

## **Employing International QA Models**

### **Important Considerations for National Systems of Tertiary Education**

#### **Transcript**

**Michelle Claville:** Greetings everyone. I am Michelle Claville. I'm the Vice President for Research and Policy Analysis here at the Council for Higher Education Accreditation. I also have the pleasure of serving as liaison to CHEA International Quality Group and it is my pleasure to welcome you to the second webinar in our CHEA CIQG webinar series for this year 2024. And I also have the pleasure of introducing you to today's moderator. The title of today's webinar, as you know, is Employing International Quality Assurance Models, Important Considerations for National Systems of Tertiary Education. Our moderator is Dr. Allan Goodman, a CIQG Advisory Council member and Chief Executive Officer for the Institute of International Accreditation. Before I yield to Allan, I just want to share some housekeeping tips. We will have opportunity for you to pose questions and comments in the Q and A functionality of the webinar module and those will be addressed after the presentations. With that being said, I welcome you Allan, and I'll let you go ahead and with the rest of the introductions. Thank you.

**Allan Goodman:** Great, Michelle. Thank you. Sorry for the little delay in unmuting. My background as a professor is in the field of political science. One of the most fundamental dictum of political science is that all politics are local. And in preparing for this webinar on the topic of international quality assurance models, I began to ask myself, is that true for quality assurance? That at the end of the day, all methods and processes are local? So we're very fortunate to have a panel of an intercultural panel of three real experts in the field of quality assurance to try to help sort that out. Our first speaker is going to be Dr. Chan Basaruddin from Indonesia, a distinguished professor of math and computer science and synonymous with quality assurance and its networks in the ASEAN region and throughout the Islamic world. So he'll speak first and then Dr. Sylvia Fernandez will follow up. Like Pak Chan.

She is also synonymous with quality assurance organizations and processes at the state, local, national, and international level. So we welcome hearing from her after Pak Chan and then hitting cleanup is John Cribbin, Senior International Education Administrator, a distinguished professor of geography in his former life, and has gravitated to the field of community of quality assurance in multicultural settings. John, since the United States is host of the World Cricket Championship this year, I need to also mention that you'll take questions about how the game is scored, who won and why, given your role in the Hong Kong, Asian and Asian Cricket Council and the International Cricket Councils. So I look forward to initial presentations from each, we'll get to questions and answers just as soon as we possibly can over to Pak Chan, Pak Chan needs to be unmuted, Ashley,

**Chan Basaruddin:** Thank you Allan for the nice introduction. Good day everyone. Good morning, good afternoon. I'm currently sitting in a very nice city in Central Asia, I mean in Eastern Europe, sorry, Bucharest, and just completed the INQAHE forum, which is closed yesterday. I'm really honored today being invited as one of the panelists in this session. And I will be talking about the system for accreditation or quality assurance system in particular, things that I am familiar with in my region. As Allan already mentioned that I'm from Indonesia and with regional experience as the president of the ASEAN Quality Assurance Network will share a little bit, about the system of accreditation and quality assurance for higher education in general. In particular, we will be looking at the shifting or the changing of the accreditation at least from the last decades.

Okay, can I have next slide? So before we talk about the changing or the shifting itself, I think it will be wise to see the key elements of the accreditation system itself. Based on my observation and experience at least, there are five key elements if we are talking about the accreditation as a system. The first component of course, there has to be a clear governance function which will determine how and what policies stand the accreditation is taking place. And secondly, there has to be also standard and procedure that will be the foundation and also the standard that will become a reference when we are talking about the quality. And the third element is the process of external evaluation where the standard being tested, be it at the institution level or the program level where the accreditation status later on will be determined. And then of course as any process of assessment, there has to be also an opportunity for the assessee, for the institutions to check and also reconfirm about their status.

So the remediation process should also be there. And finally, the accreditation itself as a part of the quality assurance should be seen as a continuous quality improvement. So within this five element, we will see that raw, I mean there is a needs to continuously looking at the relevance of each of these element with the context with the needs and with the surrounding of the accreditation process itself. Now, there are three major parties that will involved and also have the interest as far as the quality assurance or accreditation system is of concern. The first party is the government is a regulator. Usually they are interested in securing or protecting at least the interest of the public at large to make sure that any providers of higher education meets a certain minimum standard that any programs that offered by the institution will lead to a certain value for the society.

