

Joint Guidelines for Monitoring International Cooperative Academic Programs in **CAMPUS Asia**

June 2017

Higher Education Evaluation Center of Ministry of Education (HEEC)

National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education (NIAD-QE)

Korean Council for University Education (KCUE)



Contents

- 1. Introduction ----- 1

- 2. Objectives of the guidelines ----- 2

- 3. Guidelines ----- 2
 - 3-1. General principles ----- 2
 - 3-2. Implementation system ----- 2
 - 3-3. Procedures ----- 3
 - 3-4. Criteria and viewpoints ----- 4
 - 3-5. Considerations when conducting monitoring ----- 7
 - 3-5-1. Considerations for the quality assurance agencies ----- 7
 - 3-5-2. Considerations for the reviewers ----- 8

1. Introduction

CAMPUS Asia (Collective Action for Mobility Program of University Students in Asia) is a program launched based on a trilateral summit agreement among the governments of China, Japan, and Korea, and is designed to carve out a better future for Asia. Its objectives are to promote exchange and cooperation with quality assurance among higher education institutions (HEIs) in the three countries, create a shared sense of community in terms of history and culture in Northeast Asia, and nurture in future leaders a vision of regional peace and coexistence through trilateral educational exchanges. In 2010, the three governments agreed to commence the CAMPUS Asia pilot program, and 10 pilot programs were selected for participation in October 2011.

Three quality assurance agencies—*i.e.*, the Higher Education Evaluation Center of the Ministry of Education in China, the National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (currently the National Institution for Academic Degrees and Quality Enhancement of Higher Education) in Japan, and the Korean Council for University Education in Korea—set up the China-Japan-Korea Quality Assurance Council in 2010. Recognizing the modality of quality assurance in international education as a common issue, the Council agreed to carry out quality monitoring of the CAMPUS Asia pilot programs. This monitoring was intended not to confirm attainment of minimum quality standards, but to identify good practices from the standpoint of educational quality and disseminate them at home as well as abroad.

The three quality assurance agencies conducted monitoring activities twice for the 10 pilot programs. The first monitoring was conducted independently in each country in 2013, following the country's relevant regulations, quality assurance system, and methods. After that, the monitoring criteria and each country's methods were comparatively analyzed and the three agencies jointly established a common framework for quality assurance, which includes criteria, principles, and processes, before conducting the second monitoring in 2015. In the second monitoring, panel members from the three countries jointly performed document reviews and site visits, based on common self-assessment reports provided by the consortium for each CAMPUS Asia program. The monitoring results were compiled in a report featuring examples of good practices, which was widely disseminated.

The three governments then promoted CAMPUS Asia as a full-fledged program following the completion of the pilot period, selecting a total of 17 programs (including 9 new ones) for participation in the fall of 2016. They also agreed to continue discussing the feasibility of further expansion to other nations in Asia. The three quality assurance agencies plan to conduct monitoring on the full-fledged programs as well. In so doing, they are expected to refer to these guidelines and further expand their monitoring efforts based on the experience gained in the pilot period and the structure of close cooperation established among the three countries while collaborating with the national governments and the participating HEIs.

We hope that these monitoring activities and the ongoing dissemination of good practices contribute to the enhancement of the quality of international cooperative academic programs including CAMPUS Asia, to the fostering of excellent students who acquire appropriate learning outcomes with respect to the goals of the respective programs and strengthen international cooperation among the quality assurance agencies.

2. Objectives of the guidelines

The three quality assurance agencies formulated these joint guidelines based on experiences gained through the establishment of a common quality assurance method for future quality assurance initiatives on CAMPUS Asia programs.

The first objective of the guidelines is to specify a method of monitoring international cooperative academic programs so that the three agencies and the reviewers can clearly understand the monitoring criteria, processes, and methods and, thereby, carry out the monitoring of CAMPUS Asia programs in a consistent fashion.

The second objective is to serve as a helpful model for other quality assurance agencies conducting monitoring or evaluation of international cooperative academic programs, especially when working with partner agencies in other countries, and for HEIs in their internal quality assurance work with regard to international cooperative education.

