



Part Three: IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual

Document No.: IAPUC/IQA/MAN-2026-001

Version: 1.0

Effective Date: To be officially released

Preface

This Manual is the official normative document of the International Association of Private Universities and Colleges (IAPUC) Internal Quality Assurance System (IQA). It specifies in detail the standard system, application procedures, review mechanisms and decision-making procedures of IAPUC-IQA accreditation. It serves as the fundamental document guiding applicant institutions to conduct self-evaluation and self-improvement, and guiding peer reviewers to implement accreditation review work.

This Manual applies to all private universities, private colleges and private higher vocational education institutions that intend to obtain IAPUC-IQA accreditation.

Chapter 1 General Provisions

Article 1 Accreditation Objectives

The objectives of IAPUC-IQA accreditation are as follows:

- (1) To verify that applicant institutions have established and effectively operated an internal quality assurance system compliant with international standards;
- (2) To confirm that applicant institutions have achieved verifiable learning outcomes and institutional performance within the framework of their institutional missions;
- (3) To facilitate the formation of a self-reflective and continuous improvement-oriented quality culture within applicant institutions;
- (4) To provide credible quality information for global learners, employers and the public.

Article 2 Accreditation Principles

IAPUC-IQA accreditation adheres to the following basic principles:

- (1) **Voluntary Application Principle:** Accreditation is based on institutional voluntary application with no mandatory requirements;
- (2) **Information Transparency Principle:** Accreditation standards, procedures and decision-making rules are fully transparent to applicant institutions and the public;
- (3) **Evidence-Based Principle:** Accreditation decisions are grounded in facts and data, with cross-verification conducted through multiple-dimensional direct and indirect assessment tools;
- (4) **Peer Review Principle:** Review work is independently conducted by strictly selected international peer experts;
- (5) **Continuous Improvement Principle:** Accreditation encourages institutions to build a self-renewing quality improvement cycle and continuously promote quality enhancement based on the PDCA (Plan-Do-Check-Act) methodology;
- (6) **Confidentiality Principle:** Institutional information obtained during the review

process shall not be disclosed without authorization.

Article 3 Accreditation Cycle

The valid period of IAPUC-IQA accreditation is six years, consistent with the prevailing cycle of international accreditations such as AACSB. Accredited institutions shall fulfill the following obligations within the valid period:

- (1) Submit annual quality monitoring reports every year;
- (2) Accept a mid-term review at the end of the third year;
- (3) Submit a comprehensive re-accreditation application before the expiration of the sixth year.

Chapter 2 Accreditation Standard System

The IAPUC-IQA accreditation standard system consists of eight core standard domains. Each domain contains a number of specific standard items with corresponding evaluation key points and evidence requirements. Institutions shall demonstrate that they meet or exceed the corresponding quality thresholds in all standard domains.

Standard 1: Mission, Strategy & Governance

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall possess a clear, distinctive and inspiring institutional mission, and guarantee mission fulfillment through systematic strategic planning and sound governance structures.

1.1 Mission Definition and Communication

The institutional mission clearly states the institutional educational purpose, service targets and core value pursuits, and is effectively communicated to all institutional members and the public through institutionalized channels. IACBE encourages institutions to define excellence based on their own institutional missions and talent cultivation characteristics.

1.2 Strategic Planning

Institutions shall formulate formal and structured strategic planning processes, organically linking institutional goals, budgets and performance indicators, and conduct regular review and dynamic adjustment in response to changes in internal and external environments.

1.3 Governance Structure

Institutions shall establish a well-defined and efficiently operated governance structure (including but not limited to the board of directors/council, academic

committee and administrative management team) to ensure a reasonable balance between academic freedom and institutional accountability.

1.4 Ethics and Compliance

Institutions shall establish sound systems for academic ethics, financial compliance and information disclosure, and uphold integrity in all institutional operations.

Standard 2: Curriculum & Teaching

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall provide a scientifically designed, cutting-edge and standardized curriculum system, and sustain teaching quality and effectiveness.

2.1 Curriculum Design

Curriculum design shall be based on solid theoretical foundations and in-depth analysis of disciplinary knowledge systems and learner needs, and logically consistent with institutional missions and talent cultivation goals.

