

Trends in the Governance of Asian Open Universities: Preliminary Findings¹

Madhulika Kaushik and Gajaraj Dhanarajan
Wawasan Open University
Malaysia

Key words

Governance, structures and patterns, Open University processes, responsible management, conflicting pressures transparency, stakeholder accountability, good practice.

Abstract

Like all organisations, good governance is fundamental to responsible and accountable management of universities. There have been studies on governance of universities but almost all address the conventional, face to face institutions. Open universities on account of the semi industrial managerial processes required to efficiently operate the large systems, multiple locations, distributed and very diverse learner populations as well as the requirements of openness and attendant flexibilities, present a very different managerial challenge as compared to conventional universities and may have evolved governance structures/processes/ systems to respond to these challenges. The present study is an attempt to explore the trends that define and exemplify governance in Asian Open universities, through a sample study of select open universities in the region, representing mega and medium sized institutions, in both public and private domains. The study is intended to be an exploratory study, an initial attempt to understand and analyse the existing patterns before in depth analysis into the evolution and rationale for these structures can be initiated in later studies. The study is a work in progress and this presentation reports some initial findings.

Introduction

¹ The research study was conducted with funding support from the Institute of Research and Innovation, Wawasan Open University, Malaysia.

Good governance underpins and preserves the values of higher education generally but more importantly, besides values also impacts on the quality of practices of the enterprise. It can be argued that the reputation of higher education institutions is dependent on good governance. How an institution is governed is generally reflected in the arrangements made through its charter or act, the degree of empowerment various levels of governance enjoy, the transparency and openness of behaviour, the layers of governance and the separation of their powers, the channels of communication, etc. Some criteria that have been frequently applied as indicators of governance include:

- Respecting *autonomy* as the best guarantee of quality and international reputation.
- Value accorded to *academic freedom* and *high-quality research, scholarship and teaching*.
- *Protection* of the collective student interest.
- The *publication of accurate and transparent information* that is publicly accessible.
- A recognition that *accountability* for funding derived directly from stakeholders requires HEIs to be clear that they are in a contract with stakeholders who pay for their service and expect clarity about what is received.
- *The promotion of equality* of opportunity and diversity throughout the institution.
- *Openness on key aspects of practice* such as admissions [access], curriculum, assessment, progressions and promotions, appointments etc.
- *Full and transparent* accountability for public funding.

There are different descriptors of 'governance' found in the literature but for the purpose of this study a very broad description used by the World Bank in 2008 is being adopted here namely "*The term "governance" is used to describe all those structures, processes and activities that are involved in the planning and direction of the institutions and people working in tertiary*

education”². Another useful reference to the term university governance is one that is shared by the OUUK/Committee of University Chairs³ “Governance means effective stewardship of the university to secure its future, safeguarding the university’s mission and the public services it provides, securing the proper and effective use of public funds and accounting to stakeholders and society for institutional performance” While these descriptions serve as our template for the study we will

also be looking at some aspects of the external influences on governance of institutions, especially the role of governments and private owners of some open universities and the extent of their involvement.

Over the last three decades a number of studies on university governance have been undertaken by scholars such as Becher & Kogan⁴, 1992; Bleiklie, 1998; Clark, 1998; Dill & Sporn, 1995; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorf, 1997; Keller, 1980⁵; Neave, 1998⁶; Neave & Van Vught, 1991⁷, 1994;⁸ Olsen, 2005⁹; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997¹⁰; Teichler, 1988¹¹. These studies, mostly centred around older classical face to face institutions on university governance mostly around two sets of ideas which Kogan and Bleiklie, 2007¹² refer to, Universities as either being a “*republic of scholars*” or as “*stakeholder*

² World Bank [2008]: Global Trends in University Governance. Education Working Paper Series No. 9.

³ <http://www.universitychairs.ac.uk/>

⁴ Becher, T. & Kogan, M. (1992). *Process and Structure in Higher Education*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press

⁵ Keller, G. (1983). *Academic Strategy*. Baltimore and Kerr, C. (1995). *The Uses of the University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press

⁶ Neave, G. (1998). “The Evaluative State Reconsidered”. *European Journal of Education*, 33(3), 265 - 284.

