventions):**

- Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region” (Lisbon, 1997),

- Asia-Pacific Regional Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications in Higher Education (Bangkok, 1983)

Action Plan 3: To draft a handbook

◆ Tools:

- Recommendation on the Recognition of Studies and Qualifications in Higher Education (Paris, 1993),

- Revised Recommendation on Criteria and Procedures for the Assessment of Foreign Qualifications (Sèvres, 2010)

- Toolkit for the Recognition of Foreign Qualifications: A Reference for Asia-Pacific Practitioners (Bangkok, 2013)

Action Plan 3: To draft a handbook

◆ Proposed Schedule:

- Agreed in the 1st Working Group Meeting in Kunming, China
- Structure worked out and agreed
- Drafted by China and UK
- Reviewed in the 2nd Working Group Meeting in Riga, Latvia

All the 3 Action Plans

◆ Proceed smoothly at each agreed speed;
◆ Considerable efforts and significant inputs from members of the Working Group;
◆ Comprehensively reviewed in the Second Meeting in Riga, Latvia, in December, 2014

THANK YOU!
Dr. Taiji Hotta
Vice Executive of International Affairs
International Center, International Education Division, Hiroshima University, Japan

Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition
Towards Interregional Credit Transfer – Credit Transfer Systems of Asia and Europe

Abstract

The Bologna Process is regarded as a good model for the alignment of regional higher education in Asia. Influenced by Europe, Asian higher education has recently attempted to improve the compatibility of its educational framework, developing a similar credit transfer system and implementing other reforms. This presentation discusses recent developments in inter-regional credit transfer systems in Asia and introduces the concept of Asian Academic Credits (AACs) that Asian higher education can adopt to promote increased student mobility. Should this concept be adopted by all Asian nations, most universities would be enabled to transfer credits on a one-to-one basis among themselves. Therefore, these institutions wouldn’t need to process copious amounts of paperwork to convert academic credits. It would also allow Asian institutions to transfer credits with other regions’ institutions using a simplified conversion table between AACs and other credit transfer systems. For the promotion of student mobility between European and Asian universities, these regions must also establish an agreement on a simple conversion system of credits and quality of education. They must also start a large-scale scheme of student exchanges, especially by encouraging institutions to jointly create student exchange programs, to achieve mutual trust from professors and students.

The Bologna Process is regarded as a good model for the alignment of regional higher education in Asia. Influenced by Europe, Asian higher education has recently attempted to improve the compatibility of its educational framework, developing a similar credit transfer system and implementing other reforms. Meanwhile, Asian nations have developed various university
consortiums for regional student exchanges, such as the ASEAN University Network (AUN), ASEAN International Mobility for Students (AIMS), and University Mobility in Asian and Pacific (UMAP). These attempts aim to improve regional student mobility and mutual understanding among higher education institutions within Asia. This presentation discusses recent developments in inter-regional credit transfer systems in Asia and explores permeable credit transfer protocols that Asian higher education can adopt to promote increased student mobility without copious amounts of paperwork to convert credits.

I. Needs of Inter-regional Credit Transfer System in Asia
The establishment of the inter-regional credit transfer system will not only promote university student mobility in Asia, but also cross-cultural understanding among people in the region by allowing access to both formal and informal education in different nations and cultures without misunderstandings about the actual value of education, which students have acquired. This will stimulate regional economies, providing more internationalized university graduates for regional companies and institutions. However, there are still some large obstacles. Misunderstandings and misgivings about other university's educational values, which students acquired from foreign universities still exist. This is largely due to a lack of a permeable framework in our regional higher education. A permeable framework is a criterion to measure the magnitude of educational values in each institution. These standardized measures illustrate specific differences between institutions regarding their educational contents, enabling institutions to improve their level of mutual understanding and trust. As a result, the use of a framework helps promote student mobility among participating institutions.

II. Lessons from European Experiences
Europe provides an ideal model to develop such a framework in higher education. The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) has not only promoted student exchanges under the regional student exchange program, "ERASMUS (European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students), but also became the sole standardized inter-regional credit system for Europe’s entire higher education system after the Bologna Process in the 2000s. This has drastically changed European post-secondary education. Now, Europeans can matriculate with fair judgment regarding their educational credentials and move on to other stages of their career.
or study, regardless of where and how one's education was acquired. However, this success didn't occur solely through ECTS. Other new challenges, like the use of diploma supplements and showing learning outcomes on syllabuses, have also contributed to an environment of lifelong learning.

III. Recent Development of Credit Transfer Systems in Asia

In Asia, there have been several developments of credit transfer systems in recent years. AUN has developed the “ASEAN Credit Transfer System” (AUN-ACTS) and has used it for student exchanges since 2009. UMAP has been using the “UMAP Credit Transfer System” (UCTS) since 2000, though it recently revised the main concept of UCTS. Most recently, Asian Cooperation Dialogue (ACD) has proposed its own credit transfer system, called “Asian Credit Transfer System” (ACD-ACTS). ASEAN nations are also considering a credit transfer system for the AIMS programme; Japan, China and South Korea are also discussing their own credit transfer scheme for a new student exchange program, called “CAMPUS ASIA.”

IV. Issues of Current Credit Transfer Systems in Asia

Although there are several credit transfer systems in Asian higher education, none are dominant in student exchanges among Asian higher education institutions over the entire region. There are also issues requiring dialogue among the Asian community. One major concern is the appropriateness of the ECTS modeled credit transfer systems, such as AUN-ACTS and old UCTS. The concept of student workload may differ between the cases in Europe and Asia. Further, many universities in Asia don’t count credits based upon student workload, but by the amount of teaching hours.

V. The "Asian Academic Credits" (AACs) Concept

To achieve a mutually agreeable credit transfer system in the Asian region, two comparative studies on the educational framework of Asian higher education were conducted and the resulting concept of “Asian Academic Credits” (AACs) was developed. The basic definition of AACs is;
One (1) AACs = 38-48 hours of student workload. This includes 13-16 academic hours of instruction.

Should this concept be adopted by all Asian nations, most universities would be enabled to transfer credits on a one-to-one basis among themselves. Therefore, these institutions wouldn’t need to process copious amounts of paperwork to convert academic credits. It would also allow Asian institutions to transfer credits with other regions’ institutions using a simplified conversion table between AACs and other credit transfer systems.

**VI. Effectiveness of AACs and Future Challenges**

Although AACs will simplify the process, it won’t provide information about the quality of education among institutions. Thus, in addition to AACs, policies of credit transfer systems must include additional elements of permeable framework. One important task for universities is to disseminate information regarding educational contents with each other. If a new, regional credit transfer policy can implement a fair, systematic, and transparent scheme to show the amount and contents of educational experiences using AACs and learning outcomes, student mobility in the Asian region will become more streamlined and trustworthy in the future.

