



IQA ACCREDITATION SYSTEM CLOSED-DOOR CONSULTATION MEETING MINUTES

**IAPUC INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
ACCREDITATION SYSTEM**

CLOSED-DOOR CONSULTATION MEETING MINUTES

Document Reference: IAPUC/IQA/MIN-2026-001

Version: 1.0

Date of Meeting: July 15–17, 2026

IQA ACCREDITATION SYSTEM CLOSED-DOOR CONSULTATION MEETING MINUTES

IAPUC INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE ACCREDITATION SYSTEM

CLOSED-DOOR CONSULTATION MEETING MINUTES

Document Reference: IAPUC/IQA/MIN-2026-001

Version: 1.0

Date of Meeting: July 15–17, 2026

Location: Virtual Meeting via IAPUC Accreditation Management Information Platform (Video Conference System with Encrypted Communications Module)

Prepared by: IAPUC Quality Accreditation Committee (QAC) Secretariat

Distribution: IAPUC Board of Directors, Quality Accreditation Committee Members, Accredited Institution Representatives, Invited Participants

Classification: INTERNAL – For Official Use Only

1.0 MEETING OVERVIEW

1.1 Purpose

The Closed-Door Consultation Meeting was convened to systematically review the findings from the initial pilot accreditation phase launched in April 2026, to evaluate the applicability and operational effectiveness of the IQA Eight Core Standards across diverse disciplinary contexts, and to deliberate on emerging challenges in academic quality assurance, particularly those arising from artificial intelligence integration in teaching and assessment. The meeting further served to inform the final revision and global release of the IQA Accreditation System Version 2.0.

1.2 Scope

The meeting covered the following agenda items:

1. Pilot accreditation phase data and findings;
2. Multi-disciplinary applicability of the IQA Eight Core Standards;
3. Artificial intelligence and academic integrity in accreditation;
4. International mutual recognition progress and global expansion strategy;
5. IQA Accreditation System Version 2.0 roadmap and release timeline.

1.3 Attendance

Category	Number of Participants
Private Higher Education Institution Representatives	24
Quality Assurance Experts	10
Accreditation Peer Review Experts	8
International Organization Observers	5
Total	47

Geographic Coverage: 22 countries across Asia, Europe, North America, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East.

Institutional Representation: Participants represented institutions across four disciplinary domains—Business and Management, Engineering and Technology, Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, and Education and Teacher Training.

2.0 DAY ONE PROCEEDINGS: PILOT ACCREDITATION DATA AND FINDINGS

2.1 Pilot Accreditation Statistics

The Quality Accreditation Committee presented the following preliminary data from the pilot accreditation phase:

Applications and Admissions (as of July 15, 2026):

Metric	Count
Total applications and expressions of interest received	23
Institutions from which applications were received	14 countries across 3 continents
Institutions admitted to	8

substantive review phase	
Disciplinary coverage in substantive review	4 domains

Disciplinary Distribution of Substantive Review Institutions:

Discipline	Number of Institutions
Business and Management	3
Engineering and Technology	2
Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence	2
Education and Teacher Training	1

2.2 Key Findings: Standard IV – Student Learning Assessment

The Committee reported that **Standard IV: Student Learning Assessment** emerged as one of the two standards with the highest level of reviewer scrutiny and the most significant self-assessment gaps among pilot institutions.

Identified Gaps:

- 1. Learning Outcome Definition:** A majority of pilot institutions demonstrated insufficient specificity in defining learning outcomes at the course level. Learning outcomes were often stated in broad, aspirational terms that lacked the precision required for meaningful measurement and assessment.
- 2. Assessment Data Systems:** Institutions showed limited capacity for systematic collection and analysis of assessment data. While many institutions had established some form of assessment mechanism, the data generated was not consistently captured, stored, or analysed in a manner that could inform improvement decisions.
- 3. Direct vs. Indirect Assessment:** Over-reliance on indirect assessment methods (student satisfaction surveys, self-reports) was observed, with insufficient deployment of direct assessment tools (standardised tests, portfolio evaluations, capstone project assessments).

Participant Observations:

Multiple institution representatives noted that the challenge of defining measurable learning outcomes was particularly acute in interdisciplinary programmes, where

learning objectives must bridge multiple disciplinary frameworks. Representatives from smaller institutions further observed that the resource intensity of systematic data collection posed a significant capacity constraint.

Committee Response:

The Quality Accreditation Committee acknowledged these challenges and confirmed that Standard IV would receive enhanced guidance in Version 2.0, including:

- Expanded rubrics for learning outcome formulation across different programme types;
- Tiered evidence requirements calibrated to institutional size and resources;
- Additional case examples demonstrating effective AoL (Assurance of Learning) systems in varied institutional contexts.

