

**The Chiba Principles: A Survey Analysis
on the Developments in the APQN Membership**

(Conducted for APQN and financed by GIQAC)

Dr Antony Stella, Audit Director
Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA)
Melbourne 3000
a.stella@auqa.edu.au

The Chiba Principles: A Survey Analysis

on the Developments in the APQN Membership

Content

<i>Abbreviations</i>	2
1. Background	3
2. The Current Project	3
3. The Survey Questionnaire	4
4. The Analysis: Some General Comments	4
4.1. <i>Response rate</i>	4
4.2. <i>Attention to QA aspects</i>	5
4.3. <i>National contexts and expectations</i>	6
4.4. <i>Language and expressions</i>	6
4.5. <i>Some clarifications</i>	6
5. The Analysis: Specific to the Principles	7
5.1. <i>Principles on Internal Quality Assurance</i>	7
5.2. <i>Summary of Responses to Internal Quality Assurance</i>	10
5.3. <i>Principles on Quality Assessment</i>	11
5.4. <i>Summary of Responses to Principles on Quality Assessment</i>	13
5.5. <i>Principles on Quality Assurance Agencies</i>	14
5.6. <i>Summary of Responses to Principles on Quality Assurance Agencies</i>	15
6. The Analysis: Use of the Principles	16
6.1. <i>Awareness</i>	16
6.2. <i>Role of the Governments</i>	16
6.3. <i>Promotion</i>	17
7. Recommendations for Future Action	18
7.1. <i>Finetuning</i>	18
7.2. <i>Promotion</i>	18
7.3. <i>Way forward</i>	19
<i>Appendix 1: Survey on the Revision of ‘Chiba Principles’</i>	20
<i>Appendix 2: Chiba Principles</i>	26

Abbreviations

APQN	– Asia Pacific Quality Network
AUQA	- Australian Universities Quality Agency
BAN-PT	- National Accreditation Agency for Higher Education (Indonesia)
DEEWR	- Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (Australia)
GDETA	- General Department of Education Testing and Accreditation (Vietnam)
GIQAC	– Global Initiative for Quality Assurance Capacity
HEEACT	- Higher Education Evaluation and Accreditation Council of Taiwan
HEEO	- Higher Education Evaluation Office (China)
HKCAAVQ	- The Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications
INQAAHE	– International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education
MQA	- Malaysian Qualifications Agency
NAAC	- National Assessment and Accreditation Council (India)
NAA	- National Accreditation Agency (Russia)
NIAD	- National Institution for Academic Degrees and University Evaluation (Japan)
NZUAAU	- New Zealand Universities Academic Audit Unit
ONESQA	- The Office for National Education Standards and Quality Assessment (Thailand)
PAASCU	- Philippine Accrediting Association of Schools, Colleges and Universities
QA	- Quality Assurance
QAA	- Quality Assurance and Accreditation Council of Sri Lanka
NUST	- National University of Science and Technology (Pakistan)
SOWG	- Senior Officials Working Group
SVPITM	- Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel Institute of Textile Management (India)
USP	– University of the South Pacific, Fiji

The Chiba Principles: A Survey Analysis on the Developments in the APQN Membership

1. Background

In 2006, at the inaugural Asia-Pacific Education Ministers' Meeting in Brisbane (Australia), ministers and senior officials from twenty-seven countries across the region issued the Brisbane Communiqué in which they agreed to collaborate on key goals related to the recognition and quality of education and training in the region. Progressing the Brisbane Communiqué initiative is the responsibility of a Senior Officials Working Group (SOWG) chaired by Australia and supported by the Australian Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR).

In 2007, SOWG commissioned APQN to conduct a scoping study of higher education quality assurance arrangements in the region. Dr Antony Stella from the Australian Universities Quality Agency (Member of the APQN Board) wrote the survey report, based on a survey of countries in the broader Asia-Pacific region which identified developments, common issues and opportunities for collaboration in higher education quality assurance (<http://www.brisbanecommunique.deewr.gov.au/docs.htm#Quality Assurance in Higher Education - Report>). This report informed the development of a *Framework for Higher Education Quality Assurance Principles in the Asia Pacific Region* by SOWG around quality assurance principles for internal and external quality assurance.