**VII. Further Steps for ASEM Dialogue for Student Mobility**

For the promotion of student mobility between European and Asian universities, these regions must also establish an agreement on a simple conversion system of credits and quality of education. They must also start a large-scale scheme of student exchanges, especially by encouraging institutions to jointly create student exchange programs, to achieve mutual trust from professors and students.
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I-(1). Needs of Inter-regional Credit Transfer System in Asia

Positive outcomes from the development of an inter-regional credit transfer system:

1. Realization of “Student Centered” higher education in Asia
2. Establishment of “One Asian Higher Education Area”
3. Provision of truly internationalized workers in the Asian region
4. Cross-cultural understanding and mutual trust among Asian people for sustainable regional peace
5. More globally competitive regional economy in the world

I-(2). Need of Permeable Framework for Mutual Trust

1. Globalization = More Mobility of people in the world. More participation of many good, but not famous institutions
2. However, many differences sometimes cause misinformed judgments about a student’s credentials acquired from different systems/nations
3. This is largely due to the lack of readable, comparable and compatible information (permeability) on education among different institutions
4. Thus, a permeable framework of higher education is needed for Asian universities to promote trusted and attractive student mobility in the Asian Higher Education Zone.
5. The ECTS is a good example of a permeable framework
II-(1). Lessons from Student Mobility (ERASMUS²) in Europe

1. **Compatibility**: More compatibility of educational frameworks and their contents by promoting the use of a two Cycle System, ECTS², Diploma Supplement, and European Qualification Framework throughout Europe.

2. **Institutional Accountability**: More institutional accountability of a university by establishing one educational framework for an entire campus.

3. **Transparency for Regional Lifelong Learning**: More mobility of people in Europe using an aligned credit transfer system based upon the student workload.

4. **Teacher Mobility**: Built up more trust among teachers through the ERASMUS program for student exchanges.

II-(2). European Credit Transfer System (ECTS)

1. Europe has succeeded in developing and utilizing ECTS for the last 3 decades. It has allowed the rapid expansion of student mobility.

2. **1 (one) ECTS=25-30 hours of student workload** [25-30 hours/ECTS = 1500~1800 h / 60 points] (an average workload of a typical European worker).

3. ECTS is a very systematic and permeable credit transfer system: **60 ECTS/ year** (consists of the largest numbers of common measures, i.e., 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 15, 20, 30, 60) for the world.
### III-(1) Development of Credit Transfer Systems in Asia

1. Development of UMAP\(^4\) since 2000 with UCTS\(^5\)
   - the USCO\(^6\) Exchange program in Asia and the Pacific

2. Development of AUN\(^7\) with ACTS\(^8\) since 2009 & AIMS\(^9\)
   - Project since 2010 (Formally M-I-T programme)
   - Two exchange programs among the ASEAN nations

3. Development of ACTS\(^10\) under ACD\(^11\) since 2008
   - Regional in East, Southeast, South, Central and Middle East nations

4. Development of “Campus Asia”\(^12\) in East Asia in 2012
   - China, Korea and Japan’s student exchanges with QA

### III-(2) Recent Development of Two ACTSs and Old-UCTS

1. **AUN-ACTS**: (1) Modeled ECTS, (2) One academic year =60 AUN-ACTS, (3) One AUN-ACTS=25-30 hours of student workload (15-18 teaching hours?), (4) Used by AUN member universities in ASEAN nations

2. **ACD-ACTS**: (1) Uses a Malaysian concept (?), (2) One academic year =30 ACD-ACTS, (3) One ACD-ACTS =40 hours of student workload, (4) Can be used for all member states of ACD in the East, Southeast, South, Central Asia and Middle East

3. **Old-UCTS until 2012**: (1) Modeled ECTS, (2) One academic year =60 UCTS, (3) No Definition of Student Workload (4) Used by all UMAP participating states and universities in Asian and Pacific Region
IV-(1) Issues of Current Credit Transfer Systems in Asia

1. The Old-UCTS & AUN-ACTS have modeled ECTS in Europe. But ACD-ACTS (1 credit=40 h of SW)

2. ECTS is a very systematic and permeable credit transfer system. However, student workload for ECTS does not reflect an Asian workload (1500-1800 hrs./year in Europe vs. 1800-2100+(?) hrs./year in Asia)

3. Asia already has a similar tendency (One credit ≈ 40-50 hours in their regional credit systems)

IV-(2) Importance of “Permeable Framework”

The permeable framework is a set of various tools that measure the amount and magnitude of educational values in each institution. These standardized measures illustrate specific differences among institutions regarding their educational contents, thereby enabling institutions to improve their level of mutual understanding and trust. As a result, use of the framework helps promote student mobility among participating institutions.
V-(1) Recent Researches on Student Mobility in Asia

1. “A study on ACTS and credit transfer systems of ASEAN+3 nations” (a mission research of the Ministry of Education, Japan) was conducted during February-March, 2010

2. “A Comparative Table of 13 Asian Countries” & 7 country reports were posted at: http://ictlib.hiroshima-u.ac.jp /00030722 in early 2011

3. A further study, funded by the Japanese government research grant (KAKENHI-#24402045), was conducted between 2012-2014 and investigated the general framework and conditions of higher education system related to the promotion of student mobility in 24 Asian nations and regions

4. Those 24 nations and regions are: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei-Darussalam, Cambodia, China, East-Timor, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Laos, Macao, Malaysia, Maldives, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Singapore, South-Korea, Sri-Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, The Philippines, Vietnam

V-(2) The Concept of Asian Academic Credits (AACs)

This proposal is based upon the results of those two comparative studies; one for ASEAN+3 nations in 2010 and the other for 24 nations in Asia between 2012-14

1. A proposed framework of credit system is;

   One AACs = 38–48 hours of Student workload,
   (including 13–16 hours of teaching (academic) hours)

2. “Student workload is +3 the total amount of hours students spend for study, including not only lectures, but also homework, lab, writing term papers, etc.”
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V-(3) Latest Developments of AACs and Its Usage

AACs will allow many Asian institutions to transfer most of their credits on a one-to-one basis among themselves.

That means One Credit Transfer Zone in Asia

- One Credit at a host Institution = One Credit at home university

V-(4) the Conversion of AACs with Other Systems

The proposal continues to an even more developed (possible) conversion table below with Asian and other regions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nations &amp; Systems</th>
<th>AACs (Asia)</th>
<th>USA (2/3)</th>
<th>ECTS (Europe)</th>
<th>CLAR (Latin America)</th>
<th>UK (CATS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Conversion</td>
<td>1 AACs</td>
<td>≈1 credit</td>
<td>≈1.5 ECTS</td>
<td>≈1.5 CLAR</td>
<td>≈3 credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student workload</td>
<td>38-48 hours</td>
<td>≈45 hours</td>
<td>37.5-45 hours</td>
<td>37.5-45 hours</td>
<td>Converted from ECTS (30 hours?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching hours</td>
<td>13-16 hours</td>
<td>≈15-16 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This chart requires more detailed explanations regarding each indicator*
VI-(1) Effectiveness of AACs and future challenges

**The Efficiency of Credit Transfer**
Simple conversion of credits not only with other Asian and Pacific universities, but also universities in the world

NEVERTHELESS! The AAC’s concept, like all other credit transfer systems, DOES NOT have any function related to measuring the level of difficulty or the equivalency of content in courses through comparison with courses at the home institution. Thus, each institution has to make their own measurements based upon data provided from the host institution.

VI-(2) New Developments in AACs

UMAP (An international group for student mobility in the Asia and Pacific region) has adopted the concept of AACs as a new concept of UCTS from 2013

The SEAMEO-RIHED is now reviewing a possible use of the concept of AACs as a part of their new credit transfer scheme, temporarily called, “ACTFA” for two different types of student mobility projects among ASEAN nations
VII-(1) Next Steps to Promote Student Mobility in Asia and EU

1. European and Asian nations should establish a mutual agreement on a general policy of student mobility in EU-ASIA higher education networks with an aligned system of credit and quality transfer.

2. European and Asian nations should also implement a large-scale student exchange programme, particularly using the above aligned system and the scheme of joint teaching to develop mutual trust.

