



Part XI: IQA Peer Review Expert Selection and Code of Conduct

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

Version: 1.0

Effective Date: Pending Official Release

Formulating Institution: IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee, International Association of Private Universities and Colleges

Applicable Scope: All professionals applying for or already included in the IAPUC-IQA Peer Review Expert Repository, as well as all peer review panel members undertaking specific accreditation review tasks.

Preface

Peer review serves as the core cornerstone of the credibility of the IAPUC-IQA Accreditation System. The professional competence, behavioral norms and professional ethics of review experts directly determine the quality of accreditation decisions and the reputation of the accreditation system. A rigorous, impartial and transparent expert selection and behavioral management system not only provides procedural guarantee for the justice of accreditation procedures, but also forms the value foundation for the international recognition of accreditation results.

This Code integrates the best practices of mainstream international accreditation institutions (AACSB, EQUIS, IACBE, ACBSP) in peer review expert management, and fully takes into account the diversity of private higher education institutions and cross-cultural challenges in international review. The core design philosophy of this Code is to guarantee professional competence through strict admission thresholds, safeguard review impartiality with clear behavioral red lines, promote the professional growth of the expert team via hierarchical dynamic management and continuous training, and maintain the integrity and reputation of the accreditation system through robust supervision and accountability mechanisms.

IAPUC firmly believes that an independent, professional, diverse and self-disciplined team of peer review experts constitutes the most valuable asset and the firmest line of defense of the IQA Accreditation System.

Chapter I General Provisions

Article 1 Purposes and Basis

This Code is formulated for the following purposes:

- (1) To establish selection criteria, admission procedures and dynamic management mechanisms for peer review experts, so as to ensure the professional competence and international representativeness of the expert team;
- (2) To define the behavioral norms and ethical bottom lines for review experts throughout the entire accreditation review process, and guarantee the impartiality, objectivity and confidentiality of reviews;
- (3) To build an expert hierarchical system and continuous professional development mechanism, so as to facilitate capacity improvement and experience inheritance of the review team;
- (4) To establish mechanisms for expert supervision, evaluation and violation handling, and maintain the credibility and integrity of the accreditation system.

This Code is formulated on the basis of:

- Chapter IV "Review Expert Management" of the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual*;
- Chapter IX "Review Expert Management" of the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation*

Procedure Specifications;

- Chapter V "Accreditation Review Ethics" of the *IAPUC-IQA Academic Ethics and Code of Conduct*;
- Guiding principles for peer review specified in the *Code of Good Practice* issued by the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE).

Article 2 Scope of Application

This Code applies to:

- (1) All professionals applying for admission to the IQA Peer Review Expert Repository;
- (2) All experts enrolled in the repository (including Grade A, Grade B and Grade C experts);
- (3) All peer review panel members appointed to undertake specific accreditation review tasks;
- (4) All personnel participating in the selection, training and evaluation of review experts.

Article 3 Basic Principles

The management of peer review experts shall adhere to the following basic principles:

Principle	Core Connotation
Professional Competence	Experts shall possess academic qualifications, management experience and review capabilities matching the review tasks.
Impartiality and Independence	Experts shall remain objective and neutral in reviews, free from personal prejudice, academic sectarianism and external interference.
Diversity and Inclusiveness	The construction of the expert repository shall emphasize diversity in disciplines, regions, cultures and professional backgrounds.
Transparency and Accountability	The criteria for expert selection, evaluation and sanction shall be publicly disclosed and subject to supervision.
Sustainable Development	Experts shall continuously update their accreditation knowledge and review skills to adapt to the development

	and changes of higher education.
--	----------------------------------

Chapter II Construction and Structure of the Expert Repository

Article 4 Positioning of the Expert Repository

The IQA Peer Review Expert Repository is a professional talent resource pool established by IAPUC for the reserve and management of professionals engaged in accreditation review work. The construction objectives of the repository are as follows:

- (1) To provide discipline-matched, regionally balanced and conflict-free reviewers for each accreditation review task;
- (2) To cover all disciplinary fields of IAPUC-IQA accreditation (including business, engineering, humanities and social sciences, natural sciences, art and design, medicine and health, education and teacher training, law, computer science, etc.);
- (3) To reflect the diverse representativeness of private higher education across global regions;
- (4) To maintain an appropriate scale (the total number of in-repository experts is generally maintained at 3 to 5 times the number of accredited institutions) so as to ensure the rationality and fairness of review task allocation.