⁷ Neave, G. & F.A. Van Vught (eds.) (1991). *Prometheus Bound. The Changing Relationship Between Government and Higher Education in Europe*. Oxford: Pergamon

⁸ Neave, G. & F.A. Van Vught (eds.) (1994). *Government and Higher education Relationships Across Three Continents. Winds of Change*. Oxford: Pergamon.

⁹ Olsen, J.P. (2005). “The institutional dynamics of the (European) University.” *Arena Working Paper No. 15*. University of Oslo: Arena.

¹⁰ Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

¹¹ Teichler, U. (1988). *Changing Patterns of the Higher Education System. The Experience of Three Decades*. London: Jessica Kingsley

¹² Kogan, M and I. Bleiklie [2007]: Organisation and Governance of Universities. http://portal.unesco.org/education/es/files/53907/11858773735Org_governance_Universities.pdf/Org_governance_Universities.pdf

organizations". In the former case institutional autonomy and academic freedom are seen as two sides of the same coin meaning that leadership and decision-making are based on collegial decisions made by independent scholars. In the latter case institutional autonomy is considered as the basis for strategic decision making by leaders who see it as their primary task to satisfy the interests of major stakeholders and where the voice of academics within the institutions is but one among several stakeholders. The interests of other stakeholders therefore circumscribe academic freedom, and decision-making takes place within more hierarchical structures designed to provide leaders authority to make and enforce strategic decisions within the organization. The last decade has witnessed a strong move away from the republic model to the stakeholder one.

More recent studies such as Asiiimwe (2013), citing Baldwin (2009), emphasises the primacy of governance in fostering quality and innovation at universities¹³. Baldwin (2009) considered governance to be the glue that binds the components of the university together¹⁴ while Giroux, Karmis and Rouillard try to establish the positive link between academic freedom and good governance and the distinction between the democratic university and the managerial university .¹⁵ Academics working in the area of governance research also feel that the last 2 decades have seen the successive managerialisation of the university governance owing to the pressures created by the forces of massification, decreasing tendency of the society to resource higher education, progressively diminishing state funding and therefore the increased focus on financial viability.¹⁶

The above-mentioned studies and many others, like these, have mostly centered around the older conventional institutions. Very little or no similar

¹³ Asiiimwe S, Steyn GM 2013. Obstacles hindering the effective governance of Universities in Uganda. *J Soc Sci*, 34(1): 17-27.

¹⁴ Baldwin JF 2009. Current challenges in higher education administration and management. *Perspectives:Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 13(4):93–97.

¹⁵ Giroux D, Karmis D and Rouillard C' 'Between the Managerial and the Democratic University: Governance Structure and Academic Freedom as Sites of Political Struggle, *Studies in social justice* Volume 9 issue 2,142-158 2015

¹⁶ Barkony,K University Governance Overview and Criticism on the Hungarian situation

studies seem to have been carried out of the newer more innovative institutions such as the open universities, especially of those in Asia which is home to at least half a dozen of the world's biggest open learning institutions. The writings on debates and discussion, among the open universities, have mostly been centred around a variety of issues, such as access, equity, quality, the impact of disruptive technologies and the economics. Little or no studies on the governance of these institutions is evidenced in the literature. Yet as many authorities and scholars of higher education have noted, responsible governance of our universities is critically important for their well-being as institutions of higher learning. In the case of Asia, where counterbalancing forces of desire for state control of higher education and the need for autonomy on account of the very nature of a university system create interesting pulls on the governance frameworks, the study was intended to understand how a balanced steady state in governance matters is sought to be achieved in the open universities in the continent. The variation across state funded and privately funded open universities is another dimension that we sought to explore including the need to understand the measures required to be put in place for effective governance of systems involving very large learner populations that are very diverse, widely dispersed and show uneven distribution densities in different parts of the universities' markets.

The present study, therefore, was undertaken to address this gap in our knowledge of the governance of open distance education in the Asian continent. The aim was to select between five to eight open universities, both public and private, and critically examine what form of governance is in place and how well these governance structures respond to the primary purpose for which these universities have been created i.e. to democratize higher education

Research Objective

The main objective of the study is to capture and identify important elements of governance amongst the leading open universities in Asia and to identify variables that could help promote good practice.

Research Questions

The research questions that the study aims to address are:

1. What instruments, patterns and practices are currently in place among dedicated single mode open universities?
2. How well aligned are governance arrangements to the fundamental ideology of openness?
3. How do open universities resolve conflicting interests between academic autonomies and stakeholder interests?
4. What factors promote or deter successful collaboration as well as,
5. What problems detract from productive engagement amongst competing stakeholder interests?