2.2 Curriculum Management and Improvement

Institutions shall establish systematic curriculum management mechanisms (such as curriculum committees) to regularly review, update and optimize curriculum content, teaching methods and assessment approaches. ACBSP emphasizes the continuous management and improvement of academic curricula to ensure alignment with industry and market demands.

2.3 Teaching Effectiveness

Institutions shall build evaluation mechanisms for teaching effectiveness, incorporating multiple information sources including student feedback, peer review and teaching supervision into teaching quality assurance. The latest AACSB standards explicitly regard teaching effectiveness as a core criterion for measuring faculty qualifications.

2.4 Information Technology Integration

Institutions shall effectively adopt information technology and digital tools (including but not limited to learning management systems, online teaching platforms and intelligent assessment tools) to improve teaching efficiency and coverage and adapt to the educational demands of the digital era.

Standard 3: Faculty

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall maintain a sufficient, well-structured, qualified and sustainably developing faculty team.

3.1 Faculty Qualifications

Faculty members shall possess academic credentials, professional competencies and practical experience matching their teaching and research responsibilities. The latest AACSB standards require categorized faculty management to evaluate the overall quality and suitability of the faculty team.

3.2 Faculty Development and Evaluation

Institutions shall formulate systematic faculty development strategies, provide continuous professional development opportunities, and establish regular faculty performance evaluation mechanisms.

3.3 Academic Community Building

Institutions shall foster an organizational culture that respects academic freedom and encourages teaching innovation and peer collaboration.

3.4 Faculty Sufficiency

Institutions shall ensure that faculty quantity and structure meet the teaching demands of all disciplines and comply with established faculty-student ratio standards.

Standard 4: Student Learning Assessment

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall establish a systematic learning outcome assessment system to verify the achievement of educational objectives with credible evidence.

4.1 Learning Outcome Definition

Each academic program shall clearly define the knowledge, skills and literacy levels that students are expected to achieve upon graduation (Program Learning Outcomes), ensuring consistency with institutional missions and curriculum objectives.

4.2 Assessment Methods and Tools

Institutions shall adopt diversified direct assessments (such as standardized tests, portfolio evaluation and dissertation review) and indirect assessments (such as graduate surveys, employer feedback and alumni tracking) to collect evidence of learning outcomes.

4.3 Application of Assessment Data

Assessment results shall be systematically applied to curriculum optimization, teaching improvement and resource allocation decisions, forming a complete closed-

loop mechanism of "Assessment-Analysis-Improvement-Reassessment". The AACSB Assurance of Learning (AOL) framework emphasizes translating assessment results into actionable continuous improvement measures.

4.4 Outcome Disclosure

Institutions shall disclose key learning outcome indicators to stakeholders through appropriate channels for public supervision.

Standard 5: Research & Innovation

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall foster an academic environment conducive to knowledge creation and innovation, with faculty and students actively participating in research and innovation activities aligned with institutional missions.

5.1 Research Strategy and Positioning

Institutional research activities shall be organically matched with institutional missions, resource endowments and disciplinary characteristics, avoiding one-size-fits-all research output standards.

5.2 Academic Influence

Institutional research outcomes shall generate verifiable influence in corresponding academic communities and professional fields. The latest AACSB standards place special emphasis on dual dimensions of academic influence and social influence.

5.3 Innovation and Entrepreneurship

Institutions shall encourage faculty and students to engage in innovative activities and act as active innovation promoters in local communities and industrial ecosystems.

5.4 Research Ethics and Integrity

Institutions shall establish sound research ethics review mechanisms and academic integrity norms.

Standard 6: Resources & Support Systems

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall provide sufficient teaching, research and learning support resources to ensure the smooth achievement of educational objectives.

6.1 Infrastructure

The quantity and quality of teaching facilities (classrooms, laboratories, studios, libraries, etc.) shall meet institutional operational demands, and information

infrastructure shall support modern educational and teaching activities.

6.2 Student Support Services

Institutions shall provide full-process student support services covering enrollment, academic guidance, mental health counseling and career development.

6.3 Financial Sustainability

Institutions shall possess a robust financial management system and sustainable financial operation capacity, with open and transparent resource allocation mechanisms consistent with the priority of educational objectives. ACBSP standards attach special importance to stakeholder satisfaction and the supporting capacity of resources for teaching.

6.4 Information Resources

Library and information resource systems shall fully support the teaching and research demands of all disciplines.