Article 5 Structure of the Expert Repository

The expert repository implements structured management based on the following dimensions:

Discipline Grouping: Experts are assigned to one primary discipline group and no more than two secondary discipline groups in accordance with the disciplinary fields covered by IQA.

Regional Grouping: Experts are classified into corresponding regional groups (Asia-Pacific, Europe, North America, Latin America, Africa, Middle East, etc.) based on their primary workplace and residence.

Grade Classification: Experts are divided into three grades in accordance with the classification criteria specified in Chapter III of this Code: Grade A (Lead Reviewer), Grade B (Senior Reviewer) and Grade C (Reviewer).

Chapter III Expert Selection Criteria and Procedures

Article 6 Basic Admission Requirements

Candidates applying for admission to the IQA Peer Review Expert Repository shall simultaneously meet the following basic requirements:

- (1) **Professional Experience:** No less than 10 years of professional experience in higher education management, quality assurance or relevant academic fields; prior review experience in other international accreditation systems is preferred but not mandatory.
- (2) **Academic Background:** Hold a doctoral degree or equivalent senior professional qualification; the academic degree requirement may be appropriately relaxed for candidates with outstanding industry achievements and recognition in specific disciplinary fields (e.g., art design, engineering practice), subject to approval by a two-thirds majority of the Peer Review Expert Selection Committee.
- (3) **Accreditation Knowledge:** Familiar with the theoretical evolution and contemporary practices of international higher education quality assurance, and proficient in the IAPUC-IQA accreditation standard system and procedural specifications — this competence shall be verified through training and assessment.
- (4) **Language Proficiency:** Possess the language competence required for international review work, capable of professional communication and report writing in English or other languages required for specific review tasks.
- (5) **Professional Ethics:** No records of academic misconduct, financial irregularities, professional ethics violations or dismissal from other accreditation systems throughout their professional career.
- (6) **Time Commitment:** Ensure sufficient time investment for review work, with the ability to participate in at least one complete accreditation review task annually.

Article 7 Admission Procedures

(1) Nomination or Application

Candidates for the expert repository may be generated through the following channels:

1. Written recommendations from IAPUC Board members, ADC members or incumbent Grade A/B review experts;
2. Recommendations from accredited or applicant institutions (each institution may recommend a maximum of 2 candidates per year);
3. Individual applications from professionals submitted to the IQA Office.

Applicants or recommenders shall submit the following materials:

- Completed *Peer Review Expert Repository Application/Recommendation Form*;
- Personal professional resume and supporting documents;
- A personal statement explaining the motivation for joining the IQA expert team;
- Recommender's evaluation (for recommended candidates).

(2) Preliminary Qualification Review

The IQA Office shall complete the preliminary qualification review within 30 working days upon receipt of complete application materials. The preliminary review focuses on:

- Whether the applicant's professional qualifications meet the basic admission requirements;
- Preliminary verification of the completeness and authenticity of application materials;
- Identification of obvious conflicts of interest or professional ethics risks.

Candidates failing the preliminary review shall receive a written notification with detailed reasons from the IQA Office.

(3) Review by the Selection Committee

Candidates passing the preliminary review shall be submitted to the Peer Review Expert Selection Committee for comprehensive evaluation. The Selection Committee consists of:

- Director of the IQA Office or their representative (serving as the convener);
- 2 Grade A review experts from different regions;
- 1 ADC member.