Research Methodology

This study is designed as an exploratory study, aimed at collecting information from select Asian open universities, and drawing inferences on the basis of analysis of the collected data. The sample are selected as a stratified, purposive sample to ensure representation from mega and medium sized open universities, from South Asia and South East Asia as well as a representation from publicly funded and privately sponsored universities so as to enable a study of variation across different types of entities. The samples within each institution are also being selected as a purposive, stratified sample to garner information from the major participants in the governance hierarchy and processes as well as the different stakeholders. Accordingly the sample from each institution includes the members of the Governing Board/Council, the President/CEO, the Vice Presidents/Deputy Vice Chancellors, members of the governance bodies like Senate, Academic Councils; School boards/Faculty Boards and representatives of faculty or student associations wherever applicable.

The study is based on both primary and secondary data. Existing policy and statute documents as well as published information on governance selected issues form the sources of secondary data. The primary data comprises of data collected through interviews and focus group discussions. The methodology used included:

1. A survey of literature on the governance of higher education at two levels namely:
 - a. Governance as viewed from and experienced by the community at large
 - b. Governance as viewed from and experienced by the university [internal] community.
2. Collection and critical analysis of constitutional documents and arrangements.
3. Development of an interview instrument to guide a face to face survey of Vice Chancellors/Presidents, Board Chairs, and Chief Academic Officers. These identified respondents were interviewed through direct interaction by telephone and in person regarding the following:
 - a. the constitution/charter of the university and the powers bestowed/delegated to the various officers of the university and the members of the board.
 - b. involvement of the faculty senate and other leaders involved in governance issue.
 - c. identification of factors related to successful governance arrangements.
 - d. patterns of problems.

Data Analysis

The analysis conducted was both qualitative and quantitative, the latter is expected to include trend projection and trend analysis while the former involved primarily inference drawing on the basis of the interview data. This study is a work in progress and at this point no more than a preliminary analysis of the trends and inferences from them can be drawn. Annexure 1 shows the themes included in the instrument used to guide the interview sessions and the focus group discussions

Preliminary Findings

Structure and Governance Hierarchy

All of the institution studied have in place a formal governance structure as reflected by their respective Acts, Statutes or Constitutions. By and large governments have used acts and statuettes that are identical or almost similar to those used by their conventional systems, with appropriate provisions in the acts to recognize the special needs of open systems delivering courses and programmes to remote off campus students. The regulatory bodies keeping an oversight on the open universities, as enshrined, by these acts, are mostly agencies of the Ministries of Education or Higher education. An exception to this arrangement is, in India, where one of the seven or eight universities studied is monitored by a Distance Education Council which also looks after all distance education providers in the country. The agencies of the ministries that acted as the government 'watch dogs' are bodies like the University Grants commission in India or the Higher Education Commissions in Thailand and Indonesia. However, private open universities/institutions in the study, on the other hand, are found to be governed by specially framed regulations as distinct from those used by public institutions. Such regulations permit governments to intrude on a number of autonomies, normally enjoyed by private enterprises. An additional layer of state regulation is also found to exist in the form of the National Quality Assurance/Accreditation Agencies, set up to ensure adherence to the nations qualifications frameworks, maintenance of academic standards of curriculum,

assessments and ultimately consumer protection.

The universities studied derive their powers through Acts/Constitutions governing their establishment as legislated by Parliament. These Acts give the institutions substantial and fairly autonomous powers to manage their academic affairs (Indonesia, India, Malaysia, Hong Kong). In India a separate [special] act (India) defines the powers and functions of the open universities in that country. Every now and then governments are prone to give themselves extra clout, as in the case of Thailand's, Act 44, that permits them to limit the powers of institutions in times, of civil strife or other national emergencies.

The governance hierarchy in public institutions studied, so far, consists of a Board of Management/Board of Governors/Governing Council followed by the University Senate/Academic Council as the highest decision-making bodies. In one case (Indonesia) the university does not have a Governing Council, the Senate functions as the highest decision making body which is chaired by the ~~Vice Chancellor~~-Rector.