The APQN played a significant role in the dissemination of the *Chiba Principles*. During the APQN 2008 Conference and AGM in Chiba, Japan, these quality assurance principles for internal and external quality assurance were discussed at a workshop and further refined based on the comments. The Workshop was organised by DEEWR and sponsored by AusAid. During the APQN Conference 2009 in Hanoi, a further workshop to recap the discussion on the *Chiba Principles* was held. This report is one other effort of APQN to explore the steps to be taken to promote the Principles.

2. The Current Project

It has been nearly one year since the Principles were developed and made available to the APQN members. The APQN Board considered that this is the right time to seek inputs from the members on the follow-up on the principles and commissioned a survey for that purpose. It is expected that the analysis of the inputs will throw light on revising the principles so that they are better fit for the regional context and become a more relevant tool for the institutions and quality assurance agencies in the region. The need for regional contextualisation was highlighted by participants in the Chiba workshop. This report presents the analysis of the survey responses and draws some actions for the further revisions of the principles.

This project is being financially supported by UNESCO and the World Bank through the Global Initiative for Quality Assurance Capacity (GIQAC).

3. The Survey Questionnaire

A survey questionnaire (Appendix 1) with 32 items was developed Prof. Jianxin ZHANHG (Institute of Higher Education in Yunnan University, China) to collect inputs from the APQN members. It was in two parts. The first part corresponded to the three sets of Principles – A: Internal Quality Assurance; B: Quality Assessment; and C: Quality Assurance Agency given in the Chiba Principles given in Appendix 2. Part 2 of the survey was about the dissemination and use of the principles and what else needs to be done to promote them.

The 23 items in the first part presented the principles one by one and required the respondents to indicate their level of agreement with each of the principles on a five point scale. On the five-point numeric scale, ‘5’ denotes strong agreement and ‘1’ denotes strong disagreement. Respondents were also asked to suggest changes to the principles and redraft if they so wished. The nine items in Part 2 of the questionnaire required more open ended comments from the respondents.

The survey was administered by the APQN Secretariat and the responses were analysed by Dr Antony Stella of the Australian Universities Quality Agency.

4. The Analysis: Some General Comments

4.1. Response rate

APQN has four membership categories – full members, intermediate members, associate members, and institutional members. The difference between the full members and intermediate members needs an explanation here. While both full and intermediate members are either organisations responsible for assuring the academic quality of post-secondary institutions or education programs other than their own, or organisations responsible for assuring the quality of external quality assurance agencies, there is a difference in the level of membership criteria they fulfil. Full members should meet all the conditions for membership as expressed in the membership criteria of APQN, as decided by the General Council from time to time. Intermediate members are the ones which do not fully meet the conditions for full members as expressed in the membership criteria of APQN. APQN pays particular attention to the intermediate members in view of their capacity development needs.

Associate Members are organisations with a major interest and active involvement in evaluation, accreditation and quality assurance in higher education, but without the responsibility for assuring the quality of institutions, education programs, or external quality assurance agencies. Institutional Members are institutions of higher education in the region that are in good standing with the relevant quality assurance agency if one exists.

At the time of writing this report, APQN had 24 full members. Feedback was received from 13 of them resulting in a 54% response rate. This response rate is considered to be satisfactory.

Feedback was received from only one intermediate member. Considering the fact that this is the constituency that requires more capacity development in QA and therefore is the target for many APQN activities, this response rate is not satisfactory. It is not representative. In fact, the sole respondent is a member of the APQN Board and in a way the response rate implies that one of the major interest groups of APQN - the big group that is midway in its QA development, is not represented in this survey at all. Reasons may be many, which will be considered in the later sections of this report, but the fact is that the results of this survey need to be interpreted with caution.

Three institutional members have responded to this survey. Given that the 'institutional membership' was introduced only in 2008, this is a good response rate although not really representative of what the HE sector of the region may feel about the *Chiba Principles*. The three members who have responded have very different characteristics – one is a management institution from India, another is a Science and Technology institution from Pakistan and the third one is a regional institution that serves twelve small island countries of the South Pacific.

The response rates from member categories other than full members indicate that the consultation, before embarking on the next finetuning, should pay attention to collecting views of the intermediate members and institutional members. Attention to factors that might have impacted on their participation, such as early stage of QA in their countries, is worth exploring. A different strategy may be required to involve them more fully in the future discussions.

4.2. Attention to QA aspects

The *Chiba Principles* has three main sections – Internal Quality Assurance, Quality Assessment and Quality Assurance Agency.