The Committee's review covers the following dimensions:

- **Professional Matching:** Whether the candidate's disciplinary background and experience align with the disciplinary coverage and accreditation needs of IQA;
- **Cross-cultural Review Competence:** Whether the candidate possesses the awareness and ability to conduct objective reviews across different cultural and educational systems;
- **Professional Ethics Background:** Whether there exist any professional ethics risks that may undermine review credibility;
- **Repository Structural Needs:** Whether the candidate's background helps fill structural gaps in the repository in terms of discipline, region or language.

The Committee shall reach a decision via majority vote, which shall take effect only with the approval of a two-thirds majority of all members.

(4) Training and Assessment

Candidates passing the Committee review shall participate in IQA-organized accreditation review training and pass the assessment. The training curriculum covers at least the following contents:

1. In-depth interpretation of IQA accreditation philosophy and three core pillars;
2. Item-by-item analysis and evaluation key points of the eight major accreditation standard domains;
3. Evidence-based review methodology — collection, analysis and cross-verification

of review evidence;

4. Application and consistency calibration of scoring rubrics;
5. Desk review methods and skills for self-evaluation reports;
6. On-site inspection practices (symposiums, interviews, facility inspections, evidence verification);
7. Cross-cultural communication and sensitive issue interview skills;
8. Conflict of interest management and professional ethical norms;
9. Standardized specifications for review report writing.

Assessment formats include: written tests (accreditation standard and procedural knowledge), simulated case reviews, and review report writing evaluation.

(5) Repository Admission and Public Announcement

Candidates completing training and passing the assessment shall be formally admitted to the IQA Peer Review Expert Repository by the IQA Office and issued an official IQA Peer Review Expert Appointment Certificate. The IQA Office shall publish the names, disciplinary fields and grades of newly admitted experts on the official IAPUC website in compliance with privacy protection regulations.

Article 8 Dynamic Management and Exit Mechanism

The expert repository implements a biennial evaluation and update mechanism. Experts shall exit the repository under the following circumstances:

- (1) **Voluntary Exit:** The expert submits a written exit application to the IQA Office;
- (2) **Evaluation-based Exit:** The expert is assessed as non-compliant in the regular evaluation and fails to meet standards after being granted improvement opportunities;
- (3) **Automatic Exit:** Fails to participate in any IQA review tasks or continuous training for four consecutive years;
- (4) **Mandatory Removal:** Permanently removed from the repository due to violations of the provisions of this Code.

Chapter IV Expert Grading and Promotion

Article 9 Grading System

IQA peer review experts are subject to three-level hierarchical management:

Grade	Title	Core Competency Requirements	Authorized Roles	Minimum Task Requirements (per evaluation cycle)

A	Lead Review Expert	Completed no fewer than 5 IQA on-site inspections, including at least 2 as panel leader; consistently excellent review report quality; competent in review training, teaching and team guidance	PRT Panel Leader, Principal Reviewer for Complex Cases, Training Mentor, Selection Committee Member	At least 1 review task every two years
B	Senior Review Expert	Completed no fewer than 3 IQA on-site inspections; sound review report quality; possess specialized review competence in specific disciplinary fields	Core PRT Member, Specialized Reviewer for Specific Disciplinary Fields	At least 1 review task every two years
C	Review Expert	Completed training and assessment, and participated in at least 1 on-site inspection (may participate as a trainee)	PRT Member (under the guidance of Grade A/B experts), Desk Reviewer	At least 1 review task (including trainee participation) every two years

Article 10 Grade Promotion

Promotion from Grade C to Grade B

- (1) Completed at least 2 IQA on-site inspection tasks since repository admission (including at least 1 as a formal member; trainee participation excluded);
- (2) All review reports compiled during the period have achieved a rating of Good or above in quality assessment;
- (3) Completed the continuous training hours required for Grade B experts;
- (4) No violations of this Code on record.

Promotion from Grade B to Grade A

- (1) Completed at least 5 IQA on-site inspection tasks since promotion to Grade B, including at least 2 as a core member (in-depth review of specialized fields);
- (2) Review reports participated in or independently compiled during the period have maintained an Excellent rating in quality assessment;

- (3) Completed and passed the competency assessment for panel leader training;
- (4) Participated in the training or mentoring of new review experts at least once;
- (5) No violations of this Code on record.