The second parties will be the profession where they need to secure that the university graduates or higher education institution output will meet their professional expectation and standard. So in that regard, they will see that a certain level of quality is a necessity and the demonstration of meetings as quality can be easily seen if there are such model elements such as the acquisition system. And last but at least is the theory education institution itself as part of their daily life. They also need someone to look on their shoulders and see whether they have been doing the right job or not by having an external institution to check on their programs. Now please proceed to the next slide here I'm going to talk about there are at least four major drives or drivers for changing where such element or the system of accreditation will need to be adjusted from time to time.

The first drive is massification of higher education moving toward universal universal high education surfaces. In the old days where education is still considered an elite, the quality, assuring quality, it is not as complex as it is now. So with the growing number of students and also the growing number of providers of higher education institution, the system which will ensure or assure the quality will deem necessary, will be very, very or highly critical. In addition to that, the size of classroom or the number of institution that need to be accredited, they will also make the system of accreditation itself to be made as more robust, yet at the same time simpler because of the scale of the task for the accreditation process for itself. The second driver, it will be the technology. We see that before COVID for example, we normally see that the process of external quality assurance or accreditation will involve the onsite evaluation or site visit.

But during COVID we see an alternative where technology online radio conferencing can support that and many accreditation agency, they also moving toward paperless process where the starting from the collecting the data and also submitting or assessment of the sub assessment report is no longer through the manual process, rather it is being done electronically. So with that technology drive, even with the help of some technology that will help the accreditors or the assessment panel to analyze the data such as using the analytics and ethical data will also make significant change to the process of the accreditation. The third one, of course, the design of the standard and model

and procedure, sorry for the accreditation will also be determined by the key mission of the high education itself. But now we see that people talking about the broader mission of higher education institution, not merely focused on teaching and research.

The third mission becoming more important, even beyond that, in some countries the role of the institution like universities are needed not only to produce the knowledge and also the human resources skill, human resources, but also to drive the improvement of the economy of the nation. So the standard and procedure, especially the standard being used to measure the quality, which later on be implemented in the accreditation process will also need to be adjusted. Of course, the emergence of the new modalities, like the transnational education and short learning process will also be the drivers for the change. Okay, my last point will be to give you some example. Next slide please. Where such new attempt or new model of the accreditation are now being seen. For example, we just read from India, they are shifting, I mean they are implementing the binary, but they are thinking of shifting to maturity based grad system.

But in they're moving that way around from the credit into simply maturity, I have simply binary like in Indonesia for example. And of course the accreditation also changing from mandatory to incentivized voluntary to fully voluntary and more advanced country. Of course they're already voluntary, but in some developing countries, like in my region, most will still be in mandatory aspect. And also accreditation is not only quality assurance but more toward the quality enhancement and shifting also from simple compliance into more strategic and risk-based approach of accreditation and the tools to super adaptation now becoming more and more technology based, so blended with digital system, the process can be made more efficient. That's all my presentation. Alan, back to you. Thank you very much for your attention.

**Allan Goodman:** Thanks Pak Chan. Thank you very much. We'll go to Sylvia next please.

**Sylvia Fernandez:** Sure. Hello everyone. My name is Sylvia Fernandez. I serve as the president and CEO of the Council for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs. I know that is a mouthful, we are known as CACREP and we were established in 1981 as a CHEA- recognized accreditor for counsellor education. And in the United States and Puerto Rico, we have 955 programs housed in 463 institutions. In his introduction, Allan talked about paying attention to what is global but applying it to what's local. So I'm here to talk about how we use similar processes in quality assurance in accreditation, and applying that to a very different model of recognition. So CACREP had been regularly received requests for accreditation of counsellor education programs around the world, and CACREP recognized that its standards was based on culture, educational system and regulations in the United States and were not appropriate to be used around the world.