Standard 7: Social Responsibility & Impact

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall integrate social responsibility into institutional development, actively respond to social needs and generate verifiable positive social impacts.

7.1 Social Responsibility Strategy

Institutions shall incorporate social responsibility into strategic planning and establish corresponding organizational structures and implementation mechanisms. The latest AACSB standards integrate social impact as an independent core criterion, reflecting its pivotal role in contemporary quality accreditation.

7.2 Community Engagement

Institutions shall actively build mutually beneficial cooperative relationships with local communities and feed community development with educational resources and professional expertise.

7.3 Sustainable Development

Institutions shall implement sustainable development concepts (environmental, social and economic sustainability) in all institutional operations.

7.4 Diversity and Inclusion

Institutions shall uphold diversity and inclusion principles in enrollment, faculty recruitment and campus cultural construction.

Standard 8: Continuous Improvement Mechanism

Standard Tenet: Institutions shall establish systematic internal quality monitoring and continuous improvement mechanisms, transforming quality assurance from passive compliance to active pursuit of excellence.

8.1 Internal Quality Assurance System

Institutions shall establish routinely operated internal quality assurance (IQA) organizational structures and operational mechanisms covering all institutional operational fields.

8.2 Data-Driven Decision Making

Institutions shall build information management systems to support quality improvement decisions through systematic data collection, analysis and reporting mechanisms.

8.3 Stakeholder Engagement

Institutions shall effectively incorporate participation and feedback from stakeholders including students, faculty, alumni, employers and communities in quality assurance work. ACBSP standards emphasize clearly identifying student and stakeholder groups and systematically collecting and analyzing feedback to drive institutional improvement.

8.4 Improvement Closed Loop

Institutions shall verify the substantial positive effects of quality improvement measures and form a continuous improvement closed loop of "Problem Identification-Improvement Action-Effect Verification-Standard Internalization".

Chapter 3 Accreditation Procedures

Stage 1: Application and Eligibility Review

3.1.1 Application Requirements

Institutions applying for IAPUC-IQA accreditation shall meet all the following requirements:

- (1) Legally established and lawfully operated private universities, private colleges or private higher vocational education institutions;
- (2) Possess official school-running licenses or equivalent qualification recognition issued by competent educational authorities in the country/region of operation;

- (3) Have completed at least one full student cultivation cycle;
- (4) Acknowledge and accept the standards, procedures and rules of IAPUC-IQA accreditation.

3.1.2 Application Procedures

- (1) The applicant institution submits a formal accreditation application to the IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee;
- (2) The IQA Office conducts a preliminary eligibility review of application materials;
- (3) Institutions passing the preliminary review obtain candidate status and enter the self-evaluation stage.

Stage 2: Self-Evaluation and Report Submission

3.2.1 Self-Evaluation Requirements

Institutions with candidate status shall conduct comprehensive self-evaluation in accordance with the accreditation standard system specified in this Manual:

- (1) Compare institutional practices with the eight core standard domains item by item to describe current status, identify gaps and formulate improvement plans;
- (2) Collect and organize all supporting evidence materials;
- (3) compile an official Self-Evaluation Report (SER).

3.2.2 Report Submission

The self-evaluation report and supporting materials shall be submitted to the IQA Office within the specified time limit. The IACBE evaluation framework focuses on the objectives, processes and outcomes of talent cultivation, a concept fully implemented in the self-evaluation session of IAPUC-IQA.

Stage 3: Peer Review

3.3.1 Review Team Establishment

The IQA Office selects 3 to 5 peer review experts from the expert database to form a Peer Review Team (PRT). Expert selection follows the principles of disciplinary matching, regional balance and zero conflict of interest.

3.3.2 Desk Review

The PRT conducts desk review on the self-evaluation report and supporting materials submitted by the institution, forming preliminary review opinions and a list of key issues requiring on-site verification.

3.3.3 On-Site Visit

The PRT conducts a 3-to-5-day on-site visit to the applicant institution, including but not limited to:

- (1) Interviews and seminars with institutional leaders, department heads, faculty representatives, student representatives and administrative staff;
- (2) On-site inspection of teaching facilities and learning resources;
- (3) Sampling verification of documents, archives and evidence materials;
- (4) On-site observation of teaching quality and institutional management processes.

3.3.4 Review Report

Upon completion of desk review and on-site visit, the PRT compiles an official Peer Review Report (PRR), including review findings, institutional strengths, areas for improvement and accreditation recommendations.