Exceptional Promotion: Senior experts with outstanding prestige and extensive experience in higher education quality assurance may be directly awarded Grade B or Grade A qualification upon deliberation by the Peer Review Expert Selection Committee, subject to approval by a two-thirds majority of Committee members.

Promotion Procedures: Grade promotion applications may be submitted by the expert or nominated by the IQA Office, and shall be reviewed and approved by the Peer Review Expert Selection Committee. Promotion results shall be recorded in the expert's official file.

Chapter V Continuous Professional Development

Article 11 Continuous Training Requirements

All in-repository review experts shall complete no less than 16 hours of continuous training every two years. Valid training forms include:

- (1) Online or offline expert training courses organized by IQA;
- (2) Briefings on updates to accreditation standards and procedures;
- (3) Review case seminars and experience sharing sessions;
- (4) Academic conferences on international higher education quality assurance (eligible for hour conversion, with a maximum of 4 hours per half-day).

Experts failing to complete the required continuous training hours within the specified cycle shall be suspended from new review task appointments until the required hours are made up.

Article 12 Calibration Meetings

The IQA Office shall organize regular expert calibration meetings to achieve the following objectives:

- (1) Standardize the application of scoring rubrics to reduce rating discrepancies among experts;
- (2) Discuss difficult cases encountered in recent reviews and form consensus judgment guidelines;
- (3) Share effective practices and lessons learned from review practices.

All Grade A and Grade B experts shall participate in at least one calibration meeting every two years. Grade C experts are encouraged to participate actively.

Chapter VI Review Appointment and Task Management

Article 13 Review Appointment Principles

The IQA Office shall abide by the following principles when forming review panels for individual accreditation cases:

- (1) **Discipline Matching:** Experts' disciplinary backgrounds correspond to the core disciplinary fields of applicant institutions;
- (2) **Grade Adaptation:** The PRT panel leader shall be a Grade A expert; each panel shall include at least one Grade A or Grade B expert; trainee experts shall not independently undertake core review tasks;
- (3) **Regional Balance:** Prioritize panel composition with experts from different regions to avoid single regional perspective bias;
- (4) **Conflict-Free:** Appointed experts shall have no recusable conflicts of interest with applicant institutions;
- (5) **Fair Rotation:** Allocate review tasks reasonably on the premise of meeting the above criteria to avoid excessive task burden on individual experts.

Article 14 Acceptance and Rejection of Appointments

- (1) Experts shall reply to review appointment invitations within 5 working days to confirm acceptance or rejection.
- (2) Experts shall conduct a thorough conflict of interest self-review before replying. Appointment shall be rejected if:
 - Any conflict of interest specified in Article 26 of the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Procedure Specifications* exists;
 - Personal circumstances prevent sufficient time and energy investment in review work;
 - Other personal circumstances may compromise review impartiality.
- (3) Experts who reject appointments twice consecutively without valid reasons shall have the record filed by the IQA Office and be subject to targeted assessment in regular evaluations.

Article 15 Panel Composition and Announcement

- (1) A standard review panel consists of 3 to 5 experts, with the specific number determined by the IQA Office based on institutional scale and disciplinary complexity.
- (2) After confirming the panel member list, the IQA Office shall inform the applicant institution of the names, affiliations and grades of panel members prior to official

dispatch. The institution may raise objections and state reasons for potential conflicts of interest within 10 working days upon receipt of the list.

(3) The IQA Office shall review institutional objections. Valid objections shall result in expert replacement; invalid objections shall be formally explained to the institution.

Article 16 Trainee System

Grade C experts participating in on-site inspections for the first time shall participate as trainees under the guidance of Grade A or Grade B experts. The responsibilities of trainee experts include:

- (1) Full participation in desk reviews and on-site inspections;
- (2) Participation in panel discussions and provision of observational opinions;
- (3) Participation in drafting partial review report contents under the supervision of guiding experts.

