Higher Education Evaluation and Development 10:2 (December 2016): 1-17
DOI: 10.6197/HEED.2016.1002.01

Learning Assessment: The Complex Role of Universities

John N. Hawkins*

Abstract

There are a variety of approaches to learning assessment. Here the focus is on the domain of higher education, the context in which learning takes place and its relevance for learning assessment. The issue of quality assurance plays a significant role in this exploration and has increased in importance when considering the landscape of learning assessment. It is suggested that both external and internal quality assessment serve as the two major quality assurance experiences when considering learning assessment. A case study of the University of California will be utilized to reveal the tension between these two approaches to learning assessment.

Keywords: Higher Education; Learning Assessment; Quality Assurance

Manuscript received: 2016.10.20; Revised: 2016.12.9; Accepted: 2016.12.10
* John N. Hawkins: Professor Emeritus, University of California, Los Angeles, US; E-mail: Hawkins@gseis.ucla.edu

1. Introduction

It can safely be said that a principle role and function of higher education is to contribute to the successful learning and enrichment of the student population. Much more occurs in the delivery of higher education of course, and there are a variety of unintended learning outcomes that some might argue are even more important to the enrichment of students than the stated learning objectives that lend themselves so readily to quantification. Nevertheless, it would be difficult to find a respected higher education institution (HEI) that did not seek to deliver a substantive and meaningful teaching and learning experience for its students. The predicament is, how best to determine whether and how well this learning is taking place, and which aspects of the institution contribute to learning? If you ask a professor, he or she will generally tell you that it involves some sort of evaluation process, most likely called an "examination" that the professor develops generally on their own. If you ask a department chair you might hear that the quality of learning is directly related to the departmental curriculum review committee. If you ask the CEO of the institution, you might hear that the answer lies in a set of normative measures that can be categorized in a variety of ways and applies to all appropriate levels of the curriculum. If the question is posed to a national agency such as a ministry of education or other central level of authority, you may hear that there are learning objectives that can be applied across the board, common assessments that often are linked with and result in some sort of accreditation process. HEIs must generally comply with existing protocols but there often can be resistance or efforts to find new ways not only to improve learning itself but also find ways to make it more meaningful, and linked to innovation. All of these learning assessment approaches, and more, (high stakes, pre-assessments, formative assessments, summative assessments, interim assessments, placement assessments, screening assessments, standardized assessments, performance assessments and so on) can be applied in various mixes and yield important information for educational practitioners and policy-makers (Banta & Palomba, 2015; Middaugh, 2010). But as my colleague at UCLA, Alexandra Astin notes, just as important and perhaps increasingly significant is the institutional "environment" in which learning and assessment takes place (Astin & Antonio, 2012). As they note: "Environmental assessment presents the most difficult and complex challenge to the field of assessment. *It is also the most neglected topic*" (Astin & Antonio, 2012, p. 87; italics mine). Indeed, it is generally neglected, but nonetheless this particular unit of analysis or

observation of the ecology of learning and assessment is one of the most critical to determining the kind and quality of learning that takes place at the institutional level. Furthermore, "quality assurance" (QA) is one of the primary linkage factors in this conversation.

Learning assessment comes at you from many different directions. In this contribution to the journal I will focus my attention on this environment and what might also be called the "ecology" of learning and assessment, using the HEI as the unit of analysis (to paraphrase Ewell, 2010). It is no surprise that the issue of QA (which includes learning assessment among other QA issues) looms large in this discussion and has steadily moved to the center of the learning and assessment landscape in HE. This is particularly true in Asia and North America where the literature on this topic has exploded and many debates on many levels have arisen as to the value of QA and the appropriate locus of study for this policy issue (see extensive bibliography in Neubauer & Gomes, 2017). QA has taken center stage both external and internal to higher education. Externally, (ministry level, accreditation agency, governmental department of education level and so on) there is a great belief in the use of QA to improve learning and HE in general. Internally, many in the academy are not convinced that externally imposed QA measures have contributed much to improving our understanding of learning and instruction (L&I) and in fact, they may be something of an inappropriate imposition to improvement.