VII-(2) Development of CTS with Student Mobility (1)

1. Count credits using student’s workload concept, and promote how to convert teaching hours into students’ workload.

2. Consideration of an “Asian Common Credit” (ACC) concept: One AACs = 38-48 hours of student’s workload, so that many institutions can transfer credit on a one to one basis in Asia and by 1 AACs = 1.5 or 1.6 ECTS with Europe.

3. Joint Study: Teach some courses with foreign professors jointly and also try to accept the credit transfer of core subjects.
VII-(3) Development of CTS with Student Mobility (2)

4. Improve the **transparency** of education by providing (1) syllabuses, (2) course catalogues, and (3) transcripts with detailed information, like diploma supplements.

5. **Measure the Quality**: Use **learning outcomes** to improve the quality of education.

6. **Use of a Study plan** (Learning agreement): Require students to fill in a study plan form with approval from both the home and host institution.

---

**THANK YOU**

Taiji Hotta, Ph.D
Vice-Executive of International Affairs, Associate Professor, Hiroshima University, Japan
hotta@hiroshima-u.ac.jp
Glossary

1. AACs: Asian Academic Credits
2. ECTS: European Credit Transfer System
3. ERASMUS: European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students
4. UMAP: University Mobility in Asia and Pacific
5. UCAS: UMAP Credit Transfer Scheme
6. USCO: UMAP Student Connection Online
7. AUN: ASEAN University Network
8. AUN's ACTS: ASEAN Credit Transfer System
9. AIMS: ASEAN International Mobility for Student Programs (Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and Vietnam)
   (formerly M-I-I project)
10. ACD's ACTS: Asian Credit Transfer System
11. ACD: Asian Cooperation Dialogue
12. CAMPUS-ASIA: the Collective Action for Mobility Program of University Students in Asia
13. CLAR: Latin American Reference Credit
14. CATS: Credit for Accumulation and Transfer Scheme
   (in UK)
15. SEAMEO-RHED: Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization-Regional Center for Higher Education
16. ACTFA: Academic Credit Transfer for ASEAN

Some References


Ms. Karen Chalmers  
Director  
International and Policy, New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA), New Zealand

Professor Zita Mohd Fahmi  
Deputy Chief Executive Officer (Quality Assurance)  
Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA), Malaysia

Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition  
Comparability Exercise – Building Confidence to Support Recognition of Quality Assurance and Qualification Systems

Abstract

Recognition reflects a formal or legal acknowledgement that a qualification has fulfilled conditions set by recognition authorities for it to be accepted. National systems through relevant bodies such as ministries, quality assurance agencies and professional bodies and their stakeholders have developed systems and practices to meet their needs – from mutual recognition arrangements, multilateral and bilateral agreements or even unilateral arrangements. Recognition includes practices such as ‘referencing, benchmarking and comparing’ one system with a regional framework, or through peer referencing between two national frameworks. The peer referencing project undertaken by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority and the Malaysian Qualifications Agency established that quality assurance bodies can contribute significantly to the assessment of qualifications for comparability and to the confidence of their quality.

As a result of the increasing global mobility of learners and workers, issues of recognition of qualifications have been guided by international conventions for recognition under the auspices of UNESCO. Qualifications recognition systems have been developed by countries with variation in the approaches adopted. In addition, the phenomenal development of National
Qualifications Frameworks (NQF) and the growing number of Regional Qualifications Frameworks (RQF) across the world is increasing the transparency of qualifications. Quality assurance is a key component underpinning national qualifications frameworks; confidence in those quality assurance systems is vital in developing trust in the qualifications, their value and their subsequent recognition.

International recognition conventions require that signatories develop clear, transparent and cost effective processes for qualifications recognition. Designated competent bodies use appropriate assessment processes which include taking into account the outcomes of qualifications on the national qualifications framework or qualifications system, its supporting, quality assurance system and the evidence provided by the national information centre. These processes support transparency and contribute to the development of a zone of trust or confidence (as set out in the recognition conventions of UNESCO).

Recognition reflects a formal or legal acknowledgement that a qualification has fulfilled conditions set by recognition authorities for it to be accepted. National systems through relevant bodies such as ministries, quality assurance agencies and professional bodies and their stakeholders have developed systems and practices to meet their needs – from mutual recognition arrangements, multilateral and bilateral agreements or even unilateral arrangements. Recognition includes practices such as ‘referencing, benchmarking and comparing’ one system with a regional framework, or through peer referencing between two national frameworks. The peer referencing project undertaken by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) and the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) established that quality assurance bodies can contribute significantly to the assessment of qualifications for comparability and to the confidence of their quality.

Both NZQA and MQA are quality assurance bodies with responsibility for their national qualifications framework. NZQA and MQA have a long standing relationship between them which began when Malaysia embarked on the establishment of an external quality assurance agency, Lembaga Akreditasi Negara-LAN, in the mid-1990s. This relationship was renewed when the Malaysian Qualifications Agency was established in 2007.
The project addressed the commitment made by the Malaysian and New Zealand governments in the Malaysia-New Zealand Free Trade Agreement (MNZFTA) which was signed in 2009. Article 8.9 (7) of Chapter 8 in the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) required the establishment of a mechanism that allows for the recognition of the equivalency of qualifications granted within the territory of the other party. The term equivalency used in the FTA is understood by both parties as meaning the broad comparability of qualifications. The progress and outcomes of the project are reported back to the Joint Commission which oversees the FTA. The mechanism was established through a Memorandum of Cooperation (MOC) between the New Zealand Qualifications Authority and the Malaysian Qualifications Agency signed in 2011. One area of cooperation was to explore the compatibility of the New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF) and the Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF), and the comparability of the NZQF and MQF qualifications. A pilot project undertaken under the MOC was related to the Bachelor degree level qualifications for practical reasons whilst the other levels were earmarked for future projects.

The project began with formal meetings and the appointment of a Working Group which included technical experts from each country. NZQA being the more experienced party shared previous similar experiences. Both parties agreed on the outcomes, a Terms of Reference, a robust approach and methodology and a schedule of milestones and deliverables for the project. Both sides used national advisory groups and appointed independent international experts to comment as the project content was developed. The international experts provided a neutral, informed and trusted voice, commenting on the suitability of criteria, methodology, the way both parties addressed the criteria and methodology and the conclusions reached. The outcomes were jointly agreed and communicated to relevant parties. The project took almost 18 months to complete. Each party covered its own costs and this was minimized by used of online discussions and video conferencing. Discussions on the matching of levels between the frameworks, the comparability of the qualifications and technical matters were held in face to face meetings.

The main purpose of the pilot project was to recognize Bachelor degrees based on the compatibility of the NZQF and MQF as well as the quality assurance practices and the
comparability of the qualifications. The project adapted the well accepted international criteria and procedures used by the Bologna Process member states to reference their NQFs against the European Higher Education Area framework (Bologna Framework). Each side provided evidence for the five criteria: that they were the designated bodies with responsibility for the NQF in their country, that they had procedures for inclusion of accredited qualifications and programmes onto their NQF, that their NQF used learning outcomes and credit allocation, and that a robust national on-going quality assurance system underpinned the NQF and the delivery of qualifications.