Through their experience of joint monitoring of CAMPUS Asia, the three quality assurance agencies developed the unified quality assurance framework described here and also built a sense of mutual trust. This encourages them to apply the common quality framework to conduct their monitoring activities in an abridged form (e.g., joint recognition of monitoring results obtained by each country).

We hope that these guidelines will contribute to the improvement of quality assurance initiatives both within and beyond the three participating countries. The three agencies involved will review these guidelines periodically and improve them as needed in light of global trends in quality assurance and the circumstances of international collaborative education at each institution.

3. Guidelines

3-1. General principles

- Promote quality enhancement of international collaborative academic programs
- Conduct monitoring based on joint criteria and procedures
- Review consortium-wide progress and achievements to identify the programs' good practices
- Examine the degree of cooperation among participating HEIs with respect to resource integration and quality assurance activities as international collaborative academic programs
- Examine each program's continuous quality improvement
- Value students' opinions and ideas regarding CAMPUS Asia

3-2. Implementation system

The Joint Monitoring Committee is the decision-making body for conducting the monitoring. A Monitoring Panel is set up under the Committee to carry out the actual process.

The Joint Monitoring Committee consists of three experts from each of the three countries who are designated by the quality assurance agencies. One from each country represents the country's

quality assurance agency. The Committee exists to confirm, finalize, and officially release the joint monitoring report. It is preferable for Joint Monitoring Committee members to have knowledge and experience of international collaborative academic programs and quality assurance.

The Monitoring Panel consists of three experts from each country appointed by each country's quality assurance agency, serves to review self-assessment reports and write document review reports, conduct site visits, and write final monitoring reports on each consortium.

- It is preferable for Monitoring Panel members to have knowledge and experience of international collaborative academic programs and their quality assurance as well as those of the field of specialization of the program to be reviewed. Roles within the Monitoring Panel, such as those of its chairperson and coordinator, should be clarified.

The members of the Joint Monitoring Committee and the Monitoring Panel are not entitled to be part of the decision-making process on any matter pertaining to programs with which they are associated.

3-3. Procedures

The overall procedures for monitoring are as follows:

1. The quality assurance agencies hold an orientation program for Monitoring Panel members to enable them to deepen their knowledge and understanding of monitoring activities. When holding different orientation programs separately in different countries, the three quality assurance agencies should cooperate for the content to be the same at all the programs.
2. The quality assurance agencies hold an orientation program for the consortia to explain the objectives of monitoring and its implementation. They cooperate so as to provide the same or similar information for institutions in all countries.
3. Each consortium is required to produce and submit one common (joint) self-assessment report produced by all participating HEIs in the consortium, describing its good practices and issues for improvement under each criterion.
4. Monitoring Panel members conduct document reviews based on the submitted self-assessment reports.
5. Monitoring Panel members conduct site visits to ask about matters that are not clear from document reviews. Interviews with the officials responsible for the program, with faculty and staff members involved in the program, and with students are included in the site visit schedule. An exchange of views and opinions with the officials responsible for the program takes place at the end of the visit. It is preferable to conduct site visits at a time when representatives of the participating HEIs in each country can be present.
6. Monitoring Panel members produce a draft monitoring report on a consortium based on the results of their document review and site visit. If the draft report is produced in the local language, a version in English is also prepared.
7. Monitoring Panel members share the draft monitoring report on a consortium with all panel

members from the three countries so as to collect their comments and revise the draft report where necessary.

8. Before finalizing the draft monitoring report on a consortium, the consortium itself has the opportunity to review it and ensure that there are no factual errors. If any errors were to be identified, Monitoring Panel members would conduct deliberations and revise the report where necessary.
9. Monitoring Panel members then share finalized monitoring reports on a consortium with the three quality assurance agencies, which will draw up a draft joint monitoring report based on the monitoring reports on each consortium.
10. The Joint Monitoring Committee finalizes the joint monitoring report.
11. The quality assurance agencies make the finalized joint monitoring report widely available to the public in book form, online, and at symposia.