And so CACREP created IRCEP, which is the International Registry of Counsellor Education Programs. And this entity IRCEP, creates principles of quality education that could be used across cultures. And recognizing that this is important for me to say here, that this is a recognition process, not an accreditation process. So IRCEP is the international affiliate of CACREP. We develop standards or principles that are used across cultures, not accreditation. So the purpose of IRCEP is to foster excellence in education and training of professional counselors around the world. Training of counselors happens in two environments. One is at institutions of higher education like universities, and the other is in entities that might be social agencies or religious entities where they are all committed to making sure that individuals who will be providing counseling services are well prepared. And so the recognition that IRCEP provides serves as a quality assurance function, particularly in countries where there isn't an established quality assurance process for the education of counselors.

So what we seek to do is to empower programs in specific countries to develop curriculum. And I'll talk in a little while about the principles that we look for in this recognition process. And our goal is to help countries develop their own QA processes, particular to counselor education. By being a part of IRCEP and being on the registry, it allows for programs to be recognized based on common tenets. And when I talk about the principles, you will see that the principles are around what's global, what is recognized as quality in preparation, and in our case, particularly for counselor education.

The IRCEP is governed by a council, and the council is who's responsible for developing the principles. And these principles are focused on what is culturally sensitive around the world. The review processes, a review, rigorous process. I'll slow down, a rigorous process and a systematic review. I guess we can go to the next slide now. So let me talk about those six principles. So the first principle is the learning environment. And in the learning environment, what we look for is does the institution have legal approval to operate in the country? The second thing that we look at is the curriculum that's developed focused specifically on counselor education. Not only does the institution have to have legal approval, they must also be approved by whatever the regulatory entity is that authorizes education. It could be the Ministry of Education, it could be a professional organization that is the recognized entity that provides the authority.

And the third thing that we look at is the financial and administrative support provided for the program. So that's what we look at under principle one, which is the learning environment principle two, which is academic quality. What we are looking for here is does the program have the processes, the tools and the thresholds to measure quality? And the quality is determined by the mission of the program, the objectives of the program, as well as the assessment of knowledge, skills and professional dispositions. So that's what we look for in principle two. In principle three, we look for what is it that the institution does in terms of recruiting, enrolling and retaining students that are appropriate for the profession. So that's principle three. Principle four focuses on the foundational counseling curriculum. The foundational curriculum is concentrated in eight areas, professional counseling, orientation and ethics, social and cultural identities and diversity, lifespan development, theories and techniques, skills and practice, supervised practice and research and assessment.

So these are all the areas that needs to be encompassed in the program. Principal five looks at who's teaching, who are the educators in this program, what are their qualifications and do they meet the criteria for what the profession is looking for? And so we also look at how does the program recruit, employ, and retain faculty or instructors in that program? And principal six looks at leadership, what's the governing structure of the program and who their entities are. That's something that Chan had talked about in terms of who the interested parties are in the program. The benefits include creating a network of like-minded individuals that there's a recognition for standards of quality, it's visibility for the programs that are part of the registry so that when we're looking for collaborations, we have a network of individuals that we can put together and share best practices through research, through sharing of content and instruction.

And it also allows for students as they start to look at mobility within the country or internationally, it is there. And on the next slide you will see that it's a rigorous review process. It occurs at multiple levels and it is an iterative process. There's always information that goes back and forth between IRCEP the program before it's finally approved to be on the registry. So this is just one application of what Allan referred to as global principles, but in local context and application of a process while similar to accreditation is a recognition of quality around the world. Thank you.

**Allan Goodman:** Oh, thank you. That was very, very clear. Sorting out all of the acronyms and organizations, and I'll come back to culture maybe in the discussion. I'll go over to John next. John,

**John Cribbin:** Thank you. Thank you Allan. So I'm describing if you like a practice for one system. The first thing to say is Hong Kong is a relatively open market for international education to be offered at tertiary level, but it has two sets of regulations in relation to that. And the first one, the basic and legal one and compulsory one for a course leading to an international award to be offered is via the non-local courses registry of our education bureau. The second level, which is a voluntary one, is called non-local accreditation. And that's quite an intense exercise carried out by our quality agency, the Hong Kong Council for Accreditation of Academic and Vocational Qualifications, H-K- C-A-A-V-Q. Next slide please.