Different member groups have responded differently and with different levels of details to these sections. For example, institutional members have made many comments on the section of the survey on internal quality assurance and the full members have made more comments on the section on quality assurance agency. This is reasonable and it also strengthens the argument that development of a holistic framework for quality assurance should involve active involvement of the institutional members. In a way this is something that was lacking in the initial stages of the development of the *Chiba Principles* and this has to be remedied when the Principles are finetuned. The APQN response to the *Principles* communicated to SOWG in 2008 highlighted the need to involve institutions in finetuning the principles relevant to higher education institutions. That recommendation still needs to be acted on.

4.3. National contexts and expectations

APQN membership is very diverse. Some members are at the developmental stage, establishing their policies and procedures; some have developed appropriate mechanisms and are trying to make further improvements. There are also agencies that have well established policies and procedures that can be of guidance to the other agencies.

The diverse backgrounds and stage of development might have contributed to variations in the expectations the members have from the *Principles*. In systems where quality assurance policies and procedures are fairly well established, there is a desire to make the current practices more effective. In systems where policies and procedures in quality assurance are still developing, ensuring that the relevant practices are put in place seems to gain priority. Comments from the respondents indicate this variation in expectations and accordingly suggestions for finetuning the wordings and emphasis have been expressed.

If the framework of the Principles is to be used as a tool for continuous improvement, it should allow for different levels of effectiveness and contextual interpretations. It is here that examples of good practices that will help the APQN members to move from one level of effectiveness to the next higher level will be useful.

In fact there is merit in trying to see where the APQN members stand with respect to these Principles – developmental stage, continuous improvement stage or exemplar stage, is an interesting and valuable aspect to consider.

4.4. Language and expressions

English is not the first language for most of the respondents and this fact influenced the way the respondents were able to express their comments. There were comments that dissemination of the *Principles* also suffered due to the language issue. A couple of respondents have translated the principles into the national language and more such efforts may be needed.

4.5. Some clarifications

The APQN feedback given in 2008 indicates that the diagrammatic representation of the Principles needs some more finetuning and that should be addressed. The diagram has two intersecting circles. One would expect that principles that are common to both institutions and QA agencies should be in the common area of the intersecting circles. If this rationale is applied, the whole diagram will need a total recast.

It is critical that the purpose of the principles and the roles of various stakeholders are clearly stated. How will institutions and governments be involved and what are their inputs expected to be? This is particularly important given that we are talking about a new set of principles rather than endorsing already existing international guidelines and principles, and adding a few more region specific principles. The advantages of the region specific principles need to be argued clearly. This was already highlighted in the Chiba workshop and that it has to be kept in mind in the further process.

5. The Analysis: Specific to the Principles

5.1. Principles on Internal Quality Assurance

The Chiba Principles lists seven principles under ‘Internal Quality Assurance’. They are about ensuring a quality culture in the institution through appropriate policies and procedures as well as facilitating mechanisms. Survey responses indicate strong agreement to these principles. The Table below summarises the responses received on a five-point scale where ‘5’ denotes strong agreement and ‘1’ denotes strong disagreement. One full member did not answer any of the agreement/disagreement questions indicating that there are other broader issues to be considered before finding out about the agreement to the principles.

Agency	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>Full Members</i>							
1. AUQA Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. BAN-PT Indonesia	5	5	5	5*	5	5	5
3. GDETA Vietnam	5	5	5	5	5	5	4
4. HEEACT Taiwan	5	5	5	5	5	5	4
5. HEEO China	5*	5	5	4*	5	5	5*
6. HKCAAVQ Hong Kong	5*	3*	4*	1*	5	5	4*
7. MQA Malaysia	5	4	5	4*	5	5*	5*
8. NAAC India	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
9. NAA Russia	5	4*	5	5	5	5	5
10. NIAD Japan	3	4	4	4	4	4	4
11. NZUAAU New Zealand	5*	5*	5	5	5	5	5
12. ONESQA Thailand	5	5	5	4	5	4	5
13. PAASCU Philippines	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Intermediate Member</i>							
14. QAA Sri Lanka	4	4	5	5	4	4	5
<i>Institutional Member</i>							
15. NUST Pakistan	5*	5	5	5*	5	5*	5
16. SVPITM	5*	5*	5*	5*	5	5*	5*

India							
17. Univ of the South Pacific (USP), Fiji	3*	5*	5	5	5	5	5

** indicates that the respondent has added a significant comment.*

The summary table indicates that most of the responses denote ‘strong agreement’ with the principles. The only ‘strong disagreement’ is in relation to Principle 4 on the grounds that it is an overlap. Reconsideration of that principle is needed.