3-4. Criteria and viewpoints

To ascertain the current status of each program and its quality enhancement initiatives, the following monitoring criteria on quality should be applied. When monitoring with respect to each criterion, refer to the viewpoints listed thereunder. However, the envisioned viewpoints are not limited to those listed here.

1. Objectives and Implementation

1-1. Achievement of Objectives

- The vision for fostering human resources is clearly defined via discussion among the participating institutions.
- The goals are clearly articulated, including expected learning outcomes in terms of students' knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Participating institutions exhibit a shared recognition of these program goals.
- The program goals are shared among the staff members and students of the participating institutions and are understood in the same, unequivocal way at each institution.
- The program goals function as guidelines for developing and implementing the academic program.

1-2. Organization and Administration

- Basic policies on the multi-institutional operational structure, institutions' responsibilities with regard to students, and the allocation of expenses are clearly articulated in a written agreement signed and put into effect by the participating institutions.
- Periodic meetings are held among the participating institutions; a mechanism for reviewing program implementation and related issues is established, and responsibility for addressing common issues is shared.
- Where academic supervision is applicable, an appropriate supervisory system is established and implemented cooperatively among the participating institutions.
- Within each institution, responsibility for conducting the international collaborative

academic program is clearly defined along with a suitable support system involving other divisions (e.g., international, student support, and quality assurance).

- The participating institutions have agreed to sustain the program, and the operational structure and plans for sustaining the program are actively reviewed. Also, institution-wide approval to sustain the program is obtained from the management of each institution.

2. Collaborative Development of Academic Program

2-1. Curriculum Integration

- The curriculum is jointly designed by the participating institutions.
- Information on curriculum and courses at each institution is shared by and across the participating institutions.
- The educational content is suited to achieving the program goals.
- The educational content complies with the expected learning outcomes (e.g., student knowledge, skills, and attitudes).
- The educational content and methods are suited to international collaborative education.
- The relationship between the teaching methods and content and the expected learning outcomes is clarified.

2-2. Academic Staff and Teaching

- A sufficient number of qualified faculty and staff members are deployed for the sustained implementation of the international collaborative academic program.
- The system for the provision of educational content (e.g., joint supervision by dispatching faculty, distance learning) which faculty members of partner institutions join is implemented.
- Faculty and staff development and capacity building for attaining international competencies are conducted.
- Incentives and a support for the work environment are provided to attract faculty and staff members who are skilled in international education and can contribute to the sustainability of the program.
- The teaching methods used are acceptable and suitable for international students (e.g., multilingual textbooks, classes taught in English and access to after-class or extracurricular tutorials).

3. Student Support

3-1. Student Admission

- Information on the program is disseminated widely in order to recruit motivated students.
- The student selection process (selection criteria and system) is suited to the educational objectives and content and are jointly established and carried out by the participating institutions.
- The expected number of students has been secured.

- The academic level of admitted students is appropriate for the program's objectives and curriculum.

3-2. Support for Learning and Living

- Participating institutions share with students the information necessary for course selection and enrollment, including sufficient guidance prior to participating students' departure from their home countries.
- Various types of learning support are provided for participating students, including language training, supplemental classes, and support from teaching assistants.
- Various types of living support are provided for the participating students, including orientation, counseling, disaster risk management, and career support.
- A sufficient learning environment is provided for participating students, including libraries, information technology, and laboratory facilities.
- Sufficient scholarships and accommodation support are provided appropriately for participating students.
- Participating institutions support exchange and interaction among students and alumni.

4. Added Value of the Collaborative Program (Outcomes)

4-1. Student Satisfaction

- Based on the expected learning outcomes, an appropriate method for measuring learning outcomes is established, and learning outcomes are measured regularly.
- The relationship among students' course enrollment, credit acquisition, and learning outcomes is analyzed.
- Appropriate learning outcomes aligned with the program objectives are achieved.
- Students are highly satisfied with the program content and exhibit high levels of achievement.
- The results of a student satisfaction survey and student achievement survey are shared across participating institutions.
- Learning outcomes with added-value resulting from the international collaborative program are obtained.
- The status of graduates is tracked regularly and is shared among the participating institutions.