The concept of best fit was used to make judgements on the compatibility of the two NQFs. There were clear similarities in the way the NZQF and the MQF describe learning outcomes, are based on similar robust and transparent processes for including qualifications on the NQFs and have similar quality assurance processes; differences in the systems were identified and noted. The overall judgement was that the two NQFs were compatible. As the project also covered qualification types, the Bachelor degrees, it was appropriate to use the terms similar or substantial difference from the Lisbon Convention, in making judgements on the qualifications. Again there were differences in the Bachelor degrees but the overall judgement was that the qualifications were comparable.

This pilot project was successfully completed in 2012 with a signed Joint Statement on Recognition of Bachelor Degrees by MQA and NZQA noting that the Bachelor degrees are comparable and the NQZF and MQF and their quality assurance systems are compatible. A technical exchange programme that provided mutual participation in quality assurance and qualifications recognition activities was completed this year. This was to build confidence and verify the judgements reached in the Reference Framework. Technical staff observed the systems of the other agency through briefings, observations and site visits. These exchanges have also helped to strengthen the relationship between NZQA and MQA.

MQA and NZQA will be renewing their MOC this year and the focus is to further develop the zone of trust between the two agencies, promoting a better understanding and confidence in each other’s qualification systems. The next comparability exercise will focus on higher level
qualifications. Elements of timeliness, openness, transparency and respect for differences were essential to the project. In addition, the sharing of good practices enhances the quality assurance systems.
Comparability Exercise - Building Confidence to Support Recognition of Quality Assurance and Qualification Systems

The New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) and Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) education cooperation on the recognition of qualifications

- Karen Chalmers, Director International and Policy, NZQA
- Prof Zita Mohd Fahmi, Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Quality Assurance, MQA
New Zealand Qualifications Framework

In 1992, New Zealand developed one of the first qualifications frameworks in the world – the National Qualifications Framework (NZQF).

A major change in 2001/2002 legislation resulted in the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications. The levels were extended from 8 to 10 on the NZQF.

In July 2010, the New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF) replaced both the NZQF and the New Zealand Register of Quality Assured Qualifications. The NZQF:
- Is a definitive source for accurate and current information on quality assured qualifications in New Zealand
- Covers senior secondary school qualifications and tertiary education qualifications
- Employs the language of learning outcomes systematically across all the 10 levels
- Qualifications contain outcome statements which describe the knowledge, skills and attributes of a graduate
- Outcome statement is used by prospective employers and other tertiary education organisations, and for comparing qualifications.

Malaysian Qualifications Framework

Malaysia explored the need for an NZQF in 2002 under the leadership of the then National Accreditation Board (LAN).

LAN was preceded by the Malaysian Qualifications Agency – established in 2007 (MQA Act, 2007) entrusted to implement the MQF.

Transition period was provided between 2008-2010 to allow migration to MQF for all programmes. Full compliance in 2011 onwards:
- Covers post secondary education and training qualifications
- Uses the language of learning outcomes and credits to provide for academic load and student learning time for each of the 8 levels
- Programme and qualification must provide the outcome statements (guided by MQF and Programme Disciplines Standards).

Amongst the legal requirements of the Act provided are:
- No programme will be accredited unless it is in compliance with the MQF
  - Accredited qualifications are registered in the Malaysian Qualifications Register (MQR)
  - Equivalency and comparability assessment of qualifications must be against the Framework.
Governance

Set up Governance
A working group was established on the recognition of Malaysian and New Zealand qualifications.

Terms of Reference for the NZQA-MQA Working Group was agreed to:

- A reporting mechanism was agreed with co-chairs of the working group reporting to their respective Chief Executives (CEs)
- CEs report to the TQA Joint Commission
- A Working Group consisting of designated representatives of NZQA and MOA meet at least twice a year
- A Summary of Decisions is jointly agreed by CEs at the conclusion of each working group meeting
- Both parties work in the spirit of good will and cooperation to meet project milestones, deliverables, and outcomes.

Methodology

Set up Project
- Both Parties agreed to a pilot project: the ‘Recognition of Bachelor Degree project’.

- A Reference Framework was developed:
  - Methodology adapted well accepted international criteria: the criteria for verification that national frameworks are compatible with the European Higher Education Area framework (Bologna Framework) and the procedures used for self-certification of compatibility
  - Adapted criteria formed the basis of the Reference Framework for comparing each other’s systems
  - Exchange of information on each side’s qualifications and quality assurance policies and procedures populated the Reference Framework
  - There was free and frank discussion and questioning on each other’s systems as the text was drafted and agreed.
Methodology

Agreement on Technical Matching
Comparative analysis of the selected level of the NZQF.
- Analysing the concepts along a scale of similarity - the 'Best-fit' approach:
  - Qualification definition
  - Level descriptors
  - Purpose
  - Learning outcomes.
- Analysing the non-outcomes criteria using a judgement of 'Similar' or 'Substantial Difference':
  - Entry and credit requirements
  - Relation to other qualifications/Progression opportunities

Contextual Matching - Engagement with key stakeholders
- NZQA and MQA also formed their own internal advisory groups and discussed feedback at NZQA-MQA Working Group.
- Consultation with relevant national stakeholders.
- Exchange and cooperation through engagement with key stakeholders.

Independent advice
- International experts engaged for both parties provided independent advice on the technical matching process.
- Comment and advice on the Reference Framework criteria, Reference Framework populated text, Comparative Analysis, and Judgements.
Methodology

Post comparability

- Periodic review highlights trends that might challenge and/or verify the outcome of the comparative exercise.
- NZQA and MQA updated the Recognition of Bachelor Degrees Reference Framework to review changes to legislation and functions.

Overall Judgement

The NZQF Level 7 Bachelor degree and the MQF Level 6 Bachelor Degrees are comparable. The New Zealand Qualifications Framework (NZQF) and Malaysian Qualifications Framework (MQF), and their quality assurance systems are compatible with regard to Bachelor Degree qualifications.

The NZQF and MQF are unified and coherent frameworks. There are clear similarities in the way the NZQF and MQF describe learning outcomes, and the definitions and purpose of the Bachelor Degrees are based on similar concepts. Both frameworks operate similar robust and transparent entry and quality assurance systems.

Qualifications that are required to meet regulated occupational standards for the purpose of practice are excluded.
Joint Statement

On 13 August 2012, NZQA and MQA signed a Joint Statement on the Recognition of Bachelor Degrees qualification.

The Joint Statement on the Recognition of Bachelor Degrees project found that the:
- NZQF Level 7 Bachelor degree and the MOF Level 6 Bachelor Degree are comparable
- NZQF and MOF and their quality assurance systems are compatible with regard to Bachelor Degree qualifications.

The NZQA Board endorsed the overall judgement and Joint Statement on 31 May 2012.

The MOA Council endorsed the report on 9 August 2012.

Confidence in Quality Assurance
Processes and Outcomes: Technical Exchange Programmes

Technical Exchange:
The purpose of the technical exchange programme was to verify the conclusions of the Recognition of Bachelor Degrees project.

- A schedule of activities (briefings, observations, site visits) allowed for NZQA and MOA technical staff to participate in, or observe the policies and procedures outlined in the Reference Framework.

The technical exchange programme provided:
- An increase in the capability of expert staff on NZQA and MOA qualification and quality assurance systems
- The establishment of a working partnership at an operational level.
Outcomes

Recognition of Bachelor Degrees Reference Framework
- A Reference document that provides the evidence and basis from which judgments were made for the comparative analysis.

Joint Statement on the Recognition of Bachelor Degrees
- A signed Joint Statement outlining the methods, overall judgement, and conclusions under each criteria of the Reference Framework.