For better or worse, however, we have entered an era of what might be called an "evaluative culture," or competitive state culture. A variety of regulatory reforms such as privatization, marketization, and corporatization have influenced this ecology. Educational stakeholders generally want higher quality for the various elements of HE (learning, instruction, research, community service, etc.) and indeed this penchant for evaluation has led to a hyper-interest in quantification focused on the rise of a variety of ranking regimes, as well as the never-ending quest for World Class University status. As suggested above there have been at least two major QA experiences that are relevant for the broad mission of learning and assessment: accreditation (external) and institutional self-review (internal). Here I will present some relevant experiences of the tension between external and internal QA with implications for learning and assessment as they have played out in the University of California (UC). These experiences have not been limited to the UC or US experience and indeed are being practiced in different ways in many other research university settings in Asia and North

America. A recent Higher Education Forum sponsored by the Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) and the National Institute of Accreditation and Quality Enhancement (NIAD-UE) focused on the differing environments of external and internal QA noting an interest in the value of internal QA with respect to learning and assessment (NIAD-UE 2016). Similar discussions have taken place in China and Hong Kong, and much of South East Asia (*Administration and governance of higher education in Asia: Patterns and administration*, 2012). Within many settings in Asia, the central focus currently is on increasing HEI autonomy with respect to QA, decentralization of authority in general and a recognition that when considering learning and assessment, there needs to be an increasing effort to conduct these reviews and assessments at the local institutional level (*Administration and governance of higher education in Asia: Patterns and administration*, 2012). It is also recognized that this remains a challenge due to a variety of political and administrative factors and that progress will be uneven depending on the particular national and geographic setting. Nevertheless, included among the recommendations that are made in the Asian Development Bank report, are several that suggest further utilization of case studies of instances where progress has been made and the further development of databases that can be accessed for examples of such efforts. In the concluding words of the report:

> Across the region, public HEIs are gaining increased financial, administrative and curricular autonomy. The transition to greater autonomy often necessitates new policies, procedures and practices, both in how government works with universities and in how universities manage their own affairs. While the degree of autonomy and the pace of the transition differ across countries, there is widespread interest among government officials, institutional administrators, and instructional staff in designing policies, monitoring their implementation, and evaluating their appropriateness. One way of helping both governments and universities in this transition is to ensure that they have access to information, models, case studies, and expertise that can inform their thinking. (*Administration and governance of higher education in Asia: Patterns and administration*, 2012, p. 19)

The learning and assessment challenges that these on-going autonomy and decentralization reforms present are significant and not unlike those that are being engaged in elsewhere including in the US (Ewell, 2002).

As indicated above, the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) will be the case here to demonstrate how one well-known HEI has sought to reconcile

the tension between external and internal efforts to improve the ecology in which relevant and improved (i.e., "higher quality") learning and instruction can take place.

2. Background on Accreditation and Learning Outcomes in US Context

In order to do so, it is useful to provide a brief background to the context -- accreditation -- in which this occurs. There is a long history, going back to the nineteenth century of HE accreditation in the US, describing the movement toward regional associations (such as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, WASC) in the context of a decentralized HE model (no formal ministry but rather a weak central US Department of Education-USDE). While the central, federal level of educational policy making has historically been focused on a data collection and advisory role, in recent years the USDE has increasingly played a more active role in the policy of linking HE funding to learning outcomes. This policy shift created a tension filled atmosphere in the higher education community and generated a debate on which was the most suitable locus of control for assuring high levels of learning quality.

Prior to the 1980's the principal role of the USDE as well as the regional associations for accreditation was fairly straightforward. It was essentially an "input" model which included data collection on funding, faculty strengths, graduation rates, library resources, student profiles and so on (Wolff, 2009). How best to measure and assess student learning was generally left to the HEIs themselves. By the mid 1980's the appropriate roles and missions of external and internal agencies (USDE, accreditation Regional Accreditation Agencies [RAAs], and HEIs) became more complicated. A critique from the USDE focused increasingly on "student achievement;" this category moved from number 10 on the list of measurement criteria to no. 1 (Carey, 2008).