Stage 4: Accreditation Decision

3.4.1 Decision-Making Body

Accreditation decisions are made by the Accreditation Decision Committee (ADC), which is independent of the PRT.

3.4.2 Decision Basis

The ADC makes decisions based on cross-verification of the following three types of materials:

- (1) Institutional self-evaluation report;
- (2) Peer review report;
- (3) Institutional response to the peer review report.

3.4.3 Accreditation Result Levels

Level	Valid Period	Description
Fully Accredited	5 Years	The institution meets or exceeds quality thresholds in all standard domains with only minor room for improvement.
Conditionally Accredited	3 Years	The institution has deficiencies requiring

		rectification within a time limit in partial standard domains, and can be upgraded to full accreditation after completing rectification.
Temporarily Accredited	1 Year	The institution has relatively serious quality deficiencies and must complete major rectification within one year.
Deferred Decision	—	Existing evidence is insufficient to support a decision; the institution is required to supplement materials for re-review.
Denial of Accreditation	—	The institution fails to meet core standard requirements.

3.4.4 Confidentiality and Disclosure of Decisions

Accreditation decisions are first notified to the applicant institution in writing. Full accreditation information will be publicly disclosed on the official IAPUC website; disclosure of other accreditation results is subject to institutional consent.

Stage 5: Post-Accreditation Supervision and Re-Accreditation

3.5.1 Annual Quality Report

Accredited institutions shall submit annual quality monitoring reports to summarize major quality activities and improvement progress of the previous year.

3.5.2 Major Change Report

Institutions shall report major changes including merger, split, new campus establishment, suspension of major disciplines, major legal disputes or financial crises to the IQA Office within 30 days.

3.5.3 Mid-Term Review

At the end of the third year of the accreditation cycle, institutions shall undergo a simplified mid-term review focusing on the implementation of continuous improvement measures.

3.5.4 Comprehensive Re-Accreditation

One year before accreditation expiration, institutions shall submit a comprehensive re-accreditation application and initiate a new full accreditation review process.

Chapter 4 Peer Review Expert Management

4.1 Expert Selection Criteria

IAPUC-IQA peer review experts shall meet all the following requirements:

- (1) Possess rich professional experience in higher education management, quality assurance or relevant disciplinary fields (no less than 10 years in general);
- (2) Hold a doctoral degree or equivalent senior professional qualification;
- (3) Be familiar with IAPUC-IQA accreditation standards and review procedures;
- (4) Complete IAPUC-organized peer reviewer training and obtain valid qualifications;
- (5) Have no conflicts of interest that may affect impartial review.

4.2 Conflict of Interest Management

- (1) All peer reviewers shall sign a conflict of interest statement upon appointment;
- (2) Experts who have been employed by or maintained major cooperative relationships with the applicant institution within the past five years shall be excluded from the review team;
- (3) Peer reviewers shall not accept any form of gifts or benefits from applicant institutions;
- (4) Experts shall immediately declare and recuse themselves upon identification of potential conflicts of interest during the review process.

4.3 Expert Evaluation and Update

IAPUC conducts regular performance evaluations of peer reviewers, replacing or disqualifying unqualified experts. The expert database implements a dynamic update mechanism with a biennial update cycle.

Chapter 5 Appeal and Arbitration

5.1 Appeal Scope

Applicant institutions may file appeals to the Appeal and Arbitration Committee regarding the following matters:

- (1) Procedural violations in accreditation decision-making;
- (2) Major factual errors in peer review reports;
- (3) Undisclosed conflicts of interest of peer reviewers.

5.2 Appeal Procedures

- (1) Appeals shall be submitted in writing within 30 working days upon receipt of the accreditation decision notice;
- (2) The Appeal and Arbitration Committee shall establish an independent review panel within 60 working days after accepting the appeal;
- (3) The review panel conducts independent investigations on appeal matters, free from interference by the original review team and decision committee;
- (4) The review panel submits investigation reports and recommendations to the Appeal and Arbitration Committee;
- (5) The Appeal and Arbitration Committee issues a final and binding ruling.