2.3 Key Findings: Standard VIII – Continuous Improvement Mechanisms

Standard VIII: Continuous Improvement Mechanisms was identified as the second area of significant concern.

Identified Gaps:

1. **Incomplete PDCA Cycles:** While many pilot institutions had established internal quality assurance bodies, the majority had not yet operationalised complete Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycles. Institutions demonstrated capability in the "Plan" and "Do" phases but showed limited evidence of systematic "Check" (evaluation of improvement effectiveness) and "Act" (institutionalisation of validated improvements).
2. **Fragmented Quality Assurance Structures:** In several institutions, quality assurance functions were distributed across multiple administrative units without clear coordination or reporting lines, resulting in duplicative efforts and gaps in coverage.
3. **Stakeholder Engagement Gaps:** Student and external stakeholder (employer, alumni) participation in quality assurance processes was inconsistent across institutions, with many relying primarily on faculty and administrative input.

Participant Observations:

Several representatives noted that the transition from "compliance-driven" to "improvement-driven" quality culture required significant organisational change that could not be accomplished within the timeframe of a single accreditation cycle. Recommendations included the development of staged improvement pathways that recognise institutional maturity levels.

Committee Response:

The Committee confirmed that Standard VIII guidance in Version 2.0 would be strengthened to include:

- A maturity model framework allowing institutions to demonstrate progressive

improvement;

- Enhanced guidance on stakeholder engagement mechanisms;
- Templates for documenting complete PDCA cycles with verification evidence.

2.4 Discussion: Self-Assessment Report Challenges

A dedicated session addressed common challenges encountered in the preparation of Self-Evaluation Reports (SERs) during the pilot phase.

Common Challenges Identified:

Challenge	Frequency	Description
Evidence indexing and traceability	High	Difficulty in systematically organising and cross-referencing evidence across standards
Balanced self-evaluation	High	Tendency toward either overly defensive or overly self-critical assessment
Mission-evidence alignment	Medium	Insufficient connection between institutional mission statements and evidence presented
Data visualisation	Medium	Limited capacity to present quantitative data in accessible, meaningful formats

Resolution: The Committee confirmed that the SER Preparation Guide would be revised to include expanded templates, evidence mapping tools, and visualisation guidance, with a revised edition to be published alongside Version 2.0.

3.0 DAY TWO PROCEEDINGS: MULTI-DISCIPLINARY STANDARD APPLICABILITY

3.1 Parallel Working Sessions

Day Two featured three parallel online working sessions organised by disciplinary clusters. Each session was facilitated by a subject matter expert and a QAC member.

Session A: Engineering and Technology

Key Discussion Points:

- Laboratory safety management assessment criteria require greater specificity within the general standards framework;
- Engineering ethics education outcomes are difficult to assess through standardised instruments; portfolio and case-based assessment methods may be more appropriate;
- Industry partnership and work-integrated learning components require clearer articulation in accreditation standards;
- The balance between theoretical knowledge and practical competence in engineering programmes necessitates differentiated assessment approaches.

Recommendations Submitted:

1. Develop discipline-specific assessment rubrics for laboratory safety and engineering ethics;
2. Include industry partner feedback as a recognised evidence source;
3. Provide guidance on assessing work-integrated learning outcomes.

Session B: Humanities and Social Sciences**Key Discussion Points:**

- Research methodology training and critical thinking development are core outcomes that resist purely quantitative assessment;
- Qualitative assessment methods (essays, research proposals, reflective journals) require robust rubrics to ensure consistency and fairness;
- The diversity of methodological approaches within humanities and social sciences makes standardised assessment particularly challenging;
- Cultural and linguistic diversity in student populations requires assessment methods that are fair across different backgrounds.

Recommendations Submitted:

1. Develop guidance on qualitative assessment rubrics with cross-cultural sensitivity;
2. Recognise multiple forms of evidence for critical thinking outcomes;
3. Provide exemplars of effective assessment in diverse humanities and social science contexts.

Session C: Interdisciplinary and Emerging Fields**Key Discussion Points:**

- Interdisciplinary programmes present unique challenges in mapping learning outcomes to specific standards;
- Assessment must reflect integrated competence rather than disciplinary silos;

- Faculty qualifications in interdisciplinary programmes may not fit neatly into traditional disciplinary categories;
- Emerging fields (e.g., AI ethics, sustainability studies) require flexible standards that can accommodate evolving disciplinary boundaries.

Recommendations Submitted:

1. Develop specific guidance for interdisciplinary programme assessment;
2. Establish flexible faculty qualification criteria for emerging fields;
3. Create a mechanism for rapid standard updates in response to field evolution.