By the turn of the century the role of external accreditation and learning outcomes was further heightened with release of the so-called "Measuring Up" report which found that all 50 states in the US earned an "incomplete" for the learning assessment category (The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2004). That is, the authors (who interestingly dedicated the report to Clark Kerr, the author and developer of the California Master Plan for Higher Education, a widely admired "higher educational Plan" that continues to draw the attention of educators and academics in much of Asia) determined that none

of the 50 states were able to effectively "measure" or assess the quality of the learning experience in their many and diverse higher education institutions. Why was this case? It turns out that there are many reasons, among which are: the RAAs and the HEIs could not agree on what constitutes "learning," there was a lack of understanding of the tools and models that exist to attempt to measure it effectively, there was substantial and significant faculty and university administrative resistance to the very idea of using the term learning outcomes in this way, and finally there were weaknesses among staff at the institutional level (HEI) to carry out a meaningful exercise in learning assessment. In short, there has been and remains a spirited discussion of why the idea of "learning" is so difficult a concept to find agreement on thus leading to the further predicament of how to assess such an elusive concept (Arum & Roksa, 2011; Banta & Fisher, 1987).

For two decades in the US RAAs and HEIs have struggled with the issue of learning outcomes and how to effectively align this discussion with both external and internal QA. Most have accepted that it is an important if difficult measure. But increasingly the discussion has centered on asking another kind of question. Perhaps the focus on determining the quality of learning assessment should be on the internal HEI environment as suggested above and how to facilitate its linking to the accreditation process contributing to a value-added learning experience that takes place in the university.

This approach was prompted interestingly in 2006, by an effort of the USDE to increase its influence on the "learning" issue. A report issued by the Spellings Commission (named after US Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings) carried the critique of the Measuring Up report to another level by suggesting that the US accreditation process was flawed and in fact was part of the learning assessment problem rather than part of the solution. As the Chair of the Commission Spellings was famously quoted: "accreditation remains one of the biggest barriers to innovation ... (it) is a misguided failure" (AAUP, 2006). During this same time frame, the USDE which historically had been somewhat disconnected from both accreditation and HEIs moved more aggressively toward a more activist role in HE QA issuing a variety of critical policy papers on the relationship between RAAs and HEIs. Utilizing leverage the USDE had with financial support they provided for HEIs, there was a brief effort to assume some of the QA responsibilities that were typical of more centralized government involvement. In the words of American Association of University Professors (AAUP):

> What emerges from the report is a vision of higher education as a marketplace that should increasingly rely on uniform standards to measure outcomes and technological means to provide training in skills necessary for global economic competition. The process and quality of the educational experience, so central to the formation of a love of learning, civic virtues and social capital, are marginalized to the point of irrelevance. As Richard Brodhead, president of Duke University pointed out recently in the Washington Post, leaders of higher education in Asia admire America's colleges and universities for fostering "initiative, independence, resourcefulness, and collaboration." Unlike the commission's report, these Asian leaders view American higher education as worthy of emulation rather than as a project for retooling. (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 2006)

This effort to redefine the role of the USDE in US HE however did not gain much traction and soon both HEIs and the RAAs began to seek more innovative and challenging approaches to the alignment of HEIs and RAAs mission of improving QA, learning, and instruction.

The emphasis then shifted to documenting "institutional performance" and focused on better ways to support the achievement of learning outcomes, the HE environment and curriculum that nurture learning, and looking more carefully at student learning, engagement and completion (Kuh, 2001). This leads to the issue of institutional accountability and goes toward the question of how well institutions are utilizing the public funding they receive, even as it declines. Other questions of interest in accreditation and learning had to do with whether or not students are learning what they are expected to learn? Are their outcomes aligned closely to the talents and skills needed in their local economies? Are they learning and developing the values and ethics needed for the healthy development of their communities as well as the leadership qualities that are necessary for this development?

All of these questions, which are typically addressed during accreditation, raise the thorny issue of the strengths and weaknesses of the conventional accreditation approach toward a single institution which itself has become a complex learning environment. What we are increasingly seeing is the deinstitutionalization of learning. Students now commonly attend multiple institutions, and collect a variety of courses and learning activities outside of the traditional HEI setting. When assessing learning during accreditation assessors now must be familiar with learning that has taken place in MOOCs, iTunes,

TED.com among others. Technology also now plays a more complicated role in learning, challenging the traditional instructional functions of faculty (Jones, 2002; Wolff, 2013).