Principle 1: A quality assurance culture is created, defined, supported, and promulgated.

While expressing strong agreement to this principle, one respondent noted that ‘within this culture, institutions should endeavour to ensure that their operation meets the legal, ethical and quality standards as expected and / or required of within the jurisdiction / community’. Expanding the principle to spell out the various stakeholders to be included in the creation of the culture was recommended by another respondent. Reordering of the actions (changing the sequencing of created-defined-supported-promulgated) was suggested by one respondent. Replacing some of the action terms with other familiar terms had been attempted by a few respondents.

It is reasonable to conclude that there is strong support to this principle and that there is room for some minor finetuning.

Principle 2: Quality Assurance aligns with and is embedded within the institution’s unique goals and objectives.

One respondent questioned the expectation that QA be embedded within the goals and objectives. That respondent sees quality assurance as ‘an organisation culture and a mechanism for quality operation / execution’. Another respondent emphasised the need to explicitly indicate that quality assurance is understood and followed by the every employee in the institution . Such comments are due to the interpretations that respondents give to terms and the level of detail they expect. These can be addressed if the *Principles* are expanded and explained with good practices and exemplars.

Consideration of the sector wide goals and objectives of higher education, in addition to the institutional goals and objectives, was highlighted in another comment. This comment is valid for many other principles as well and can be addressed in the preamble.

One respondent suggested the following rewording: ‘Quality assurance activities are effectively embedded within the institution and are aligned with the institution’s unique goals and objectives’

Minor finetuning is adequate. If the principles can be expanded and explained with good practices and exemplars that will address variations in interpretations. The preamble should be strengthened to highlight the need to consider the national contexts.

Principle 3: Internal quality management systems, policies and procedures are in place.

A couple of respondents suggested an explicit mention of the word 'effectiveness'. The need to shape institutional internal quality assurance according to the demands in the education system was commented on by an institutional member.

Adding 'effectiveness' to the wording of the Principle should be considered.

Principle 4: Periodic approval, monitoring and review of programs and awards.

This is seen as an overlap with the next principle, perhaps one of the mechanisms to implement principle 5. If retained, rewording this into a complete sentence such as 'Effective approval, monitoring and review of programs and awards undertaken on a cyclic basis' is necessary.

The role of the academic staff in periodic monitoring and review and having a structure in place to act on the recommendations has been suggested by an institutional member. This is again a case of developing exemplars and good practices.

Reconsider the place of this Principle. If retained include examples.

Principle 5: A strategy for the continuous enhancement of quality is developed and implemented.

Some expansion such as '. . . developed, implemented and monitored' has been suggested.

Incorporating Principle 4 with Principle 5, and providing examples could be helpful.

Principle 6: Quality assurance of academic staff is maintained.

Some respondents expanded the principle by adding emphasis such as 'maintained and enhanced'. The word 'maintained' was expanded to explicitly state that the academic staff should be supported with effective professional development. Means to achieve professional development was suggested in one of the responses such as 'Faculty members participate in National and International Level Development Programs to update the information.'

One respondent suggested additional items to be included under this principle.

Overall, these inputs support the earlier finding that good practices and exemplars need to be provided.

Principle 7: Appropriate and current information about the institution, its programs, awards and achievements is made publicly available.

Addition of adverbs and adjectives such as ‘regularly’, ‘available’ or ‘in real time’ was suggested by the respondents.

5.2. Summary of Responses to Internal Quality Assurance

Overall, there is strong agreement to the *Principles* on internal quality assurance and some finetuning is required. Institutional members have been more active in responding to this section. Comments indicate that there is a desire to make the expectations of the *Principles* (what is involved in the implementation) clearer. For example, one of the respondents indicated that the modes through which quality assurance information is made public (Web site/ Magazines/ Journals/ News Papers) should be included in the *Principles*. Another respondent spelt out the information to be made public such as graduation statistics, progression statistics, finances etc, which should be ready for internal and external review. It is possible to include this level of detail if the *Principles* are expanded to provide examples and exemplars.