So this is a quick picture of the scale of transnational education over the past two decades really. And first thing to say is 1999 is actually the first year in which any figures are available because that's when the licensing system, if you like, came into effect. So as you can see, there was growth for the first five or six years and then a slow decline and a faster decline in the last few years. So something like 40% in the last decade dropped in the numbers 60% really over the last 20 years. So it's quite steep. Next slide please. Now the legislation that controls the accreditation is called Cap 493 and it only commenced in 1998. And there are two categories exempted, which are those partnerships with the eight UGC - publicly funded universities and registered any other bodies, whether with private universities or colleges, private companies, or in fact even the non-local body itself can register under this system.

Next slide please. And the rationale for that, that difference is that the eight publicly funded universities are able to vouch for the quality of the institutions they partner with while others have to undergo a fairly simple process via our local quality agency. So the costs are a bit higher for registration than exemption, but otherwise all the annual reporting requirements are the same. Next slide please. So the criteria are fairly simple. One is that the institution is recognized in its home jurisdiction. The second is that the program to be offered is also an offer in the home institution. And then the third is that there is some support for the learners like library support, tutorials, classrooms available. So the fees involved are minimal for the exemptive sector talking about US \$15, but a bit more for a registered three to 4,000 for the registered courses. Next slide please.

So here's a quick picture of the scale. So as you can see in 2007, there are about almost 1200 courses more exempted than registered in 2007, but by 2024 on the bottom there, the bit more registered than exempted. Next slide please. And here's some data on the exporting countries. You can see there in 2007 the dominant position of the UK but a spread of other countries, particularly Australia and to an extent the same other states. And again in the registered sector a bit less for the UK but still the dominant provider. And then in the next slide please. And here's 2024, where the UK position is even more dominant in the exempted sector, almost 90% and nearly 75% in the registered sectors where the other countries have been squeezed. And I think this reflects partly this history if you like, of Hong Kong as a British colony, so that that's an interest from the UK and also that UK institutions are exporters of TNE in a big way, whereas some of the other countries are not. Clearly there's been a decline of interest from Australian institutions compared to the previous years. Next slide please.

I should also say quickly on that that in terms of the US involvement, there are about 1,200 students in TNE courses from the states. About 400 are in one course on gemology one professional course. About 400 are in high value MBA courses from places like the Kellogg school. Who else have we got? We've got Chicago Booth, who've got a campus here, the case Western

from Canada and Columbia. And between them, those courses probably bring in 50 million US dollars. So they're big small numbers, but a big factor. And then the other 400 are in lesser known universities. So this brings us then to non-local accreditation. It's a voluntary process if an overseas provider wants to have its course recognized in the same way as any local qualification. So it's an intense exercise over two to three days involving a panel with external academics and professionals. And if it's successful then it's equivalent to any local university qualification subject to review every five years.

And the important thing for students is that they're eligible for a wider range of loans and grants than if it's not in this system. It's costly, of course about 125,000 US dollars and there's about a hundred courses on that register at the moment from overseas and more than 20 of those are from my own institution. Next slide please. So to conclude, it's a relatively simple and cheap process to operate a t and e course in Hong Kong, but rather more elaborate and costly to become fully locally accredited. And one important caveat there is that the legislation which dates from the 1990s specifically does not cover online and wholly distance courses. Of course, there weren't any online courses back in the nineties I guess, and obviously now that's much more more common provision, particularly since Covid. So those courses are not caught by legislation unless they have any physical presence in Hong Kong.

So that's an important caveat. The other thing it's worth saying is that since the 2021, also our inland revenue department has started taxing the revenue of overseas providers, which obviously is a deterrent. Going back to why the numbers have declined, partly it's a decline in our local population of secondary school leavers and partly more local provision because the number of community colleges and self-finance universities since the turn of the century has grown quite significantly. So that's squeezed out I think TNE to an extent. Hong Kong itself has an ambition to be an international education hub, attract students from elsewhere. It may be that that will help TNE in the future. We at the moment, Chinese mainland Macau and Taiwan students cannot enter onto non-local courses in Hong Kong, but there are signs that the border may be, the boundary may be softening, and if that market opens up, then there could be a lot of growth. But that's where we are at the moment. So thank you Allan.