Technical Exchange Summary Report
- Verification of the findings through briefings, observations, and site visits.

Zone of Trust

- A ‘Zone of Trust’ was established between NZQA and MQA.
- The Recognition of Bachelor Degrees project has developed an understanding of each other’s qualifications frameworks and quality assurance systems based on a common language of learning outcomes.
- Trust is established - relationships are built from a transparent exchange of information and the rigorous examination of information.
- Confidence is built between country qualifications systems through a shared understanding of each other’s national qualifications frameworks.
- Confidence is developed between the parties - presenting evidence, answering questions and explaining policy as well as demonstrating and observing practice.
Future Work

Verification of the quality assurance policies and procedures has influenced further comparison work:

- Both parties are currently progressing the Recognition of Master’s and Doctoral Degrees project.

Periodic review is important - updating the Reference Framework on a regular basis supports an ongoing relationship:

- Ensures the relevance of the comparative work
- Keeps each other abreast of changes to quality assurance and qualification policies and procedures.

Learnings from the NZQA-MQA partnership can be shared and applied to future work and other international recognition projects.
Mr. Gong Wan
Deputy Director General
Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE), People’s Republic of China

Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition of Transnational Qualifications

Abstract

This presentation describes the definition of transnational qualification and the modes of delivery of transnational education. The developed countries are dominating the transnational education activities while the Asian countries are major receiving countries. China set up the regulatory framework to ensure the quality of provision of transnational education in China and diverse regulatory frameworks vary in other countries. CSCSE, competent recognition agency in China, assesses the transnational qualifications by focusing on national regulatory frameworks and quality assurance mechanism in both exporting and receiving countries. Six key elements are identified at the assessing criteria and some countries cases are presented. Seven questions are raised for further discussion.

1. Definition
A qualification conferred by a higher education institution to a learner, who has successfully completed a study program that is operated independently or collaboratively with an overseas partner institution outside the country where the awarding institution is based, could be labeled as transnational qualification. The study program could be delivered at an overseas branch campus set up by the awarding institution or by an overseas partner institution with collaborative arrangements (franchised or validated). The mode of teaching and learning may be traditional face to face, or on the web by distance, or a combination of both. This presentation limits the definition to the transnational qualification of higher education obtained through traditional mode of teaching and learning.
2. **Trends**

The institution exporting its study program may be described as exporter while the institution collaborating in delivering the study program in its home country can be named receiver. The data shows that the exporters in developed countries, particularly from Anglophone countries, are dominating the transnational education activities. The number of branch campuses is much less than that of the franchising and validating arrangements. Regulatory frameworks on transnational education in both exporting and receiving countries are quite diverse in terms of establishment and quality assurance such as registration, certification and accreditation. By whom and in what extent, the transnational qualification can be recognized? Different countries have various approaches.

3. **China’s approach**

China enacted the regulation on establishment of Chinese-foreign cooperatively-run schools in China in 2003. The operation of a Chinese-foreign cooperatively-run school or program in China should be approved and licensed by either Ministry of Education or provincial governments. The former is in charge of institutions and programs leading to the awarding of bachelor and above degrees and the latter takes responsibility for diploma or non-qualification institutions and programs. The regulation defines that the approved transnational institutions in China belong to Chinese education system and should be non-profit. The institutions and programs should receive regular external audit by MOE or its authorized quality assurance agencies.

4. **Recognition of transnational qualifications in China**

Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE) is the competent recognition agency of overseas qualifications for the purpose of further study, employment and access to regulated professions in China. Under the Chinese legal framework, CSCSE follows the basic principles of UNESCO Convention of recognition of degrees and diplomas in the Asia and Pacific region and the bilateral recognition agreements between China and 42 countries or regions. Major elements considered for the recognition of overseas qualifications include: level, student workload, quality assurance, program profile, mode of study, learning outcomes, etc. As regards the recognition of transnational qualifications, the following three key facts are taken into account:

- Regulatory frameworks and National qualifications frameworks in both exporting/receiving
countries;
- Quality assurance mechanisms in both exporting/receiving countries;
- Status of awarding institution and delivering institution.

5. **Assessing criteria**

1) **Status of institutions**

   Both exporting and receiving institutions should belong to the higher education system in respective countries, and should both be approved or licensed by the education authorities to deliver the related programs as well as to award qualifications.

2) **Quality assurance**

   The quality of transnational programs should not only be assured by the exporting institution, but also by the competent authority in receiving countries. Besides, there is still another acceptable situation: the exporting institution is invited by the competent authority of receiving country, and the quality audit is exempted by the national regulation of receiving country.

3) **Admission requirements**

   The admission requirements at the receiving institution for the study program should be the same as at the exporting country.

4) **Qualification awarding**

   The qualification awarded by the exporting institution should be the same as the one awarded in its home country.

5) **Official recognition**

   The qualification awarded by the exporting institution should be recognized officially by the competent authority of the receiving country for the purpose of further study and employment.

6) **International students recruiting**

   The receiving institution should be approved by the competent authorities of the receiving country to recruit international students.

6. **Cases in receiving countries**

   UK, USA and Australia are ranked top three in the list of exporting countries of transnational
education in China.
Malaysia, Singapore and United Arab Emirates are the major receiving countries of transnational education in the world.

7. **Issues for discussion**
1) How can existing national and international quality assurance systems and instruments address the quality of programs offered by transnational education providers?
2) Can the accreditation of the exporting institution be transferred to the franchised or validated foreign institution or the branch campus?
3) In what ways is it ensured that quality in the delivering institution is the same as in the exporting institution?
4) Is it possible to require that the admission requirements in the delivering institution are comparable to those of the exporting institution?
5) What guarantee can be given on the quality of the teaching staffs in the delivering institution?
6) How can the substantial differences be defined in the process of recognition of transnational qualifications?
7) Is it necessary to replace the official recognition of transnational qualification by market recognition?

References:

UNESCO/Council of Europe, Guidelines for quality provision in cross-border higher education, 2005.


UNESCO/Council of Europe, Revised code of good practice in the provision of transnational education, 2007.

Council of Europe/UNESCO, Revised recommendation on criteria and procedures for the assessment of foreign qualifications, 2010.
UNESCO, Revised Asia-Pacific regional convention on the recognition of qualifications in higher education, 2011.


1. Transnational Education

1.1 Definition

A qualification conferred by a higher education institution to a learner, who has successfully completed a study program that is operated independently or collaboratively with an overseas partner institution outside the country where the awarding institution is based, could be labeled as transnational qualification.
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1.2 Transnational arrangements

1) Overseas branch campus
2) Jointly-run institution (Program)
3) Franchising/Validation

1.3 Modes of teaching/learning

1) Traditional face to face teaching/learning
2) Distance teaching/learning
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2. Trends

2.1 Exporter and Receiver

1) Developed countries exporting
2) Anglophone HEIs dominating
3) More franchising than branch campus
4) Diverse regulatory frameworks in receiving countries in term of establishment and quality assurance

3. China’s approach

3.1 Regulatory framework

1) Regulatory framework on transnational education
2) Part of national education system and non-profit
3) License required for institution/program
4) Degree licensed by Ministry of Education
5) Non-degree licensed by provincial governments
6) Self-auditing/external auditing
4. Recognition

4.1 Principles and key elements

- Chinese law/convention/bilateral agreements
- Chinese /Overseas Regulatory frameworks
- National qualifications frameworks
- QA mechanisms
- Level, student workload, quality assurance, program profile, mode of study, learning outcomes
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4.2 Transnational Qualifications

1) Regulatory frameworks and national qualifications frameworks in both exporting/receiving countries
2) Quality assurance mechanisms in both exporting/receiving countries
3) Status of awarding institution/delivering institution
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5. Assessing Criteria

5.1 Status of institutions
5.2 Quality assurance
5.3 Admission requirements
5.4 Qualification awarding
5.5 Official recognition
5.6 International students recruiting

6. Cases

6.1 UK, USA and Australia are ranked top three in the list of exporting countries of transnational education in China.

6.2 Malaysia, Singapore and United Arab Emirates are the major receiving countries of transnational education in the world.
7. Questions

7.1 How can existing national and international quality assurance systems and instruments address the quality of programs offered by transnational education providers?