5.3. Principles on Quality Assessment

The Chiba Principles lists six principles under ‘Quality Assessment’ and a general item that applies to these six principles. Around these seven aspects, the survey questionnaire had seven questions. There was strong agreement to all the principles and there were some good comments towards finetuning the principles. One full member did not answer any of the agreement/disagreement questions indicating that there are other broader issues to be considered before finding out about the agreement to the principles.

Agency	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Full Members							
1. AUQA Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. BAN-PT Indonesia	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3. GDETA Vietnam	5	5	5	5	5	5	4
4. HEEACT Taiwan	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
5. HEEO China	4*	5	5	5	5	5	4*
6. HKCAAVQ Hong Kong	5	5	5	5	4*	5	5
7. MQA Malaysia	5	5*	5*	5	5*	5*	4*
8. NAAC India	5	4	4	5	5	4	4
9. NAA Russia	5	4*	5	5	4*	4	5
10. NIAD Japan	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
11. NZUAAU New Zealand	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
12. ONESQA Thailand	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
13. PAASCU Philippines	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Intermediate Member							
14. QAA Sri Lanka	4*	5	5	5	5	5	4*
Institutional Member							
15. NUST Pakistan	5	5	5	5*	5*	5	5*
16. SVPITM India	5*	5*	5	4	4*	4	4
17. University of the South Pacific, Fiji	5	5	4*	5	5	5	5

* indicates that the respondent has added a significant comment.

The APQN response to the Chiba Principles in 2008 indicated that the way the term ‘quality assessment’ is used is not in line with how it is used internationally. Networks of QA agencies such as INQAAHE use the term quality assurance as the overarching term. It would be clearer to use quality assurance as the general term. In 2008, APQN gave a feedback on this issue but the use of the term quality assessment was retained in the *Principles*. Other specific comments are discussed below.

Principle 8: Quality assurance activities are undertaken on a cyclical basis.

One respondent commented that the QA activities should be done at the ‘inter-collegial and self-assessment level’ and another respondent queried whether it is better to specify the periodicity of QA activities. One institutional member commented that the principle should include student feedback mechanisms and attention to infrastructure and ICT facilities to assure quality. These are issues that deal with specificity and they can be addressed by providing explanations and examples to the Principle.

Keeping the Principle still at a high level, it can be finetuned to include the monitoring aspect as highlighted by one of the respondents. Addition of the phrase ‘. . . and monitored for effectiveness’ may be considered.

Overall, adding the ‘monitoring’ aspect and providing examples may be required.

Principle 9: Stakeholders participate in developing the standards and criteria for assessment.

Noting that involving all stakeholders may pose problems and have certain disadvantages, one respondent placed an emphasis on ‘key stakeholders’ and another respondent argued that stakeholders are less prepared for ‘developing’ standards and criteria and that they can only be consulted. The meaning of ‘standards’ was questioned.

This issue can be addressed by providing explanations and examples.

Principle 10: Standards and criteria are publicly available and applied consistently.

In addition to the query on the meaning of standards, the other suggestions are about adding adjectives and adverbs that reflect consistency, fairness, objectivity and regularity. Some minor finetuning is adequate.

Principle 11: Formal procedures are in place to ensure reviewers have no conflict of interest.

There were no significant comments. There was strong agreement to the Principle.

Principle 12: Assessment would normally include: 1) institutional self-assessment; 2) external assessment by a group of experts and site visits as agreed; 3) publication of a

report, including decisions and recommendations; 4) a follow-up procedure to review actions taken in light of recommendations made.

The level of detail of the Principles is not consistent throughout – some are very general and some are operational, e.g. the four stages included in this Principle are more operational. This comment was also noted in APQN’s feedback about this aspect in 2008.

Publication of reports has always been a debatable issue. There are QA agencies that do not find the publication of full report helpful for their purposes in their specific national contexts. While there is general support for the steps mentioned above, including some amount of public disclosure of QA outcome, there are differences in how much of the outcome should be made public.

Comments on the changes to wording reflect this variation in perception:

- change publication of 'report' to 'outcome of external assessment'
- change 'publication of a report' to 'publication of a summary report or full report, including decisions and recommendations'
- change 'publication of a report' to 'publication of abstracts and comparison of results.'

Use of consistent terminology has been suggested. Use of 'quality assessment' and 'quality assurance' in an interchangeable way needs attention.