**Allan Goodman:** John, thank you very much. You answered all the questions I was about to ask related to TNE and is there cultural resistance and the local context for it? Ashley, do you want to tell us how people can submit questions? And if you have questions already, I'd be happy if you read the first one.

**Ashley Corley:** Sure. You can just submit your questions in the Q&A box. We do have one question for Dr. Fernandez. For counseling programs that are in online modality in the US, do you recommend to have IRCEP accreditation and CACREP accreditation?

**Sylvia Fernandez:** If I'm understanding the question, do we have CACREP accreditation and IRCEP recognition for online programs.

**Ashley Corley:** And do you recommend it? I

**Sylvia Fernandez:** I think Covid has taught us that online education is viable and what it has also done for us is increased an awareness of what quality assurance in online education and digital teaching and learning. So CACREP in the US for US programs, we do have programs that are online programs that are accredited. They are US-based programs that are also on the IRCEP registry and there may be some that use digital teaching and learning, but not fully online. We've not seen that yet with cept programs, but that is always a possibility.

**Allan Goodman:** Thank you. Ashley, if you collect more questions, I'm going to direct one to Pak Chan. Early in your presentation you made the very important point that quality assurance also can lead to the enhancement of the educational experience. In your region, can you cite an example or two of where there was that direct relationship between QA and then the educational experience was enhanced because of that oversight or that review?

**Chan Basaruddin:** Thank you. Alright. Yeah. In case of Indonesia, for example, the accreditation process is considerably new. We started doing accreditation in 1998, so currently about three or third cycle is being done. If we look at the impact of the accreditation itself, of course it's not really easy to see the correlation directly between the process of acquisition with the increase of quality. But if we look in a particular areas, things that we have done some study, for example, where the graduates actually working in a specific profession like accounting, engineering or medical based on our study, indeed, if we compare between the program which is not yet meeting the standard fully or at least still considerably low in the rating of the accreditation will perform less according to the user of the, in addition to that, internally we also check and one of the standard in our accreditation is the efficiency, internal efficiency happening in the university. Of course we also see that the accredit institution tend to be more efficient internally. I think that's my answer, Alan.

**Allan Goodman:** Thank you. Ashley, I think we have a question now.

**Ashley Corley:** Yes. What restrictions do you see for the United States based on college offering learning sites where teachers recruited to teach a class onsite internationally? CHEA has the requirement that a CHEA-recognized accreditor seek guidance from governmental authorities. And this is a question to all panelists.

**Allan Goodman:** That's probably only one that Michelle can answer. So I'm hoping Michelle is on the line and can unmute herself.

**Michelle Claville:** So I am here and

**Allan Goodman:** It's the first time I've heard a question posed that way in terms of our extraterritorial ability to affect who can teach what in a place outside the United States.

**Michelle Claville:** Yeah, that's a question that I don't know that CHEA has ought to be responding to with regard to what teachers can teach outside of the United States. However, since it is posed to everyone on the panel, may I ask Sylvia to chime in with regard to what is happening with CACREP, if there's any guidance there and I will follow suit.

**Sylvia Fernandez:** Sure. I think I see two parts to this question. The first part to the question is when there are US-based programs that are operating in another country. So if University X in Virginia is offering a program in Hong Kong and you are employing individuals who live in Hong Kong to teach in those programs, what's the criteria? And so the criteria that we look for is in terms of what is their own background, their own degree preparation, their work preparation. So it is again, locally based, which is different than someone who might be traveling who might be in the institution in Virginia who travels to Hong Kong to teach. So I hear two different parts to that question is when the program is offered in another country, the degree is being awarded by the US-based program that, so there's two ways that faculty teach in that program. So they still, if it's accredited by CACREP, they have to meet the US based standards. If the program is an IRCEP program that's recognized, we pay attention to what the local expectations are. So for example, for counseling, the entry level is the master's degree. So at minimum faculty must have a master's degree. But in other countries where entry into the profession may be at the baccalaureate level, so

then we're looking for faculty who at least have a baccalaureate and some tertiary education. So it just depends on which entity is providing the recognition or the accreditation. So it depends.