Indeed one of the principle critiques of accreditation wherever it occurs is that accreditors do not pay enough attention to results. The metrics they typically employ lend themselves well to areas such as finance and institutional sustainability but are more dubious and challenging when applied to learning assessment and learning outcomes (Wolff, 2014). As Wolff notes, "assessment is not the same as demonstrating effective learning" (Wolff, 2014, p. 3). That is, there remains a disconnect between what students learn and how they can apply their learning outside the academy upon graduation (Klein, Benjamin, Shavelson, & Bolus, 2007). To address this issue efforts have been made to develop systems of "core competencies" in key areas of the undergraduate curriculum (critical thinking, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy and so on); or, similar rubrics for degree qualifications (Lumina Foundation, 2011). In addition, a number of studies have been conducted in the US to help clarify these measurement issues yet the criticism remains that the conventional accreditation approach has its limits (Wolff, 2014). One intriguing conclusion reached by these studies is that only by working closely with the internal QA processes of HEIs is it possible to clearly have an impact on the complexity of learning development and develop methods of assessment that make sense and get beyond the idea of single measures of learning. In short, there needs to be a "value added" to the HEI undergoing review that takes into account the internal ecology of quality assurance.

3. The Internal Ecology of QA -- Implications for Improved Learning Outcomes

In today's modern university, assessment of quality, including learning, occurs at many levels. As has been discussed, in most settings, this takes the form of external accreditation and some form of internal self-review regime. These reviews exert an enormous influence on our understanding of what kind of learning is both possible and actually taking place, in other words, the ecology of learning, instruction and their assessment. Here I will outline a structure of review and assessment that has evolved over time in a rather typical research university and which has increasingly become a paradigmatic model for HE in Asia as well as the US (Hawkins, 2010).

Some form of self-review has become standard in most HEIs. The research literature makes note that this form of review and QA is often taken more seriously among the stakeholders than external accreditation, while at the same time, the internal process can be very supportive of the external more conventional accreditation process (*Administration and governance of higher education in Asia: Patterns and administration* 2012). Faculty, administrators and students feel more engaged in the QA process and generally believe that a comprehensive internal review system is the most effective and participatory measure to assure high level learning quality and assessment thereof. As Astin has noted: "It is our strong belief that the future course of assessment in US higher education will be primarily determined not by what the federal and state legislators and policy makers do, but rather by how we in the institutions respond to the challenge of the assessment movement ... we still maintain direct control over most of the things that really matter: who we admit and on what basis we admit them; how we place our students in different courses of study; what we teach and how we teach it; *how we assess, grade and certify our students*; who we hire and on what basis we reward and promote them; and ho we operate our institutions internally" (*Administration and governance of higher education in Asia: Patterns and administration*, 2012, p. 263). While many HEIs utilize some variation on the general model the basic architecture has some recognizable similarities. There are two fundamental parts to the internal QA approach and both will be briefly described here: QA for *academic and administrative personnel*, and QA for *academic programs*.

Within the broad category of personnel review one can say that it occurs at all levels in most HEIs; in other words, no one escapes this level of review. Faculty, administrators, staff and other stakeholders take these reviews very seriously. The reviews are generally staggered occurring every three to five years and include all levels of personnel from faculty, to departmental chairs, deans, vice chancellors/presidents) and chancellors/presidents) as well as center directors and in some cases adjunct personnel. This cohort of personnel has the most direct influence over what is taught, how it is taught, and how it is assessed.

With respect to tenure-track teaching and research faculty, the reviews occur throughout their career from the early recruitment reviews, hiring processes, in-service reviews and promotions, retention processes, and dismissal processes. While research performance is a key indicator for these reviews, increasingly there is general agreement that the key to quality learning outcomes is directly

related to the quality of the faculty (*Administration and governance of higher education in Asia: Patterns and administration*, 2012). In order to sharpen the focus on the teaching quality aspect of the reviews multiple layers are probed utilizing peer review from inside the HEIs as well as from other institutions. Rewritten eliminates "elsewhere as well." Increasingly, HEIs are adopting faculty-mentoring systems to help faculty improve their teaching quality (Hutchings, 2010). A variety of faculty teaching support systems are utilized and these institutional support functions are becoming well established according to multi-institutional studies (Jacob, Xiong, Ye, Wang, Xu, & Lu, 2016). The fact that these reviews result in salary increases that are directly related to the quality of teaching is not lost on those in the academic personnel sector (Harnisch, 2011). In short, there is an important relationship between the internal faculty review process with all of its checks and balances, and student learning. And it is often here that innovative assessment measures and means of evaluating learning are derived and popularized (Arreola, 2007).