Trainee experts' opinions are for panel reference only and carry no voting rights. Trainee experts shall not independently host symposiums, interviews or make independent judgments on standard compliance.

Chapter VII Code of Conduct

Article 17 Pre-Review Code of Conduct

(1) **Pre-Appointment Self-Review:** Upon receiving a review invitation, experts shall complete a conflict of interest self-review within 5 working days. Any existing conflicts of interest specified in Article 26 of the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Procedure Specifications* or other circumstances unsuitable for appointment as stipulated in Article 14 of this Code shall be immediately declared to the IQA Office, and the appointment shall be rejected.

(2) **Adequate Preparation:** Appointed experts shall fully review and conduct preliminary analysis of the institutional self-evaluation report and supporting materials prior to the commencement of desk reviews. Prior to the panel kick-off meeting, experts shall form preliminary review focuses and key issues to be verified on-site.

(3) **Confidentiality Commitment:** Prior to accessing review materials, experts shall sign the *Case Confidentiality Commitment*, undertaking confidentiality obligations for all non-public information obtained during the review process.

Article 18 In-Review Code of Conduct

(1) Impartiality and Objectivity

1. All review judgments shall be strictly based on IAPUC-IQA accreditation standards and objective evidence, free from personal preferences, academic sectarianism, regional bias, school-running model tendencies and other non-academic factors;

2. Maintain an open yet critical attitude towards institutional self-evaluations and responses, avoiding blanket acceptance or preset negation;
3. Adopt cross-verification of multiple evidence sources for compliance judgments, rather than relying on single evidence or subjective impression;
4. Ensure consistent standard application within the review panel and alignment with overall IQA review practices across all cases.

(2) Professional Etiquette

1. Comply with professional communication norms in symposiums and interviews, respecting the cultural backgrounds, expression habits and personal dignity of interviewees;
2. Focus questions on evidence verification and quality diagnosis, avoiding interrogative, contemptuous or provocative questioning styles;
3. Respect the normal teaching and operational order of applicant institutions; streamline and focus on-site inspection arrangements to minimize disruptions to teaching activities;
4. Maintain professional dressing and demeanor to reflect the formality and respect of the review panel.

(3) Evidence Norms

1. All compliance judgments and review findings shall be supported by verifiable evidence, with no unfounded speculation or assumption;
2. Specific evidence indexes shall be attached to identified problems and deficiencies in review reports to ensure traceability;
3. New evidence identified during the review process shall be fully discussed by the panel to form unified consensus;
4. Where sufficient evidence cannot be obtained to verify compliance with specific standard clauses, the situation shall be clearly marked as "Insufficient Evidence, Judgment Pending" in the report, with no arbitrary compliance or non-compliance conclusion.

(4) Team Collaboration

1. Panel members shall actively participate in panel discussions and fully present professional judgments and analytical opinions;
2. Respect diverse opinions within the panel and reach consensus through rational discussion and evidence re-examination;
3. Truthfully reflect both majority and minority panel opinions in review reports, with reasons attached to minority opinions;
4. The panel leader undertakes coordination and overall planning responsibilities but holds no weighted priority in professional judgments over other members.

(5) Prohibited Acts

The following acts are strictly prohibited during the review period and on-site inspection:

1. No commitment, implication or prediction of accreditation results in any form or occasion;
2. No acceptance of gifts, cash, securities, banquets, tours or other hospitality beyond standard working meals and transportation arrangements from applicant institutions;
3. No solicitation of materials, information, conveniences or benefits from applicant institutions by virtue of review identity;
4. No disclosure of case information, internal panel discussions or review findings via private occasions, social media, academic conferences or other public platforms;
5. No establishment or negotiation of personal cooperation, consulting or employment relationships with applicant institutions during the review period that may compromise review impartiality;
6. No use of review materials or non-public institutional information obtained during reviews for personal academic research, publication or other non-review purposes;
7. No development of excessive personal relationships with institutional personnel beyond normal review interactions during the review period.