**John Cribbin:** If I could speak in practice of Hong Kong, I mean it's a matter between the two institutions and clearly if it's the University of Virginia, then they have the final say and they may fly in their faculty or if they're confident in the people we can put forward who can teach their course, then that's what can happen. Often it is a combination of both that there will be some flying faculty and some local teaching.

**Allan Goodman:** John, you mentioned Hong Kong's aspiration to be an international or global hub. If that aspiration increasingly gets realized, how do you think that the processes you outlined may change or what may need to be added if the destination you seek to be an international hub?

**John Cribbin:** Well, I think mean one of the problems we have is simply that this is an expensive city and property is extremely expensive. So actually being able to provide for international students in a comfortable way is a major problem. But I think in terms of the quality processes, not much would change from the existing regime. But to be internationally competitive in Hong Kong, I think more overseas institutions would have to go through that more in depth process that I described so that they're on the Hong Kong qualifications register, the same as any local course. So that gives 'em the status that they need I think to attract international students.

**Allan Goodman:** We have 32 countries represented on this call with 180 participants. If anybody could put in the chat, does their accreditation or QA system already have two tiers for national institutions and then essentially foreign institutions Because if that continues, it may be a trend in accreditation. We have to look at that. There are two tiers and two different sets of criteria. Ashley, do we have any other questions because I have one more if we don't.

**Ashley Corley:** Go ahead.

**Allan Goodman:** Okay. So Sylvia, you mentioned when you were starting up you were essentially trying to avoid imposing US cultural norms and values on an international process. Do you recall one of the made in the USA things that your Council wanted particularly not to impose or wanted particularly to avoid because it's so unique to America?

**Sylvia Fernandez:** There are a couple of things that I can think about. One is entry level into the profession, right? In the United States it is at the masters level. In other countries it's not necessarily at that level. So recognizing that there is a difference in terms of entry into the profession, that's one and two recognition of the profession. Counseling happens to be one of those very highly personal interaction that individuals have. And so recognizing that there are the cultural aspects about talking to a stranger about your problems or paying attention to the type of institution in other countries, counseling training happens in faith-based institutions and recognizing that there may be greater numbers of faith-based institutions that are providing the training. Then in the United States it kind of recognizing that there's some of that that occurs too. But when we look at the curriculum, we look at what's universal in terms of understanding the human condition and the context within which that occurs. So paying attention to those kinds of things and not imposing those values that we have that are US based in other countries.

**Allan Goodman:** So Pak Chan, coming back to your initial chart of what drives and what goes into making quality assurance, is there something from the international QA world that fits particularly well in Indonesia that you're at a conference, one of your regional conferences, you traveled throughout the Islamic and the ASEAN world. Is there a process or a principle that is international in scope and works particularly well in your setting? And I'll ask that question of John next.



**Chan Basaruddin:** Okay. I think there are universal or common phenomena or trend in accreditation standard and process. Now they are questioning about the relevance and the efficiency. For example. Now of course when we are talking about relevant, it's always seen from the regional or national context. In Indonesia for example, we are still striving to bridge, I mean to link our higher education system into the needs or the demand from the user, especially industry. So the quality component in our case will be inclined more toward checking the impact or the outcomes of the process. Now we learn of course from other countries because, but maybe 10 years or five years ago, our standards still very much dominated by the input and process aspect, but now we are shifting toward that. In addition to that, we also learn from the international practices that the needs to look also into the third mission in more important component and accreditation process like the community engagement and how university actually engaged the community in the process, which is previously not really as an important part in our standard, but now we put it, we include that in our new standard.