The Governing Councils of the Universities in general have vested in them powers to design and make policies relating to organizational structures, finance, staff management, infrastructure management and capital investments. In addition private institutions may also have an additional layer in the form of trusteeships and Board of Directors, largely looking at the interests of the investing stakeholders, who may also have rights to sit as members of governing council of the university. In at least 50% of the institutions studied, the CEO/President also chaired the Governing Board or the Management Board to which he/she was expected to be accountable. These institution wide bodies were reported to by the school or faculty boards or the which have the responsibility of deciding on academic programme design, curriculum, course development, allocation of faculty workloads and providing learner support In accordance with university policies approved by the senate and subsequently the governing boards. In some cases (Thailand and Indonesia), the academic authority of the school boards is delegated to

faculty boards/faculty councils and even further down to specialisation clusters (Thailand) with relative autonomy to decide on issues in the respective disciplines.

Membership of Governing Boards

The membership of governing boards in most cases is prescribed by the Act or the Constitution of the university. In almost all the public institution studied external members representing eminent scholars, industry and community leaders sit as invited members. Most public open universities (except Indonesia) also have nominees of the government as statutorily members. The private universities have representatives of the Board of Directors /Board of Trustees, sitting in Councils. In almost all institutions, other than the Presidents, the Academic Heads/Deans of schools and faculties are not seen even as ex-officio members of the Governing Council in the institutions studied.

Membership of Faculty/School Boards

In most cases while the number of faculty members participating in the board was reflective of the provisions of the Act /Constitution, the actual selection was mostly by nomination by either the President himself or a subordinate body like the senate. A more democratic set up was found to exist in Indonesia, where each faculty could elect 2 members for the Senate where all Deans were ex-officio members and the Rector and Vice Rectors hard legislated members. The Rector often is advised by the groups headed by vice rectors, who may not have legislated power but have a lot of delegated power.

Student Representation

Student representatives were not found to participate in the governance

hierarchy in any of the institutions studied. Except in one case (India), faculty or staff unions were not found to exist, therefore collective bargaining as a negotiation counter in the formal sense was nonexistent except in the case cited above. In one case (Malaysia) the membership of the Governing Board has changed in accordance with the changes in the Act governing private universities which has now made it compulsory for all the directors of the company owning the university to have membership of the governing board.

In both public and private institutions studied, the power of hierarchy seemed to be fairly strong. In some cases it was attributed to the University Act by design assigning almost absolute power to the Vice Chancellor, with no defined powers given to the Pro Vice Chancellors (India) or on account of the prevailing institutional culture (Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia).

At the faculty/school board level, the extent of debate was found to be extensive (India, Thailand) or modest (Malaysia, Indonesia). At the senate or council level however limited (Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia) or modest debate/discussion by internal members (India) were reported.

As reported by the respondents in the study, the powers of the governing board in public open universities are being curtailed/infringed by directives from the ministry from time to time on the grounds of bringing them to be on par with conventional institutions. This has consequences, which are not necessarily healthy.

Tuition Fees

Surprisingly in almost all cases studied, the tuition fees are set by the Institutions themselves in accordance with the OU mission of creating wider access to higher education, but as in the case of Malaysia tuition fees set by the University has to be sanctioned by the government. This is seen as an unwarranted imposition by the institution but the government sees it as necessary to protect consumer interest.

Voting Status of Members of the Governing Board/Senate/Academic Council

The membership of the governing boards in the institutions studied except in the case of one private institution (India) are not separated into voting and nonvoting members. It was, however, also observed that owing to the institutional culture of respect to the authority of the chair (Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand), voting as an option is rarely resorted to, and consensual decision-making seems to be the norm. Formal recording of dissent is observed only in the case of one public university (India) where incidentally nominees of the faculty *union* are required to be on the governing board and their committees. In the case of one private open institution (India) representatives of the faculty/deans were invited to the Council meetings only as observers and had no voting or participation privilege except when invited to contribute.

Many of those interviewed were of the view that the relative powers and authority of the university governance structures over time, was eroding especially on reported an erosion of power on account of either quality of leadership or increasing interference from the concerned regulatory bodies.