Article 19 Post-Review Code of Conduct

(1) **Report Quality Assurance:** Submit high-quality review reports within the time limit specified in the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Procedure Specifications* upon completion of on-site inspections. All review judgments shall be objective, accurate, complete and fully supported by evidence.

(2) **Continuous Confidentiality:** Experts bear perpetual confidentiality obligations for all non-public institutional information obtained during reviews. All non-public review documents (including copies and electronic files) shall be safely returned to the IQA Office or permanently and irrecoverably destroyed. Confidentiality obligations survive the termination of review tasks, expiration of expert qualifications or termination of employment relationships.

(3) **Post-Review Interaction Restrictions:** Within one year after the completion of a review task, experts shall not accept any appointment, consulting invitation or other paid cooperation from the reviewed institution. This restriction does not prohibit normal academic exchanges with institutional faculty on a peer basis, provided that no confidential review information is involved.

Article 20 Supplementary Provisions on Conflicts of Interest

In addition to the mandatory recusal circumstances specified in Article 26 of the *IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Procedure Specifications*, the following supplementary

provisions apply:

(1) If an unidentified potential conflict of interest is discovered during a review task, the expert shall immediately submit a written report to the IQA Office. The IQA Office shall consult with the panel leader to determine whether the expert may continue participating in the review;

(2) Experts who establish any employment or cooperative relationship with a reviewed institution within two years after task completion shall report the relationship to the IQA Office within 15 days of establishment. Such conduct does not constitute a violation but shall be filed and referenced in future review appointment arrangements for the expert.

Chapter VIII Supervision, Assessment and Sanctions

Article 21 Expert Assessment

The IQA Office conducts ongoing performance assessments of review experts based on the following dimensions:

(1) **Review Quality:** Evaluation of review reports (sufficiency of evidence, accuracy of judgments, standardization of writing); contributions to panel work assessed by panel leaders and members;

(2) **Professional Ethics:** Compliance with this Code, timeliness of conflict of interest declarations, performance of confidentiality obligations;

(3) **Participation Engagement:** Frequency and dedication of review participation, adequacy of pre-review preparation, engagement and contributions in panel discussions;

(4) **Continuous Development:** Participation in continuous training and calibration meetings, updates of accreditation knowledge and skills;

(5) **Institutional Feedback:** Formal evaluation feedback from applicant institutions on review processes and expert conduct.

Assessment results are classified into four grades: Excellent, Good, Needs Improvement, and Non-Compliant.

Article 22 Appeal Mechanism

Experts disagreeing with assessment results may submit a written appeal to the Appeal and Arbitration Committee within 30 working days upon receipt of results, in accordance with the provisions of the *IQA Accreditation Appeal, Complaint and Dispute Resolution Management Measures*.

Article 23 Violation Investigation

(1) Any person may report suspected violations of this Code by review experts to the IQA Office via official channels.

(2) The IQA Office shall conduct a preliminary review of all reports. Formal investigation procedures shall be initiated if the report is deemed reasonably grounded.

(3) The IQA Office shall establish an independent investigation team excluding the implicated expert to collect evidence and interview relevant personnel. The investigated expert shall have the right to be informed of the alleged violations and to provide written statements and supporting evidence.

(4) Upon completion of the investigation, the team shall submit an investigation report and sanction recommendations to the IQA Office.