7.2 Can the accreditation of the exporting institution be transferred to the franchised or validated foreign institution or the branch campus?

7.3 In what ways is it ensured that quality in the delivering institution is the same as in the exporting institution?

7.4 Is it possible to require that the admission requirements in the delivering institution are comparable to those of the exporting institution?

7.5 What guarantee can be given on the quality of the teaching staff in the delivering institution?

7.6 How can the substantial differences be defined in the process of recognition of transnational qualifications?

7.7 Is it necessary to replace the official recognition of transnational qualification by market recognition?
Gratitude

Thank you for your attention.

gongwan@cscse.edu.cn
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PLENARY SESSION

Sharing of Outcomes and Decisions
**SUGGESTIONS**

Listed below were some suggestions by the participants during the ASEM Dialogue to be considered for execution.

1) **Interactive Roundtable 1: Regional Quality Assurance Framework and Regional Qualifications Framework – Commonalities and Differences**

   a) In-depth studies are suggested to be conducted to look at the commonalities and differences of both the regional quality assurance framework and regional qualifications framework from the Asian and European perspectives. Other initiatives such as inter-regional sharing of effective practices, experts and quality assurance and qualifications-related developments were also proposed.

   b) The establishment of the ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework in Higher Education (AQAFHE) led by the Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA) under the AQAN’s initiative serves as a common reference point for ASEAN quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions. The Framework which promotes regional harmonization in higher education has been acknowledged and will be considered as one important agenda in the implementation of the ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF), and vice versa.

2) **Interactive Roundtable 2: Cross Border Higher Education**

   a) Due to the nature of transnational education which is highly agile and evolutionary, in-depth study and work on research and development by respective technical expert teams are proposed to strengthen cross border higher education.

   b) Three steps in implementing transnational education should be considered as the good practice, i.e. establishing Cooperation Agreement between the providing and receiving countries based on a firm ground of policies and regulations; getting national approval to run an international programme or institution; and conducting regular evaluation by taking into account the advice of the quality assurance agency of the sending country.

   c) It was also proposed to look into the possibility of having a single set of international quality standards for transnational education.
3) **Interactive Roundtable 3: Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives towards Facilitating Recognition**

a) Concrete steps to implement the ASEM Recognition Bridging Declaration which was endorsed during ASEMME4 are to be explored with focus on developing action plans for implementing and facilitating recognition of qualifications within Asia and Europe. Three action plans were identified, i.e. building a website for the Asian NICs; establishing a Cross-border Quality Assurance Network (CBQAN) and drafting a Handbook of Guidelines, Principles and Good Practices on Recognition.

b) More platforms for discussion are to be arranged in order to raise the level of awareness, appreciation and common understanding of issues related to quality assurance and recognition.

c) Activities such as comparability exercise and sharing of technical expertise should be made familiar between the countries from both Asian and European regions.

d) Towards promoting student mobility, elements of permeable framework must be included in the policies of Asian credit transfer systems as an addition to Asian Academic Credits (AACs), a concept which is similar to ECTS. It was introduced to be used among participating institutions within Asian region to enable simple conversion of credits not only with other Asian universities but also universities in the world.

e) A mutual agreement between European and Asian nations on a general policy of student mobility with an aligned system of credit transfer and quality of education was also proposed to be established.

f) European and Asian nations should also implement a large scale student exchange programme, particularly using the above aligned system and the scheme of joint teaching to develop mutual trust.

g) An expert group is to be established to discuss the interregional credit transfer mechanisms among ASEM member countries. The inclusion of competency-based indicators to measure merit of the credit transfer system especially to consider the skill-based type of programmes is to be deliberated.
CONCLUSIONS

Interactive Round Table 1:
Regional Quality Assurance Framework and Regional Qualifications Framework – Commonalities and Differences
European Standards & Guidelines (ENQA (E4))/ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework (AQAFHE)  
ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (QARF)/European Qualifications Framework (EQF)

- Evolution - glossary - principles - standards and guidelines (process)............ referencing processes
- QA one element to work in tandem with Qualifications framework (A/E)
- Clarity & Transparency; trust; external stakeholders; national reform; Transparency tools
- Flexible enough to accommodate diversity - not prescriptive but indicating a real threshold (A/E) – a sound point of reference for all to sign up to.
- Harmonisation and transparency not standardisation (A/E)
- Individual Cultural orientation and values maintained in regional frameworks (A&E)

European Standards & Guidelines (ENQA (E4))/ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework (AQAFHE)  
ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (QARF)/European Qualifications Framework (EQF)

- National Regulatory priorities prevail - National Policies impact – protectionism! Implementation is key (E)
- Formal structures are required and need to be adopted
- Initial commitment and buy-in at agency, political, and institutional level to develop
- ongoing commitment to evolve and improve – work is never complete. HE is a complex business expected to satisfy many economic and social needs in a national and transnational context. QA needs to become an efficient tool to facilitating reform and enhancement.
Issues to be considered – further work

• Planning for future institutional operating context – future HEIs??
• Other ‘Non state’ commercial qualifications (ICT)
• Influences on ‘student centred learning’ QA
• National public policy versus regional ambitions, standards/principles
• Quality of National system dictates reference to regional and level of associated trust - National systems should be accessible, understood, and transparent to all. Gaps and shortcuts may undermine all efforts.
• Regional and national QA systems should undertake impact analysis – set clear performance indicators at an early stage of development.
• First stage of framework development is preparatory - stage two requires real visibility at the national level.

Conclusions

National Regional National Regional National

• Regional quality assurance does not alleviate the pressure on National QA systems and HE institutions to react, resolve, respond, deliver reform and improve. However regional frameworks establish formal parameters - reference points and lead to further convergence
• Other parallel regional frameworks may not be a threat - are more likely to converge than clash (Bologna/EQF).
• Clarity on common language is a part of the developmental process.
• Capacity building is key to both regions ASEAN/Europe. National bodies need to develop effective practice. Regional frameworks reflect the sum of the parts. (e.g. Dublin descriptors – short cycle quals)
• Smart and efficient QA/qual criteria and tools can deliver if all the parties are committed to ongoing development/ sharing effective practice
• National/Regional formal endorsement is critical for QA and Qualifications
Conclusions

National-Regional-National-Regional-National-Regional

- QA and qualifications systems are under more pressure with reduced funding and resources - Qualifications are expected to deliver jobs, alleviate social and economic shortcomings and become exportable commodities for ambitious internationalisation policy approaches
- Implementation is key and the experience of reflection and analysis is a valuable source of information.
- Collaboration and sharing effective practice is key. (EFFECTIVE IS CONTEXT)
- National Framework (whether QA or qualifications) is the vital link to the Regional Framework – National Framework should in turn be influenced by the Regional Framework parameters (regional is a catalyst for national)
- National Frameworks can influence Regional Frameworks
- National Frameworks can be all embracing facilitating QA systems for all types of provision, qualifications (VET – HET – professional alignment and more)

- Development is on going – continuous improvement

Action?