3.2 Plenary Discussion: Standard Harmonisation

The parallel session outputs were consolidated and presented in a plenary session. The following cross-cutting themes emerged:

Theme 1: Mission-Driven Differentiation

Participants affirmed that the "mission-driven" pillar of the IQA framework provides adequate flexibility for disciplinary adaptation. However, institutions require clearer guidance on how to operationalise mission-driven assessment across different disciplinary contexts.

Theme 2: Evidence Standardisation

While assessment methods may differ by discipline, the underlying requirements for evidence quality—verifiability, traceability, and relevance—should remain consistent. The Committee committed to developing discipline-specific assessment rubrics while maintaining core evidence standards.

Theme 3: Faculty Development

Multiple participants noted that faculty capacity for outcomes-based assessment varies significantly across disciplines and institutions. Recommendations included the development of discipline-specific training resources and peer learning networks.

Committee Decision:

The Quality Accreditation Committee confirmed that discipline-specific supplementary assessment guidance would be developed for each of the nine IQA disciplinary domains, with initial releases scheduled for Q4 2026. The guidance will address discipline-specific:

- Learning outcome formulation exemplars;
- Assessment method recommendations;
- Evidence type guidance;
- Faculty qualification considerations.

4.0 DAY THREE PROCEEDINGS: EMERGING

CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENTS

4.1 Artificial Intelligence and Academic Integrity

Session Context:

A dedicated session addressed the implications of generative AI for academic integrity and the verification of learning outcomes. The discussion was informed by the Committee's recently completed *Accreditation Guidelines for AI-Assisted Teaching and Assessment* (May 2026).

Key Observations:

1. **Ubiquitous Adoption:** AI tools are being deployed across all pilot institutions, though with significant variation in policy clarity and transparency.
2. **Policy Gaps:** Most institutions lack clear, publicly available policies on permitted and prohibited uses of AI in academic work. Students and faculty operate in a grey zone where acceptable use is not clearly defined.
3. **Assessment Authenticity:** Generative AI challenges the fundamental assumption that submitted work reflects student-generated learning. Institutions require new approaches to assessment design that make AI-assisted submission less attractive or less effective.
4. **Detection Limitations:** AI detection tools have variable accuracy rates and may produce differential false positive rates across language backgrounds and demographic groups. Detection results alone should not constitute evidence of academic misconduct.

Expert Presentations:

- **Dr. [Name Redacted], Asia-Pacific Region:** Presented findings on institutional responses to AI in three pilot countries, noting that institutions with clear AI policies demonstrated higher student awareness and more consistent application of academic integrity standards.
- **Professor [Name Redacted], European Region:** Discussed the relationship between assessment design and AI vulnerability, arguing that assessments requiring critical analysis, personal reflection, and oral defence are inherently less vulnerable to AI substitution.

Committee Presentation:

The Quality Accreditation Committee presented the *Accreditation Guidelines for AI-Assisted Teaching and Assessment*, emphasising the "Human-in-the-Loop" principle: decisions with substantive impact on student academic progress must ultimately be made by qualified faculty members, with AI outputs serving as reference points rather than replacements.

Key Committee Commitments:

1. The AI Guidelines will be published alongside Version 2.0 in Q1 2027;

2. A dedicated AI governance module will be developed for the IQA online resource centre;

3. AI governance practices will be incorporated into the Standard I (Ethics and Compliance) assessment framework.

Participant Feedback:

The guidelines received strong endorsement from participants, with the following suggestions for enhancement:

- Additional discipline-specific AI use case examples;
- Sample AI policy templates for institutions to adapt;
- Guidance on student disclosure requirements for AI use in submitted work;
- Protocols for handling AI-related academic integrity cases.

4.2 International Mutual Recognition Progress

Secretariat Report:

The IAPUC Secretariat provided an update on international mutual recognition developments:

IAPUC-GAFM Comprehensive Mutual Recognition Agreement (June 2026):

Aspect	Detail
Partner Organisation	Global Academy of Finance and Management (GAFM®)
Agreement Type	Comprehensive Mutual Recognition Agreement
Coverage	IQA accreditation framework and GAFM International Business Standards
Effective Date	June 2026
Beneficiaries	IQA-accredited business and finance programme graduates eligible for expedited GAFM certification pathways
Geographic Reach	GAFM network: 100+

	accredited training offices across 50+ countries
--	---

Strategic Significance:

The Secretariat characterised the GAFM agreement as the first step in a broader mutual recognition strategy, with the following objectives:

1. **2026-2027:** Establish mutual recognition dialogues with regional quality assurance networks in Asia-Pacific and Europe;
2. **2027-2028:** Achieve formal mutual recognition agreements with at least three additional quality assurance bodies;
3. **Pre-Launch Objective:** Establish a foundational mutual recognition network covering major private higher education regions prior to the global launch of IQA Version 2.0.