Participation in Decisions on appointments, tenure, salary and benefit packages of the Faculty and Staff

In the case of one of the public institutions studied (Indonesia), faculty upon appointment are considered to be civil servants and governed by the service conditions of the civil service. In all of other cases, they were considered the employees of the university as an autonomous body but governed by the rules prescribed under the UGC (India) or the HR policies of the institution in case of private institutions. In the appointments of faculty departmental heads and deans played a deterministic role and surprisingly in two S.E. Asian Open Universities, the entire university community was involved in one way or another in the search, selection and appointment of their rectors/Presidents/Vice Chancellors.

In all the open universities studied, faculty remuneration and benefits were as per the regulations for civil servants (Thailand, Indonesia) or norms governing all universities (UGC in India). Private institutions in the sample were found to exercise discretion over the salaries determined for individual faculty members within the prescribed pay band approved as per the staffing policy at the university. In these institutions while there was transparency regarding the different pay bands and faculty benefits, the actual salary determined for each faculty member was confidential and not expected to be publicly shared. Discretionary powers of the CEO to allocate remuneration/benefits were found to exist in some cases (Indonesia, Malaysia, private institution in India). Collective bargaining is unheard of in the educational institutions generally in the region.

Academic Authority

In all the institutions studied, the initial concept for a new programme was found to originate at the school level. While most institutions studied, used external resources for programme and course development, one (Indonesia) was found to rely largely on internal resources. The school faculty in charge of the programme are required to assess market needs and competition before putting up the programme proposal for the evaluation and approval. At the senate level the financial and academic viability is assessed and then the programme is submitted to the ministry or/and the accreditation agency for provisional approval. All the institution studied except one (India) have well established internal quality assurance units with strong control over instructional design, editing and production quality as well as elements of learner support proposed for each programme.

In all cases studied in the sample, delivery dates for programmes to be offered are decided at the university level, with faculty not having much control or a say in actual delivery schedules. Once the schedules are decided at the university level, these become deadlines are expected to be followed

and respected by the respective faculty.

Faculty influence on decision making

In most instances, though not all, senior management viewed faculty participation in decision making between modest and minimum. At higher level forums even departmental heads and deans were not enthusiastic contributors to dialogues and decision making. This was not due to lack of opportunity to air views but to reticence for a number of reasons, including very high faculty workloads to general apathy as well as the very nature of the open university system where the faculty domain of influence was largely confined to programme related decisions and not much else. Related to this reticence but contrary to modest participation, both the senior management and the faculty groups themselves, however, rated the faculty attitudes towards governance decisions as being cooperative rather than being contentious or adversarial.

Refreshingly faculty were found to have a deterministic role in university decisions on types of degrees offered, programme design and development , curriculum design ; having a discussion role in appointment of other full-time faculty ,setting up an average teaching loads, appointment of department heads, choice of technology for programme delivery and short range budgetary planning .

Patterns of communication, openness and sharing:

For important institution-wide issues, a practice of town hall meetings addressed by the president was found to exist in Thailand, Indonesia and Malaysia. For the public university in India, communication was largely through written public communication rather than public meetings involving all employees. In all institutions, however, for other ~~the~~ issues, ~~both for demand and~~ informal channels ~~for~~ are utilized. Informal channels seem to have an influencing role rather than a decision support role . Almost all the universities studied had a practice of sharing minutes of important meetings, over the institutional intranet. In some institutions (Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia) technology has started playing a major role in communication networks. Chat rooms, *whatsapp* groups and use of social media are fairly prevalent in sharing information expeditiously

The annual report of the universities is available in public domain in most of the institutions studied except for the private ODL institution in India. The audit reports on the other hand are made available to the members of the governing board but only information related to their own activity is sent to respective unit heads or department heads/Deans in the institutions studied.

Appointment of the President

In case of all universities studied, the president was required to be an eminent academic of some standing in the country. This was not found to apply in case of one private open learning institution studied (India).

In all institutions, the initiative for replacement or appointment of the president was found to be initiated by the governing council (Thailand, Malaysia) or the concerned ministry of higher education (India, Indonesia). In the case of the private ODL institution in India, the same person has served as the president of the institution since inception.

In Thailand, once the call for replacement is initiated, nominations are invited from all segments of the university community, the nominations are debated upon at the departmental level, then forwarded to the senate and then to the council, which conducts due diligence on all the nominations received from the senate. All candidates nominated by the senate are invited for a presentation to the entire university community; the short listing is done using a participative course right from the departmental level onwards. The council then proposes one name to his majesty, the King who is the appointing authority.