The next grade of internal personnel review occurs at the departmental and division levels, where periodic assessments and reviews of academic Chairs and Deans occur. Chairs and deans represent the two academic officers most directly responsible for assuring and maintaining both teaching and learning quality, as well as monitoring and supporting appropriate assessment measures given the diversity of curriculum that characterizes the modern university. If there is a weakness at this level of leadership it will most likely be reflected in the quality and strength of the instructional programs. In the paradigm being discussed here chairs and deans are generally reviewed both formally and informally every five years. The outcome of these reviews depends to a large degree on the quality of the teaching and learning environment in both the departments and divisions. Data that supports the continuing improvement and growing strength of learning and instruction at the departmental and division levels results in the reappointments and rewards of chairs and deans. And, the opposite response to a weak review is also an option, that is, the non-reappointment of an academic officer whose division does not reflect improved learning and instruction.

Finally, at the highest level of academic leadership, that is the CEO (chancellor/president), five-year reviews are usually carried out by the Academic Senate or faculty governance body at the university. While the CEO is the furthest removed from the learning and teaching classroom environment, increasingly a major part of this review has to do with how well the institution is doing with

respect to improvements in these areas and the support provided for innovative and successful improvement strategies.

As mentioned above, the second layer of institutional review for QA has to do with academic programs. In most HEIs the principal unit of analysis is the academic department. To an increasing extent departments are becoming more diverse in focus, that is multi-disciplinary programs are attaining department status (more will be said on this below). Nevertheless, departmental reviews are a key component in assessing the learning and teaching strengths and weaknesses that characterize the institution. These reviews are often performed every eight years and everything is on the table. Programs can be added, enriched, eliminated and affected in a variety of ways depending on the outcome of the review. The focus here is heavily on teaching and learning outcomes.

The overall point here is that it is precisely the internal QA structure of HEIs that provides the foundation for an accurate and meaningful approach to learning assessment. Everything else, the quantification of learning outcomes, the development of learning objectives, assessing student inputs, and the external accreditation process all rely on the integrity and strength of the institutional environment and its multiple layers of internal review. This allows the institution to firmly state and publish the educational goals of the academic programs and curriculum so students are aware of what they are expected to learn and achieve. It also allows the institution to articulate how the departmental goals for undergraduate education (for example) are being implemented and how evidence can be examined on whether goals are being met, high quality student work being achieved, evidence on job placement aligned with degree objective, and relevance of the curriculum and so on. Finally, a strong internal institutional review process provides a tapestry of checks and controls over QA, and one that is operated locally and conducted by the stakeholders themselves. There is a sense of ownership of the review process that allows policies for improvement and change to occur. And it promotes an atmosphere of trust between the administration, the faculty and students. All of this is very relevant and useful for external reviews such as accreditation to take place (Wolff, 2014).

4. The UCLA-WASC Thematic Approach to Innovative Learning 2006-2016

It is worthwhile to take a closer look at one effort to innovatively align the internal HEIs' efforts to improve learning and assessment with that of the external

accreditation process. During a regularly scheduled accreditation process in 2006 the western regional agency (WASC) and the UCLA administration agreed to try a new approach to reform teaching and learning so that there was a value added to the usual accreditation process. The data that was normally collected during accreditation reviews continued to provide the base for accreditation but added to this process was a joint effort to reshape undergraduate education in such a way that the undergraduate learning and teaching experience would qualitatively contribute to an improvement in the curriculum as a whole.

The team adopted a "thematic" approach to substantively change the undergraduate experience and thereby redefine what "learning" means as well as "add" new components to the curriculum. Three new initiatives were launched: (1) Shaping undergraduate education via a "*capstone*" experience; (2) Facilitating *interdisciplinary education and research*; (3) *Using educational technology* to enhance the student academic experience (UCLA, 2016). The focus on these three initiatives was jointly decided by both WASC and the UCLA central administration and supported by the Academic Senate. The capstone project attempted to introduce a learning experience that was not uncommon among smaller liberal arts colleges but fairly rare in large research universities. The mission was to develop a creative; inquiry based learning experience for all undergraduates that would be part of an upper division course in the student's major. There were three principle goals here: they would be peer group projects; they would result in a tangible product, and they would be shared in the broader community. The hope is that the project will provide graduating students with something tangible rather than just a collection of courses and grades. The learning experience would be focused and unique, and taught and assessed by peers and faculty alike.