- DIRECT DIALOGUE BETWEEN EQF AND ASEM
- INTER REGIONAL SHARING OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICE [IN REAL TIME]
- CONCRETE SOLUTIONS MAY BE MORE ACHIEVABLE BETWEEN REGIONS - Case studies on NFOs, Referencing, ENQA reviews against ESQ Guidelines, New innovative approaches by ASEAN and new national QA and qualifications frameworks emerging
- INTER REGIONAL SHARING OF EXPERTS – COMMON POOL INVOLVED IN META DEVELOPMENTS IN QA & QUALIFICATIONS
- INTER REGIONAL SHARING OF DEVELOPMENTS MAY ALLEVIATE RESOURCE INTENSIVE ACTIVITIES OF COUNTRY TO COUNTRY OR AGENCY TO AGENCY AND INVOLVE OTHER REGIONAL ACTORS.
Dr. Libertad P. Garcia
Director IV
Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Philippines

CONCLUSIONS
Interactive Round Table 3:
Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition

Outcomes and Decisions Based on the Issues Raised and Responses Made During the Dialogue on Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition

August 26, 2014
**Outcome of the Discussion: Some Issues addressed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The growing importance of quality assurance and recognition.</th>
<th>Common understanding of some concepts, definitions, principles.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The varied and diverse methods and systems used in quality assurance and recognition.</td>
<td>Collaboration, support and transparency in the implementation of the initiatives for quality assurance and recognition both at the national and regional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of permeable framework resulting in misunderstandings and misgivings about other university’s educational values</td>
<td>The need for permeable framework for mutual trust (with standardized measures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-inclusion of competency-based (outcomes-based) in measuring credit transfer system</td>
<td>More platforms/dialogues to raise the level of awareness, appreciation and common understanding of issues related to quality assurance and recognition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct of studies to include competency-based indicators to measure merit of the credit transfer system especially to consider the skill-based type of programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credit transfer systems is not new!</th>
<th>Promotion of university student mobility (in Asia) and cross-cultural understanding among people in the region through inter-regional credit transfer system (to stimulate regional economies).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Although there are several credit transfer systems in Asian higher education, there is no common standard (no dominant standard) in student exchanges among Asian higher education institutions over the entire region.</td>
<td>The efficiency of credit transfer system—simple conversion of credits not only with other Asian and Pacific Universities but also universities in the world should be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absence of data or lack of information on the quality of education.</td>
<td>Dissemination of information regarding education contents should be a must for all universities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transparency and accountability; exchange of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse regulatory framework and diverse approaches to transnational qualification.</td>
<td>• Adoption of major common elements for recognition of overseas qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The need to take into account the three (3) key facts in transnational qualifications (experience from China)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regulatory frameworks and National qualifications in both exporting and receiving countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality assurance mechanisms in both exporting/receiving countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Status of awarding institutions and delivering institution.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• The importance of cooperation and mutual understanding.</th>
<th>• Clear agreement and governance. Terms of reference must be agreed by concerned parties.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Quality assurance and quality systems?</td>
<td>• Adoption of an acceptable reference framework supported with a clear feedback mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The issue of efficiency and effectiveness</td>
<td>• Clear methodology, periodic review, regular updating of the Reference Framework and support for the ongoing relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engaging international experts for an independent advice particularly on the technical matching process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Desired Decisions**

- Joint efforts to facilitate the mutual recognition
- Establishment of CBQAN
- Drafting and compilation of handbook for the criteria, guidelines, procedures and recommend good practices for recognition practices
- Support for the deepening of mutual recognition
- Promotion of student mobility in Asia and EU
- Provision of support for student scholarship
- Development of CTS with student mobility
- Issuance of Agreements
- Public information of the changes/revisions
- Conduct of survey and sharing of results of the survey/study
- Building of a website
- Systematic links between institutions on credit measurement
ASEM DIALOGUE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE AND RECOGNITION

PROGRAMME SCHEDULE

SUNDAY, 24 AUGUST 2014

1400 - 1800  |  Registration (Sunway Putra Hotel Lobby)

DAY 1: MONDAY, 25 AUGUST 2014

0800 – 0900  |  Registration (Dewan Tun Dr Ismail, PWTC)

0915 – 1000  |  Opening Ceremony (Dewan Tun Dr Ismail, PWTC)

1030 – 1100  |  Tea Break and Photography Session

DIALOUGE SESSIONS AT GRAND BALLROOM, SUNWAY PUTRA HOTEL

1100 – 1300  |  Interactive Round Table 1: Regional Quality Assurance Framework and Regional Qualifications Framework – Commonalities and Differences

Chair: Dr. Karena Maguire, Head of Quality Assurance Services, Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI)

Regional Quality Assurance Framework – Interregional Recognition of Quality Assurance Agencies:

- European Standards and Guidelines (ESG)
  Mr. Josep Grifoll, Vice-President, European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)

- ASEAN Quality Assurance Framework in Higher Education (AQAFHE)
  Professor Zita Mohd Fahmi, Executive Secretary, ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN) and Chair of AQAFHE Task Force

Regional Qualifications Framework – Complexities, Demands and Impacts:

- European Qualifications Framework (EQF)
  Mr. Jens Bjornavold, Senior Expert, European Center for the Development of Vocational Training (CEDEFOP)

- ASEAN Qualifications Reference Framework (AQRF)
  Ms. Teresita R. Manzala, Chair of AQRF Task Force

1300 – 1430  |  Lunch (Museum Chinese Restaurant, Sunway Putra Hotel)

1430 – 1600  |  Interactive Round Table 2: Cross Border Higher Education

Chair: Dr. Achim Hopbach, Managing Director, Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation Austria (AQ Austria)
## Interactive Round Table 3: Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition

**Chair:** Dr. Libertad P. Garcia, Director IV, Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Philippines

- **ASEM Bridging Declaration – The Proposed Implementation**
  Mr. Wang Lisheng, Deputy Director-General of the China Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Development Center (CDGDC), China

- **Towards Interregional Credit Transfer – Credit Transfer Systems of Asia and Europe**
  Dr. Taiji Hotta, Vice-Executive of International Affairs, International Center, Hiroshima University, Japan

- **Comparability Exercise – Building Confidence to Support Recognition of Quality Assurance and Qualification Systems**
  Ms. Karen Chalmers, Director, International and Policy, New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)

- **Recognition of Transnational Qualifications**
  Mr. Gong Wan, Deputy Director-General, Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE), China

---

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1600 – 1630</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 – 2200</td>
<td>Welcome Dinner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>End of First Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Day 2: Tuesday, 26 August 2014

### Interactive Round Table 3: Strengthening Partnership and Cooperation in Implementing Initiatives Towards Facilitating Recognition

**Chair:** Dr. Libertad P. Garcia, Director IV, Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Philippines

- **ASEM Bridging Declaration – The Proposed Implementation**
  Mr. Wang Lisheng, Deputy Director-General of the China Academic Degrees and Graduate Education Development Center (CDGDC), China

- **Towards Interregional Credit Transfer – Credit Transfer Systems of Asia and Europe**
  Dr. Taiji Hotta, Vice-Executive of International Affairs, International Center, Hiroshima University, Japan