4-2. Credit Transfer and Degree Awarding

- The credit systems of the partner institutions are mutually understood, and a program-based credit transfer system is established.
- As regards a program that awards two degrees upon completion, criteria for awarding degrees and methods of review at each institution are shared, and the criteria and methods of review are discussed periodically among the participating institutions.
- Grading methods are coordinated among the participating institutions with each institution conducting strict assessments so as to ensure the validity of the awarded

credits.

- As regards a program that awards two degrees upon completion, the achieved learning outcomes are appropriate for a CAMPUS Asia program.

5. Continuous Quality Improvement

- Feedback from students is periodically gathered in multiple ways, in such manners as through questionnaires, interviews, and student participation in review committees, and is incorporated into the program review.
- A program review is carried out based on an analysis of information gathered on the learning progress of students, learning outcomes achieved, curriculum, teaching and its contents, and other information.
- An external review, including inputs from an advisory committee, is conducted.
- The results of program reviews are shared and discussed among the participating institutions to contribute toward further program improvement and development.
- Participating institutions discuss and consider measures for quality improvement and future initiatives based on the self-assessment results.
- The results of the review are appreciated by the international affairs, quality assurance, and student support divisions of each institution, and necessary measures are taken at the institutional level.
- The participating institutions agree to sustain and enhance the program through quality improvement. Also, institution-wide approval from the management of each institution to sustain the program is obtained.
- Some effects of the program's implementation on students who are not in the program are recognized.

3-5. Considerations when conducting monitoring

3-5-1. Considerations for the quality assurance agencies

- (1) Adequate and appropriate resources, both human and financial, should be available to carry out consistent monitoring. It is preferable to obtain financial support from the government in one's own country.
- (2) Objectivity, transparency, and independence of the quality assurance agencies should be maintained. The independence of the reviewers should be ensured to carry out objective and fair monitoring.
- (3) Active communication and cooperation among quality assurance agencies from the three countries, participating institutions, and organizations concerned should be ensured in all monitoring activities.
- (4) Systems leading to continuous improvement through quality assurance activities should be developed.

3-5-2. Considerations for the reviewers

- (1) Active communication and cooperation: Reviews are to be conducted with active communication and cooperation among the reviewers from the three countries.
- (2) Monitoring documents and information: Documents and information obtained during monitoring are not to be used or provided for purposes other than monitoring activities.
- (3) Liaison and coordination: If uncertainties or inquiries about the CAMPUS Asia programs are recognized during the document review and the preparation of reports, the quality assurance agency in charge of queries should be contacted. Directly contacting the HEIs is discouraged.
- (4) Objective and unbiased review: Reviews are to be conducted objectively and in an unbiased manner.
- (5) Dialog during site visit:
 - Before each interview, the reviewers should hold a meeting to thoroughly discuss the facts to be confirmed and remarks to be made during the interview.
 - Regarding inquiries from the HEIs during the site visit, the reviewers carrying out the site visit should, in principle, be unanimous on their responses. Should you wish to offer your personal opinions, it would be appropriate to convey to the interviewees that the views are personal and not those of the review team.
 - The reviewers should refrain from asking interviewees about personal issues.
 - The reviewers should take care so that interviewees are not detrimentally affected by their responses but ensure confidentiality.
 - The reviewers should not debate with interviewees or criticize the HEIs.
 - Should the interviewees criticize CAMPUS Asia initiatives or the monitoring process, it would be advisable to listen for the reasons behind their opinions and avoid making any counterarguments. However, if there are misunderstandings, correct information should be conveyed.
 - At the end of the site visit, the reviewers should thoroughly discuss the facts to be included in the report.
- (6) Points to keep in mind when producing each report (document review report, site visit report, and final report)
 - Reports should be produced with objectivity and fairness based on the facts verified in the document review and the site visit.
 - Especially when making negative observations, care should be taken to provide detailed and objective reasoning that led to that observation.
Any contradictions should be avoided within a report.