**Allan Goodman:** And John, I imagine you have pretty active community engagement already in Hong Kong, but I'd welcome your observation on this

**John Cribbin:** Question as well. I think one thing perhaps I should have said earlier is that having gone through the basic level to be offered in Hong Kong, another requirement is that in any advertising or promotion of a course, there must be a statement that says there that it's up to an employer to recognize the qualification that this course leads to or not. In other words, in a convoluted way, they're saying this is not a quality assurance process, it's simply a market entry process that has gone on. It's only if you go through the second level that I described that you could say, then yes, there's been a pretty specific and high level quality process. And it is perhaps to deter the lesser known institutions. Obviously if it's Columbia or, Northwestern or Chicago Booth offering program, then say no more. They speak for themselves, whereas some lesser known institutions do not speak for themselves.

**Michelle Claville:** Allan, I just wanted to let you know that in response to your earlier request and the question that was posed, we have a comment that says the University Council of Jamaica, the National External Quality Assurance Agency, conducts accreditation locally but also conducts recognition of transnational education qualifications offered online. So that's in response to your earlier comment and in response to as an add-on to what Sylvia said. In short CHEA, as you know, we accredit the accreditor. We don't tell the institutions what to do. That being said, the accreditors understand that whatever happens in the United States, there is an expectation that the standards that we have set for our accreditors in the United States will also be represented in the other nations with which they engage. And of course, there is an expectation that there is some guidance according to the comment that was made or the question that was made to see guidance from governmental authorities.

**Allan Goodman:** Thank you, and thanks for Jamaica for letting us know it may be true throughout the Caribbean and Indy culture region. A quick speed round, because we're almost at the end of the hour, this is the first of a series of webinars we hope to do. I'd like to ask each of the panelists, if they could do another webinar for us, what would they like us to focus on? And I'll start with John and then Sylvia and end with Pak Chan.

**John Cribbin:** Well, I think, I mean really it's a question of where quality assurance is going as far as we are concerned. We've adopted quality assurance and enhancement now as our guideline internally. So it's really a question of whether that is a worldwide phenomenon, if you like, and then how we ensure that we're doing that, how the quality assurers can tell themselves that they're doing the right job.

**Allan Goodman:** Thank you. Sylvia?

**Sylvia Fernandez:** And I think some of that is about us looking at ourselves as well, right? In terms of continuous improvement about our own processes and as we get into the international arena to ensure that we recognize what's global, what's universal versus what's local. And I think being able to, as more of us get into the quality assurance and enterprise and are engaging internationally, that we do pay attention to what that is. So there's some internal reflection that needs to occur as well.

**Allan Goodman:** Thank you. I can see a continuing series of webinars already. Pak Chan, you conclude for us.

**Chan Basaruddin:** Yes. Thank you, Alan. I think on the same line of thought, as John and Sylvia already mentioned, that universities sometimes see the accreditation or qualitative process, external qualitative processes is somewhat burden to them. So the issue how to make it more efficient and more effective, it also will be important to be seen from, I mean for us as the agency who are doing the accreditation. So reflecting on that and an agreement, I second what John mentioned earlier, how to make it that the quality assurance process or the accreditation process is really helping the university to improve and sustain their quality.

**Allan Goodman:** When I volunteered to do the accreditation, be on the committee for Georgetown, people thought I was crazy because of the enormity of the burden and the multi-year. I learned a lot about the university and I also learned that I was crazy. I loved the panel. I'm so glad CHEA had put this together. Thanks, Ashley, Joel, Michelle, I think we're at the end of the hour, unless Ashley has further instructions for us and also how to access the recording. That would be great. Ashley, so

**Michelle Claville:** I'll jump in. Ashley, are you here? Yeah, I'll just jump in. I'm okay. Thank you so much. I thank you all for attending the webinar and I thank our presenters for presenting your expertise, for sharing what has been happening in your part of the world, especially with regard to international accreditation and something and recognition. I don't want to forget that Sylvia emphasized that recognition is also happening starting from a US base, but respecting the international space and the cultures that are reflected in that space. We invite you to continue to attend our webinar series. We expect to have another webinar by the fall, and so we are hoping that you will chime in for that. In the meantime, please expect to see a recording of this webinar within the next week and a half or so. So we again, thank you Allan, for being our moderator and we look forward to the next time we meet. Have a good day.