The emphasis on interdisciplinary studies programs (IDPs) was the second project, this one focused principally on the structure of knowledge in the university. It had become well known that the traditional disciplinary approach to learning whereby knowledge existed in fenced off departmental silos no longer if ever represented the bread and depth of knowledge, as it exists in the real world. At many universities and colleges the rise of interdisciplinary studies (hyphenated fields of studies as it were -- e.g., political economy, bio-chemistry, historical-sociology, bio-physics, etc.) had begun to compete with the traditional disciplines both in courses taught and research centers. The problem was that this growth had developed with little or no articulation of how it fit within the conventional academic environment. The goal of this mission was to articulate a campus-wide

vision for IDPs as they related to overall undergraduate and graduate education and research. One structural problem with IDPs was that though they were very popular with students and faculty who saw the value in interdisciplinarity, there were a number of barriers to faculty participation in such programs, often associated with departmental turf wars, as well as promotion policies. A major challenge thus is to find ways to remove these barriers and create a flexible, porous environment for the easy flow of ideas and students and faculty across knowledge boundaries. A second challenge is to increase student awareness and engagement in IDPs.

The third proposal is to articulate a vision and plan for the role of educational technology (ET) in the general curriculum. Like the IDPs, ET had grown exponentially across the campus in almost every field of study. Yet there remained a number of issues that hindered the effective use of this burgeoning phenomenon. First and foremost was to develop scalable services for the engagement, preparation and support for training and evaluating faculty and teaching assistants in the use of ET. Closely related to this was an effort to develop measures on how the application and introduction of this technology impacted student-learning outcomes. It was thought that this would be a far better use both of external (accreditation) and internal (university) energies than simply attempting to develop new learning outcome measures on a course-by-course scale or as core competencies. Finally, as undergraduates are increasingly and actively engaged in faculty research projects there was an added goal to build a research rich environment to facilitate the use of ET by students linked to those research projects (UCLA, 2006).

All three of three of these major initiatives were launched in 2006 as a result of an upcoming accreditation process, and they were seen as long-term institutional learning challenges. They remain in progress and will be evaluated formally before 2019 when UCLA celebrates its centennial.

5. Conclusion

At the very least, it is my hope that a discussion of the learning or talent development mission of HEIs, often considered in the context of "learning assessment" will be broadened to include the various institutional elements of the HEI ecology that provides the basis for supporting learning improvements. Too often current assessment practices focus on the idea of providing evidence on the "excellence" of HE, both reputational (rankings) and resource strength (faculty

and student eminence, level of funding/endowments, physical plant to name a few) in addition to limited measures of learning, and this leads to a narrow view of what constitutes assessment and often contributes little to learning development (Pacarella, Seifert, & Blaich, 2010; Pike, 2011; Zis, Boieke, & Ewell 2010). In seeking to raise the quality of the educational experience and thereby the learning that is taking place there are a few questions that are relevant for educational leaders at various levels in the HE ecology we have been discussing.

- What are the current essential elements of QA in the area of learning development? Too often there has been little work done to analyze this question at the institutional level.
- Given what we know about QA both theoretically and practically, what is missing? This involves a much more critical and analytical analysis of the different levels of QA, and how each contributes to learning development.
- Is there a generic model of QA? There exists a tendency cross-nationally to seek a general model, which lends itself to distorting cross-national ranking efforts, thus masking the often unique and innovative practices that individual HEIs offer.
- Has QA kept up with the new paradigmatic research and thinking about HE? The field of learning and instruction (L&I) has been dramatically changed by recent science on the mapping of the brain, which has enormous implications for how learning takes place, learning theory and instructional improvement.
- How does QA square with issues of access, equity and diversity? Does "one size fit all"? There are many implications here for dominant learning assessment procedures.
- And finally, how can we best determine the appropriate roles of "outside" actors and the HE institutions themselves in the QA process for learning improvement?

These topics and many others demonstrate that the issue of quality assurance and learning assessment are not limited to specific national systems but indeed are readily represented throughout the Asia Pacific region (Neubauer & Gomes, 2017). The hope ultimately is that by finding a judicious way to align external with internal QA, it will be possible to avoid concluding, as Martin Trow did many years ago, that "accreditation has not led to a single major improvement in higher education since it began" (Trow, 1994, p. 34). By empowering and aligning the internal review process with the external accreditation process it is possible to create a potent combination for teaching and learning improvement

as well as research support and community service that goes beyond the more narrow learning assessment approaches.