Chapter 6 Accreditation Fees

6.1 Fee Structure

IAPUC-IQA accreditation fees adhere to the principles of non-profit, cost recovery and full transparency, including:

- (1) Application Fee: A one-time fee charged to all institutions submitting accreditation applications;
- (2) Annual Maintenance Fee: An annual fee paid by fully accredited institutions throughout the valid accreditation cycle;
- (3) On-Site Visit Fee: Calculated based on actual costs (including expert travel, accommodation and remuneration).

6.2 Fee Disclosure

Specific fee standards are dynamically published on the official IAPUC website with regular rationality reviews.

Appendices

Appendix A: Glossary of Key Terms

Term	Definition
IQA	Internal Quality Assurance: The institutional quality management mechanism established and operated independently by higher education institutions.
AOL	Assurance of Learning: A systematic methodological framework for evaluating and guaranteeing student learning outcomes.
PDCA	Plan-Do-Check-Act Cycle: The core methodological foundation for continuous quality improvement.
ADLI	Approach-Deployment-Learning-Integration: An analytical framework for evaluating the maturity of quality management systems.
SER	Self-Evaluation Report
PRT	Peer Review Team
ADC	Accreditation Decision Committee
CHEA	Council for Higher Education Accreditation: The authoritative U.S. organization responsible for accrediting higher education accreditation bodies.

Appendix B: Comparison of AACSB, IACBE, ACBSP Standards and IAPUC-IQA Integrated Innovation

Dimension	AACSB	IACBE	ACBSP	IAPUC-IQA Integrated Innovation
Service Targets	Global Business Schools	Global Business Education Units	Global Business Schools and Programs	Global Private Universities and Colleges (Full Disciplines)

Core Concepts	Strategic management, student success, thought leadership, social impact	Mission-driven, outcomes-oriented	Performance excellence (Baldrige Criteria), teaching excellence	Three major pillars: Mission-Driven + Outcomes-Based + Performance Excellence
Standard Coverage	Faculty classification, academic/social impact	AOL, outcome evaluation system, operational guarantee	Leadership, strategic planning, stakeholder satisfaction, curriculum quality, faculty qualification, teaching support	Eight core standard domains, covering the entire institutional operation chain
Evaluation Methods	Self-evaluation + peer review + on-site visit	Self-evaluation + outcome assessment + on-site visit	ADLI framework evaluation + self-evaluation + on-site visit	Multi-dimensional evidence cross-verification, in-depth integration of ADLI and PDCA
Continuous Improvement Mechanism	Periodic re-accreditation	PDCA cycle improvement	Sustained quality enhancement	Full-cycle closed-loop management: Annual monitoring + mid-term review + comprehensive re-accreditation

Appendix C: Self-Evaluation Report Framework Guidelines

Institutional self-evaluation reports shall be compiled in accordance with the following structure:

1. Institutional Profile and Operational Background (basic information including institutional history, educational level, disciplinary layout and student scale)
2. Overview of Accreditation Preparation Work (acreditation organizational structure, self-evaluation process, participant coverage)
3. Standard Compliance Statement (item-by-item demonstration of current status, supporting evidence, existing deficiencies and improvement plans against the eight core standard domains)
4. Comprehensive Self-Evaluation Conclusion (strength summary, challenge analysis and future quality improvement plans)
5. Supporting Material Index (list and numbering of all cited evidence materials)

Document Approval

Role	Name/Position	Date
Compiled by	IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee Standard Formulation Working Group	May 2025
Reviewed by	IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee	To be confirmed
Approved by	IAPUC Council	To be confirmed

Copyright Statement

The intellectual property rights of this document and the IAPUC-IQA accreditation system belong exclusively to the International Association of Private Universities and Colleges (IAPUC). Without written authorization from IAPUC, no institution or individual may copy, modify or use this document for commercial purposes. Applicant institutions may freely use this document for internal self-evaluation and quality improvement.

Explanatory Notes

This full set of documents is the draft version 1.0 of the IAPUC-IQA accreditation system. Integrating advanced international concepts including the strategic management and impact orientation of AACSB, the mission-driven and outcome-based evaluation of IACBE, the performance excellence framework of ACBSP, and CHEA international quality principles, this system is a comprehensive international quality accreditation system exclusively designed for global private universities and colleges. All materials are for reference only, and official accreditation operations

shall be subject to the latest version officially released by IAPUC. The system benchmarks the ISO 21001 educational organization management system and CHEA accreditation criteria to ensure the quality and credibility of the IAPUC-IQA system itself.