Participant Discussion:

Institution representatives expressed strong support for the mutual recognition strategy, noting that cross-border qualification recognition is a key factor in international student recruitment and institutional partnerships. Several representatives offered to facilitate introductions to quality assurance bodies in their respective regions.

4.3 IQA Accreditation System Version 2.0 Roadmap

Committee Announcement:

The Quality Accreditation Committee announced the following roadmap for IQA Accreditation System Version 2.0:

Milestone	Target Date
Incorporation of consultation feedback and pilot findings	July–October 2026
Version 2.0 draft completion	November 2026
Quality Accreditation Committee review and approval	December 2026
IAPUC Board of Directors ratification	January 2027
Global release and	Q1 2027

publication	
Accreditation applications open	April 2027
First formal accreditation decisions announced	Q1 2028

Version 2.0 Key Enhancements:

- 1. Eight Core Standards Optimisation:** Systematic refinement of assessment indicators across all eight standards based on pilot findings;
- 2. Discipline-Specific Supplementary Guidance:** Domain-specific assessment guidance for all nine IQA disciplinary areas;
- 3. Enhanced AI Governance Framework:** Integration of AI Guidelines and governance expectations into the core standards;
- 4. Micro-Credentials and RPL Standards:** Full integration of supplementary standards for micro-credentials and Recognition of Prior Learning;
- 5. Remote and Blended Learning Standards:** Refinement of distance and blended learning quality standards based on pilot experience;
- 6. Evidence Quality Framework:** Enhanced guidance on evidence collection, organisation, and presentation.

Application Process Update:

The Committee confirmed that the online accreditation application system would be fully operational for the April 2027 opening, with the following features:

- Integrated self-assessment and evidence submission module;
- Real-time application status tracking;
- Secure document upload and management;
- Automated communication and notification system.

5.0 CLOSING REMARKS

IAPUC President's Address:

In her closing remarks via video address, the IAPUC President stated:

"This closed-door consultation, though conducted across 22 time zones, has demonstrated that our shared commitment to quality assurance in private higher education transcends geographic boundaries. The insights gathered over these three days have provided an invaluable foundation for the transition of the IQA Accreditation System from institutional framework to accreditation practice.

IAPUC remains steadfast in its commitment to the core values of rigour, fairness,

transparency, diversity, continuous improvement, and social responsibility. We will continue to work alongside private institutions worldwide to build a quality infrastructure that withstands scrutiny and serves learners, institutions, and societies."

Closing Resolutions:

The meeting concluded with the following resolutions:

Resolution	Description
1	The Quality Accreditation Committee shall incorporate all consultation feedback into the Version 2.0 revision process
2	Discipline-specific supplementary assessment guidance shall be developed for all nine IQA disciplinary domains by Q4 2026
3	The AI Guidelines shall be published alongside Version 2.0 in Q1 2027
4	The mutual recognition strategy shall proceed with priority engagement with Asia-Pacific and European quality assurance networks
5	The IQA Accreditation System Version 2.0 shall be released in Q1 2027 with applications opening in April 2027

6.0 DOCUMENTATION AND RECORDS

6.1 Meeting Records

The following records have been archived in accordance with the *IQA Accreditation Records and Data Retention Management Rules*:

- Full video recording of all plenary sessions;
- Summaries of parallel working sessions;
- Participant submitted comments and recommendations;
- Presentation materials;
- Discussion transcripts (edited for clarity and confidentiality).

6.2 Deliverables

The following documents will be prepared and distributed:

Document	Target Date	Distribution
<i>IQA Accreditation System Closed-Door Consultation Meeting Minutes</i> (this document)	August 2026	IAPUC Board, QAC, Participants
<i>Accreditation Standards Amendment Proposals</i>	September 2026	IAPUC Board, QAC, All Institutional Members
<i>Version 2.0 Draft</i>	November 2026	QAC Internal Review
<i>Version 2.0 Final</i>	Q1 2027	Global Public Release

Prepared by:

David Chow

Secretary, Quality Accreditation Committee

IAPUC

Reviewed by:

Mika Kin

Chair, Quality Accreditation Committee

IAPUC

Approved by:

Fuli Zhang

President, IAPUC

© 2026 International Association of Private Universities and Colleges. All rights reserved.

This document is the intellectual property of IAPUC and may not be reproduced, modified, or distributed without prior written authorization.