- **Comparability Exercise – Building Confidence to Support Recognition of Quality Assurance and Qualification Systems**
  Ms. Karen Chalmers, Director, International and Policy, New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)

- **Recognition of Transnational Qualifications**
  Mr. Gong Wan, Deputy Director-General, Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE), China

---

### Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0900 – 1045</td>
<td>Plenary Session: Sharing of Outcomes and Decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100 – 1145</td>
<td>Plenary Session: Sharing of Outcomes and Decisions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chair:** Dato' Dr. Syed Ahmad Hussein, Chief Executive Officer, Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA)

- **Recognition of Transnational Qualifications**
  Mr. Gong Wan, Deputy Director-General, Chinese Service Center for Scholarly Exchange (CSCSE), China
(QQI)
Dr. Achim Hopbach, Managing Director, Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation Austria (AQ Austria)
Dr. Libertad P. Garcia, Director IV, Commission on Higher Education (CHED), Philippines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1200 – 1245</td>
<td>Closing Ceremony (Dewan Tun Dr Ismail, PWTC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245 – 1430</td>
<td>Lunch (Bilik Mawar, PWTC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

End of Dialogue
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<td>Estonian Higher Education Quality Agency (EKKA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Mrs. Nina Scholle-Pollmann</td>
<td>Foundation for the Accreditation of Study Programmes in Germany (German Accreditation Council)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Mansur Ma'shum, Dr. Dwiwahju Sasongko</td>
<td>National Accreditation Agency for Higher Education Indonesia (NAAHE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>Dr. Karena Maguire</td>
<td>Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Ms. Eri Hata-Matsunaga, Dr. Taiji Hotta</td>
<td>National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (NIAD-UE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hiroshima University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>Dr. Minwon Seo, Dr. Seon-Joo Kim</td>
<td>Korean Council for University Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Dr. Phonephet Boupha</td>
<td>Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education Lao PDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>Ms. Baiba Ramina</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>MINISTRY/ QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY/ RECOGNITION BODY/ HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Ms. Nora Skaburskienė</td>
<td>Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education (SKVC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Prof. Emeritus Tan Sri Datuk Seri Panglima Dr. Abu Hassan Othman</td>
<td>Malaysian Qualifications Agency (MQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dato' Dr. Syed Ahmad Hussein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Zita Mohd Fahmi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Salmah Ahmad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Soo Sit Chuan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Najmi Mohd Noor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Mohamad Dzafir Mustafa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Halinordina Mat Saat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Ainil Nilam Mohd Mokhtar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>MINISTRY/ QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY/ RECOGNITION BODY/ HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Muhamad Amran Zainal Abidin</td>
<td>HELP University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Zakiah Abdul Wahab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Eddy Herman Zaidel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Dr Rozilini M. Fernandez-Chung</td>
<td>Department of Polytechnic Education, Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Noor Aidi Nadzri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Norhanom Awang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dato’ Amir Md. Noor</td>
<td>Department of Community College Education, Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Noriah Abdul Malek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Aruna Ismail@Abdul Wahab</td>
<td>Department of Skills Development, Ministry of Human Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Ir Dr. Shahrir Abdullah</td>
<td>Higher Education Institutions Quality Assurance Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Dr. Fauza Abdul Ghaffar</td>
<td>Majlis Pengurusan Kualiti IPTA (MPQ-IPTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>MINISTRY/ QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY/ RECOGNITION BODY/ HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Datuk Parmjit Singh</td>
<td>Malaysian Association of Private Colleges and Universities (MAPCU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Aishah Abu Bakar</td>
<td>University of Malaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Dr. Kyi Shwin</td>
<td>Department of Higher Education, Ministry of Education Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Ms. Karen Chalmers</td>
<td>New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Mdm. Teresita R Manzala</td>
<td>Professional Regulation Commission, Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Melinda L Garcia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Jose Y Cueto Jr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hon Joel L. Tan-Torres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Libertad P. Garcia</td>
<td>Commission on Higher Education (CHED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Mrs. Izabela Kwiatkowska Sujka</td>
<td>Polish Accreditation Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prof. Mieczyslaw Socha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Ms. Camelia Tudose</td>
<td>Embassy of Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>COUNTRY</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
<td>MINISTRY/ QUALITY ASSURANCE AGENCY/ RECOGNITION BODY/ HIGHER EDUCATION PROVIDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Mr. Brandon Lee</td>
<td>Council for Private Education Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Su Elina Subandrio</td>
<td>Higher Education Division, Ministry of Education Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Mr. Josep Grifoll</td>
<td>The Catalan University Quality Assurance Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Mr. Ekaphong Lauhathiansind</td>
<td>The Office for National Standards and Quality Assessment Education (ONESQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Tharinee Khunnen</td>
<td>Office of the Higher Education Commission Thailand (OHEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Noparat Prasartkhetkarn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>Mr. Anthony McClaran</td>
<td>Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Ms. Truong Thi To Nga</td>
<td>General Department of Education Testing and Accreditation (GDETA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ASEM Education Secretariat</td>
<td>Prof. Aris Junaidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>NO INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION</td>
<td>NO PARTICIPANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ASEAN Quality Assurance Network (AQAN)</td>
<td>Dato’ Dr. Syed Ahmad Hussein, Prof. Zita Mohd Fahmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ASEAN Secretariat</td>
<td>Mr. Kamal Mamat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ASEAN University Network (AUN)</td>
<td>Prof. Nantana Gajaseni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>Mr. Guntur Sugiyarto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA)</td>
<td>Mr. Josep Grifoll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td>Mr. Jens Bjornavold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education (EQAR)</td>
<td>Prof. Eric Froment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD)</td>
<td>Mr. Michael Horig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Migration Policy Institute</td>
<td>Ms. Dovelyn Rannveig Aguinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Southeast Asian ministers of Education Organization Regional Training Centre (SEAMEO RETRAC)</td>
<td>Dr. Do Thi Hoai Thu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATION</td>
<td>PARTICIPANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization-Regional Centre for Higher Education and Development (SEAMEO RIHED)</td>
<td>Dr. Chantavit Sujatanond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>PARTICIPANT</th>
<th>OBSERVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>Mr. Nar B Raika</td>
<td>Quality Assurance and Accreditation Division (QAAD), Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tshewang Dorji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Ms. Fathimah Muzna Rasheed</td>
<td>Maldives Qualifications Authority (MQA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Ahmed Ahsan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASEM DIALOGUE ON QUALITY ASSURANCE AND RECOGNITION

APPRECIATION

The Malaysian Qualifications Agency would like to express our sincere appreciation and heartfelt thanks to all participants for dedicated participation and sharing of ideas and expertise in the 2014 ASEM Dialogue on Quality Assurance and Recognition.

The Dialogue was an overwhelming success attracting dynamic group of speakers and participants from many countries across Asia and Europe which provided great intellectual and social interactions. Therefore, we hope that the Dialogue has been all that was expected and the participants have taken the opportunity to discuss and exchange experiences, suggestions and opinions on current policies and ongoing initiatives in relation to recognition, quality assurance and cross-border higher education. We believed that the Dialogue had placed great impact on enhancing existing collaboration and assisting in building trust and establishing mutual recognition between both regions.

We look forward to organising future events to encourage more intellectual discourse in the area of quality assurance and recognition.

The Public and International Affairs Unit
Malaysian Qualifications Agency
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Email	syahrizan@mqa.gov.my; elieja@mqa.gov.my;
azlin@mqa.gov.my; fazliana@mqa.gov.my