Some responses indicate that there is an expectation to spell out the specific details, for example including assessment of academic staff in terms of research etc. These expectations can be addressed by providing examples and good practices.

Principle 13: An appeals mechanism is available.

Addition of the word 'effective' has been suggested by a couple of respondents.

14: Inclusive of different foci: institution, program, institution and program.

This was not developed as a separate principle. It was meant to apply to all the other principles under Quality Assessment. Respondents indicate that this was a bit confusing. A similar situation with respect to item 23 which is not a principle in its own right was observed. These need more clarification.

5.4. Summary of Responses to Principles on Quality Assessment

Overall, there is strong support to the principles on quality assessment. Some finetuning of wordings is possible. Providing examples and exemplars will help in communicating the focus and scope of the principles to the readers and users.

5.5. Principles on Quality Assurance Agencies

There are eight principles and a general item under this section. The survey had nine questions, one around each one of these nine items. As before there was strong agreement to the principles. The comments for changes and finetuning have been only a few. One full member did not answer any of the agreement/disagreement questions indicating that there are other broader issues to be considered before finding out about the agreement to the principles.

Agency	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
Full Members									
1. AUQA Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2. BAN-PT Indonesia	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
3. GDETA Vietnam	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
4. HEEACT Taiwan	5	5	5	5	-	5	5	5	5
5. HEEO China	4*	5	5	5	5	4*	5	5	4*
6. HKCAAVQ Hong Kong	4*	5	4	4*	5	5	5	4*	5*
7. MQA Malaysia	5*	5	5*	5*	5*	5*	5	5*	5*
8. NAAC India	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	5	4
9. NAA Russia	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
10. NIAD Japan	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
11. NZUAAU New Zealand	5	5	5	5	5*	5*	5*	5*	5
12. ONESQA Thailand	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	-
13. PAASCU Philippines	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Intermediate Member									
14. QAA Sri Lanka	5	5	5	5	4*	5	5	4	4
Institutional Member									
15. NUST Pakistan	5	5	5*	2	5	5*	5	5*	5*
16. SVPITM India	4	5	5	4	4	4	5	5	3
17. University of the South Pacific, Fiji	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5

* indicates that the respondent has added a significant comment.

The eight Principles are about fairness of judgements, clarity in objectives, adequacy of resources, clarity and transparency of policies and procedures, and other good practices such as cooperation and research in relevant areas.

Since the comments are not many, instead of a 'Principle by Principle' approach, this section looks at the inputs in totality. Most of the comments are about finetuning and adding some phrases to make the emphasis explicit. For example, adding 'effectiveness' and 'monitoring progress' have been suggested as in the previous sections. Some comments made in the earlier sections have been highlighted again such as the query on the meaning of standards and using the terminology 'outcome' instead of 'reports'.

Some of the principles are not given in complete sentences. To ensure consistency all the principles should be given in full sentences. Two principles on policies and procedures and documentation are very similar (almost identical) in meaning. They need reconsideration.

Explicit acknowledgement to the fact that the QA Agency should work within the legal and educational framework relevant to the community / country that it serves has been commented by one respondent.

Under 'cooperation', one respondent suggested that it should be expanded further to include '. . . to ensure the effective and relevant transfer of appropriately quality assured qualifications and the mobility of students and staff'.

Research to be undertaken by the QA agencies received some comments. One respondent highlighted the need to include 'provision of training and development activities to inform all stakeholders of the accreditation / external review requirements, standards, processes and possible outcomes and follow-up' under this principle. Another respondent indicated that the nature of the research should be made explicit by adding the phrase 'in quality assurance matters, and related policies'. Adding reference to 'relevant communities of interest' has been suggested by another respondent.

5.6. Summary of Responses to Principles on Quality Assurance Agencies

Overall, there is strong support to the Principles on quality assurance agency and some finetuning is possible.

6. The Analysis: Use of the Principles

There were nine open ended questions under this part and they were about the use and dissemination of the principles.

6.1. Awareness

Awareness about the principles among the full members who responded to the survey has been good. Most respondents (ten out of twelve) indicated that they were aware of the Principles.

Those who indicated that their staff are not familiar with the principles, commented that newness of the principles and the language have been the reasons for the low level of awareness among their staff.