In Indonesia and India for the public open universities, the exercise is initiated by the ministry. Names are invited from both internal and external community and based on defined criteria; a short listing of candidates is done at the school level and forwarded to the university Senate (Indonesia) or directly by a specific search committee appointed by the ministry (India). While the ministry has a substantial vote in the Senate (35%, Indonesia), the weightage does not count if the university membership endorses a single candidate.

The name approved by the Senate (Indonesia) or the search committee (India) then is forwarded to the ministry for final appointment. In case of the national open university in India, faculty of the university seems to have little participation or role, other than sending in their own cases for consideration in the appointment.

In case of Malaysia, once the search is initiated by the governing board, a search committee involving some members of the governing board and the chairman of the staffing committee is formed. The search may be conducted with the help of a headhunter or through public advertisements/invitations to identified eminent academics for an expression of interest. The faculty has little or no role in the appointment of the president or the vice presidents.

Checks and balances on executive power:

For institutional decisions especially those with financial implications a strong element of internal audit (Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia) coupled with annual external audit(Malaysia, India) was in place to exercise checks on executive power. In institutions where faculty unions exist, issues impacting academic freedom or accountability are challenged through collective bargaining. This may at times have negative consequences as important quality assurance measures applied annual faculty performance review have been blocked through union activism. Some checks on executive power are also applied through governance structures where the chief executive does not chair the board of governors. In such cases, stakeholder action in the form of board of directors / trustees may provide checks and at times directive influences on executive power.

Conclusion

While our present analysis indicates a fair level of autonomy exercised by universities in terms of academic powers, there is also evidence of the heavy

hand of governments on matters concerning employment, tenure, financial independence and participation in governance. Summing up:

The preliminary findings served to confirm the initial premise presented in the introductory section of this paper that being large, multi location institutions catering to very large , geographically distributed learner populations with high levels of diversity ,open universities present a different governance challenge as compared to conventional universities and structures used for effective good governance in universities may not serve open universities well. Some of the pointers to the challenges and therefore the need for adaptive change include the following :

- The industrial nature of operations required to manage logistics of efficient flows of materials and information, efficient learner support ,timely assessments and cost efficiencies In the face of flexibilities allowed to learners ,are found to limit some academic freedoms and flexibilities In open universities
- In very large systems that are geographically distributed, it is difficult to include regional faculty/ staff participation in most governance discussions unless inclusive structures are specifically put in place
- In some large systems, where the university Act provides for overriding power to the chief executive by virtue of his being the chair of all governing bodies, as well as the nominating authority for all internal members ,good governance may become a casualty .In such cases and some others ,relative democratisation becomes fairly dependent on the quality of the leadership at a given point in time .
- Higher prevalence of faculty apathy in governance matters in these institutions may be on account of both high workloads and the deadline driven culture but may also be reflective of the perception of their own role as being a small cog in a large system
- The rapid transition to technology supported teaching and learning at most open universities has added another layer of complexity where the enthusiasm for technology and the preparedness for it may not be

evenly distributed among faculty but institutional decisions need to be made for reasons of efficiency and market responsiveness .

- Developments like MOOCs, Data analytics, cross border collaborations and globalizing markets create conflicting pressures of centralization of institutional decision making in long term investments and the need to have delegated, inclusive decision structures, empowering the faculty towards higher accountability. These may require adaptive governance structures reflective of the changing open university

Annexure 1

A. Themes Included In the instrument used to guide Interviews /Focus group discussions

1. Governance structure and hierarchy at the university
2. Status of faculty employment
3. Membership of governing boards /selection /well-being status
4. Collective bargaining if any
5. Communication and transparency
6. Selection of the president
7. Checks and balances on executive power
8. Faculty participation in governance decisions and domains of faculty influence
9. Organization of budgetary and administrative authority
10. Internal quality assurance

B. Sample Profiles [to date]

The institutions included in the study were

1. Universitas Terbuka Indonesia
 2. Indira Gandhi National Open University
 3. Symbiosis Centre for Distance Learning
 4. Sukhothai Thamathirat Open University
 5. Hong Kong Open University
 6. Korea Open University
 7. Wawasan Open University
- 

Number of institutions	VCs/Rector	Members of the Governing Board other than VCs	Focus group members:DVC/Vice Rectors	Focus group member: Deans/ Directors	Focus group members : other faculty
5	5	12	9	19	25