Article 24 Violation Sanctions

The IQA Office shall impose corresponding sanctions based on the severity and impact of verified violations:

Sanction Level	Applicable Circumstances	Sanction Measures
Verbal Reminder	Minor behavioral irregularities with no substantial adverse impact	Verbal reminder, no official file record
Written Warning	Notable behavioral irregularities with no substantial adverse consequences	Written warning, filed in official expert records, one-year probation period
Suspension of Qualification	Serious violations of behavioral norms not warranting permanent removal	Suspension of review qualification for 1–3 years, prohibiting participation in all IQA review tasks; qualification restoration requires re-training and re-assessment upon expiration of the suspension period
Permanent Removal	Intentional concealment of conflicts of interest, solicitation or acceptance of improper benefits, disclosure of core confidential information causing substantial losses,	Permanent removal from the expert repository, report to the IAPUC Council and ADC, and notification to relevant international quality assurance networks when necessary

	intentional distortion of review conclusions, or other extremely serious violations	
--	---	--

The IQA Office shall grant the implicated expert the right to statement and defense prior to imposing any sanction. Sanction decisions shall be delivered to the expert in writing, with clear notification of appeal rights and time limits.

Chapter IX Supplementary Provisions

Article 25 Relationship with Other Regulatory Documents

This Code forms a unified and complementary IAPUC-IQA normative system with the following documents:

Document	Relationship with This Code
<i>IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Manual</i> Chapter IV	This Code serves as the detailed institutional expansion of the "Review Expert Management" module in the Accreditation Manual
<i>IAPUC-IQA Accreditation Procedure Specifications</i> Chapter IX	This Code comprehensively refines the expert management clauses in procedural specifications in terms of personnel competence, behavioral standards and violation sanctions
<i>IAPUC-IQA Academic Ethics and Code of Conduct</i> Chapter V	The behavioral norms specified in this Code are consistent with the review ethical principles in the ethical code and provide operational detailed rules
<i>IQA Accreditation Appeal, Complaint and Dispute Resolution Management Measures</i>	The appeal and violation sanction procedures of this Code are fully aligned with the appeal and dispute resolution mechanisms

Article 26 Interpretation and Revision

- (1) This Code is interpreted by the IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee.
- (2) IAPUC reserves the right to revise this Code in accordance with the development of accreditation practices. Revised versions shall be released upon Council approval with a reasonable transition period.

(3) Revisions involving expert grading standards and promotion criteria shall only apply to promotion applications submitted after the revision takes effect, with no retroactive impact on experts who have already obtained established grades.

Article 27 Effectiveness and Transitional Arrangements

This Code shall take effect upon approval by the IAPUC Council. Existing in-repository experts shall be transitioned in accordance with the following arrangements upon the Code's entry into force:

- Experts with no fewer than 2 prior terms as review panel leader shall be directly recognized as Grade A experts;
- Experts with no fewer than 3 prior review task participations shall be directly recognized as Grade B experts;
- All other existing in-repository experts shall be recognized as Grade C experts, with grade adaptability verified in the first regular evaluation cycle.

Appendix A: Peer Review Expert Application/Recommendation Form

This form shall include the following mandatory contents:

1. Basic applicant information (name, affiliation, position, contact information);
2. Educational background and highest professional qualification;
3. Core disciplinary fields and professional expertise;
4. Professional work experience in higher education management and/or quality assurance over the past decade;
5. International accreditation review experience (if applicable) — specifying accredited systems, roles and service periods;
6. Language proficiency;
7. Recommender information (for recommended applications);
8. Self-declaration on any professional ethics or conflict of interest matters;
9. Personal statement on the motivation for joining the IQA expert team.

Appendix B: Interview and Symposium Behavioral Guidelines

Review experts shall abide by the following basic guidelines for interviews and symposiums:

- Introduce personal identity, role, interview purpose and expected duration at the

start of each interview;

- Adopt open-ended questions initially, followed by in-depth targeted inquiries;
- Cover all preset key questions within the scheduled interview time while retaining flexibility to explore valuable clues;
- Adjust questioning styles in response to cultural differences and sensitivities;
- Provide interviewees with opportunities for supplementary statements before concluding interviews;
- Thank interviewees for their time and candid participation.

Document Approval

Role	Name/Position	Date
Compiled by	IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee Expert Management Standards Working Group	May 2026
Reviewed by	IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee	Pending
Approved by	IAPUC Council	Pending

Copyright Statement

The intellectual property rights of this document and the *IQA Peer Review Expert Selection and Code of Conduct* contained herein belong 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.