Some APQN members have considered the principles while developing their own QA procedures. The potential of the principles to serve as one of reference points towards enhancing the quality of higher education has been acknowledged in general. But many insist that their policies and procedures are already in alignment with the Principles. Four respondents indicated that the Chiba Principles are already embedded in their policies and procedures.

6.2. Role of the Governments

While the QA agencies may be familiar with the Principles, the outreach among the other stakeholders in many countries is not significant. An institutional member indicated that they came to know about the principles only after joining APQN. Lack of an official statement about the principles has been pointed out as a shortcoming by one of the respondents.

Responses on what the national governments have done and can do to promote the use of the Principles did not bring out encouraging inputs. Australia has already funded a number of activities related to the development and refinement of the Principles (Survey on QA developments, Workshop in Chiba) and the other governments are yet to show their support in any significant way.

Some respondents indicate that the current developments in their countries are already in alignment with the principles. For example, in Hong Kong, the Government has developed Good Practices Manual for the Sub-degree Sector in Hong Kong and majority of the principles adopted for the Good Practices Manual resemble the Chiba Principles. Many other respondents say that they are not aware of their governments' possible attention to the Principles.

Writing to the governments and regional bodies seeking support for the Principles has been suggested.

6.3. Promotion

To promote the principles, some APQN members have organised workshops and discussed them internally with staff. Two members have translated the principles into the national language.

The respondents have suggested a number of steps to promote the principles further and they include:

- The Principles need more discussion.
- Terminologies need to be tightened.
- Missing aspects should be introduced.
- Uniqueness and value addition of the principles should be established.
- Initiate nationwide or regional workshops
- Identify and reach specific stakeholders within the region.
- Develop instructions in detail that can make more people understand these principles
- Give more publicity through the APQN website
- Maybe region based representative institutions to be selected through which Chiba principles may be promoted

One respondent commented that APQN should commission an independent assessment of the extent to which current practice by agencies in the region aligns with the principles. This would have to be more than the completion of surveys by the agencies themselves; this would have to be an independent assessment to find out what really happens, not what the agencies say happens.

7. Recommendations for Future Action

While there is strong agreement for the Principles, two points should be noted. Firstly, many APQN members who support the principles indicate that their policies and procedures are already in alignment with the Principles. Many responses build on that premise rather than reflecting on the Principles per se. Secondly, there are concerns about the broader aspects related to these Principles such as unique advantages and region specific aspects. The advantages of the region specific principles need to be argued clearly. Uniqueness and value addition of the principles should be established. Since this articulation has not been done, some APQN members have questioned the present form of the Principles. Keeping these two points in the background, the following are the recommendations that emerge from the survey:

7.1. Finetuning

- Some of the principles are not given in complete sentences. To ensure consistency all the principles should be given in full sentences.
- Some more finetuning has been suggested by the respondents and it is worth considering them.
- Terminologies need to be tightened.
- Missing aspects (such as dealing with TNE) should be introduced.
- The diagrammatic representation of the Principles is not very clear. The diagram has two intersecting circles. We would expect that principles that are common to both institutions and QA agencies should be in the common area of the intersecting circles. If this rationale is applied, the whole diagram will need a total recast.
- There are some overlaps in the principles and they need reconsideration.
- It is critical that the purpose of the principles and the roles of various stakeholders are clearly stated.
- Before embarking on the next finetuning, more active involvement of institutional members and intermediate members may be warranted. Attention to factors that might have limited their participation, such as early stage of QA in their countries, is worth exploring. A different strategy may be required to involve them more fully in the future discussions.

7.2. Promotion

- APQN membership is very diverse. If the framework of the Principles is to be used as a tool for continuous improvement, the principles need to be explained in terms of their suitability to varying national contexts. Examples of good practices that will help the APQN members to move from one level of effectiveness to the next higher level will be helpful.
- There is merit in trying to see where the APQN members stand with respect to these Principles – developmental stage, continuous improvement stage or exemplar stage, is an interesting and valuable aspect to consider.

- While the QA agencies are familiar with the Principles, the reach among the other stakeholders is not significant. Writing to the governments and regional bodies seeking support for the Principles may be considered.

7.3. Way forward

- The report will be forwarded to the APQN Board for consideration of future action in regard to the further development of the Principles.