References

Administration and governance of higher education in Asia: Patterns and administration. (2012). Manila, Philippines: Asian Development Bank.

American Association of University Professors. (2006). *AAUP statement on the spellings commission report*. Retrieved October 1, 2016, from https://www.aaup.org/our-work/government-relations/GRarchive/Spellings/Statement

Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems*. Bolton, MA: Anker.

Arum, R., & Roksa, J. (2011). *Academically adrift: Limited learning on college campuses*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Astin, A. W., & Antonio, A. L. (2012). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education*. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.

Banta, T. W., & Fisher, H. S. (1987, March 4). Measuring how much students have learned entails more than simply testing them. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 45.

Banta, T. W., & Palomba, C. A. (2015). *Assessment essentials: Planning, implementing and improving assessment in higher education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Carey, K. (2008). Measuring up: The right report at the right time. *Chronicle of High Education*, *55*(15), A88.

Ewell, P. T. (2002). An emerging scholarship: A brief history of assessment. In T. W. Banta (Ed.), *Building a scholarship of assessment* (pp. 3-25). San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.

Ewell, P. T. (2010). *The new "Ecology" for higher education: Challenges to accreditation*. Washington, DC: Western Association of Schools and Colleges.

Harnisch, T. (2011). *Performance based funding: A re-emerging strategy in public higher education funding*. Washington, DC: American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Hawkins, J. N. (2010). Higher education transformation: Some trends in California and Asia. In K. H. Mok (Ed.), *The search for new governance in higher education in Asia* (pp. 29-47). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Hutchings, P. (2010). *Opening doors to faculty involvement in assessment*. Champaign, IL: National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment.

Jacob, W. J., Xiong, W. Y., Ye, H. Y., Wang, X., Xu, S. M., & Lu, F. (2016, May). *Building flagship universities through optimal professional development ICT training initiatives*. Paper presented at APHERP Seminar, Zhejiang Universisty, Hangzhou, China.

Jones, S. (2002). *The internet goes to college: How students are living in the future with today's technology*. Washington, DC: Pew Internet and American Life Project.

Klein, S., Benjamin, R., Shavelson, R., & Bolus, R. (2007). The collegiate learning assessment: Facts and fantasies. *Evaluation Review*, *31*(5), 415-439.

Kuh, G. D. (2001). Assessing what really matters to student learning: Inside the national survey of student engagement. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *33*(3), 10-17.

Lumina Foundation. (2011). *Degree qualification profile*. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation.

Middaugh, M. F. (2010). *Planning and assessment in higher education: Demonstrating institutional effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Neubauer, D. E., & Gomes, C. (2017). *Quality assurance in Asia-Pacific universities: Implementing massification in higher education*. New York: Springer.

NIAD-UE. (2016). *National institution for academic degrees and university evaluation.* Tokyo, Japan: NIAD-UE.

Pacarella, E. T., Seifert, T. A., & Blaich, C. (2010). How effective are the NSSE benchmarks in predicting important educational outcomes. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *42*(1), 16-22.

Pike, G. R. (2011). *Assessing the generic outcomes of college: Selections from assessment measures*. San Francisco, CA: Joessey-Bass.

The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. (2004). *Measuring up 2004: The national report card on higher education*. Washington, DC: The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education.

Trow, M. (1994). *Managerialism and the academic profession: Quality and control*. London, UK: Quality Support Centre.

UCLA. (2016). *UCLA capstone initiative*. Retrieved October 7, 2016, from http://www.capstones.ucla.edu

UCLA. (2006). *UCLA institutional proposal* [Internal Document, May 12, Chancellor's Office]. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA.

Wolff, R. A. (2009). Future directions for U.S. higher education accreditation. In T. W. Bigalke & D. E. Neubauer (Eds.), *Higher education in Asia/Pacific: Quality and thr public good* (pp. 79-98). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Wolff, R. A. (2013, December 12). *Accreditation as quality assurance: Meeting the needs of 21st century learning.* Paper presented at Before the Senate Health, Education Labor and Pensions Committee, Washington, DC.

Wolff, R. A. (2014). Exploding myths. *The Presidency*, *17*(1), 1-6.

Zis, S., Boieke, M., & Ewell, P. T. (2010). *State policies on the assessment of student learning outcomes: Results of a fifty-state inventory*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management System.