Appendix 1: Survey on the Revision of Higher Education Quality Assurance Principles for the Asia Pacific Region ('Chiba Principles')

Please enter information in the spaces provided below

Organization			
Country/Territory			
Contact Details of the Respondent Person			
Name		Title(Dr/Professor/Mr/Mrs/Ms)	
E-mail		Telephone number	
Postal address			

Part 1: Questions on Framework for Higher Education Quality Assurance Principles ('Chiba Principles')

Based on 'A Framework for Higher Education Quality Assurance Principles in the Asia Pacific Region' (see Appendix), we'd like to ask you to comment on the 'Chiba Principles', and therefore some open and closed questions are listed below. We would appreciate if you would suggest some changes to the wording, add dimensions or contextualize them.

Rank from 1-5				
5 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	1 <input type="checkbox"/>
Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree

Please indicate with 'x', i.e. 5 =strongly agree; 4=agree; 3= neither agree nor disagree; 2= disagree; 1= strongly disagree.

A: Internal Quality Assurance

	Items	5	4	3	2	1
1	A quality assurance culture is created, defined, supported and promulgated.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Please make some changes or redraft it:

2	Quality assurance aligns with and is embedded within the institution's unique goals and objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

3	Internal quality management systems, policies and procedures are in place.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

4	Periodic approval, monitoring and review of programs and awards.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

5	A strategy for the continuous enhancement of quality is developed and implemented.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

6	Quality assurance of academic staff is maintained.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

7	Appropriate and current information about the institution, its programs, awards and achievements is made publicly available.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
---	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

B: Quality Assessment

	Items	5	4	3	2	1
8	Quality assurance activities (at institutional and/or program level) are undertaken on a cyclical basis.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Please make some changes or redraft it:

9	Stakeholders participate in developing the standards and criteria for assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

10	Standards and criteria are publicly available and applied consistently.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

11	Formal procedures are in place to ensure reviewers have no conflict of interest.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

12	Assessment would normally include: (1) institutional self-assessment; (2) external assessment by a group of experts and site visits as agreed; (3) publication of a report, including decisions and recommendations; (4) a follow-up procedure to review actions taken in light of recommendations made.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

13	An appeals mechanism is available.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	------------------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

14	Inclusive of different foci: (1) institution; (2) program; (3) institution and program.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

C: Quality Assurance Agency

	Items	5	4	3	2	1
15	Independent and autonomous responsibility for operations – judgments should not be influenced by third parties.	<input type="checkbox"/>				

Please make some changes or redraft it:

16	Written mission statement, goals and objectives are clearly defined.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

17	Human and financial resources are adequate and accessible.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

18	Policies, procedures, reviews and assessment reports are fully and clearly disclosed to the public.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

19	Documentation that states standards used, assessment methods, processes, decision criteria and appeals processes are clear.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

20	Periodic review of activities, effects and value.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

21	Cooperates with other agencies and key players across national borders.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

22	Undertake research and provide information and advice.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

23	Inclusive of different forms: (1) accreditation; (2) audit.	<input type="checkbox"/>				
----	---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Please make some changes or redraft it:

Part 2 Questions on Use of the 'Chiba Principles'

We would appreciate if you would answer the following questions! By doing so, you help APQN to capture how the principles have been used and how they could be better promulgated in the future.

24. Is your agency familiar with 'Chiba Principles'?

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If not, what might be the reasons?

25. Has your agency discussed 'Chiba Principles'?

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If so, what were the main views expressed?

26. Has your agency made use of the principles?

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If so, how and in what context?

27. Have your agency taken any initiatives to share the principles with other stakeholders such as higher education institutions, students and/or employers

28. What can your agency do to promote 'Chiba Principles' in the future?

29. Has your government done anything to promote 'Chiba Principles'?

Yes	No
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If so, what has your government done to promote 'Chiba Principles'?

30. Do you have any other suggestions as to what your government can do to consider the 'Chiba Principles'?

31. What can APQN do to promote the Chiba Principles?

32. Do you think there is anything missing in 'Chiba Principles'?

Appendix 2: A Framework for Higher Education Quality Assurance Principles in the Asia Pacific Region

Note: This web link (<http://www.brisbanecommunique.deewr.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/F7C48BD9-DA8D-4CFD-8C6A-914E001E2E39/23073/FinalQAPrinciples.pdf>) can lead you to the whole text of *Higher Education Quality Assurance Principles for the Asia Pacific Region*

