

# Construction of Public Management Mechanisms for International Education Quality Assurance from a Global Perspective

Wei Chen\*

University of Shanghai for Science and Technology, Shanghai 200093, China

*\*Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

**Copyright:** © 2025 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

**Abstract:** Currently, the international education quality assurance system still lacks order, and the quality guarantee mechanism is not perfect, making it difficult to achieve smooth information exchange. Therefore, from a global perspective and the angle of embracing educational differences among countries, with the purpose of win-win cooperation among multiple subjects, this paper proposes strategies such as constructing a unified public management framework, scientifically improving the management mechanism, standardizing the certification process, and comprehensively statistically analyzing relevant data. It is hoped that this study can play a promoting role in the development of international education.

**Keywords:** Global perspective; International education; Public management mechanism

**Online publication:** August 29, 2025

## 1. Introduction

Ensuring the quality of international education from a global perspective serves as a primary driver for cultivating talent across nations, with close collaboration among countries in the field of education becoming an inevitable trend in global educational development. However, a review of the current state of international education quality assurance reveals several issues that require resolution. These issues severely impact the international mobility and exchange of students, while also hindering the long-term development of international education<sup>[1]</sup>. Therefore, it is essential to strengthen the construction of public management mechanisms for international education quality assurance to effectively safeguard the quality and fairness of international education development.

## 2. Current status of international education quality assurance

### 2.1. Lack of an ordered quality assurance system

A relatively prominent problem in the development of international education is the lack of order in the quality

assurance system. For different countries, their educational concepts and goals vary greatly, and the indicators for evaluating educational quality also differ <sup>[2]</sup>. For example, when implementing educational quality evaluation, the United States usually tends to focus on the improvement of students' innovative abilities and comprehensive quality levels, and attaches great importance to the accumulation of students' practical experience. However, when some Asian countries conduct educational quality evaluations, they pay more attention to students' mastery of knowledge and academic performance. Precisely because of the existence of such differences, it is extremely difficult for various countries to reach a consensus and mutually recognize each other in terms of educational quality. The standards for certifying academic qualifications often also vary, resulting in situations where, after completing cross-border studies, some students find that their academic qualifications are not recognized in other countries, which seriously affects the sustainable development of international education. Due to the lack of unified international education quality standards, the implementation of international education programs faces numerous difficulties. It is challenging to scientifically design uniform educational methods, content, and requirements, thus hindering the improvement of international education quality <sup>[3]</sup>.

## **2.2. Inadequate quality assurance mechanisms**

Another relatively prominent issue in the quality assurance of international education from a global perspective is the lack of a sound guarantee mechanism, which leads to the inability to supervise and manage the quality of international education. When some countries regulate international educational institutions, the intensity is insufficient. They not only fail to establish clear admission thresholds but also fail to conduct regular reviews of them, resulting in a mixed bag of educational institutions and large differences in educational quality. For some developing countries, there are great limitations in educational resources, making it difficult to achieve comprehensive supervision of international education projects. To expand their benefits, some bad educational institutions not only carry out false propaganda, but also have many loopholes in the educational content. The implementation of educational quality evaluation methods in some countries lacks scientificity and objectivity. When implementing educational quality evaluation, too much emphasis is placed on the quantification of evaluation indicators, and insufficient attention is paid to the qualitative factors in education, such as the teaching methods adopted by teachers in teaching and the sense of experience obtained by students in the learning process <sup>[4]</sup>. It can be seen that this evaluation method is relatively one-sided, and it is difficult to comprehensively and accurately reflect the actual situation of educational quality, nor can it put forward feasible suggestions for the implementation of educational reform.

## **2.3. Lack of smooth information exchange**

From a global perspective, another problem in the quality assurance of international education is the lack of smooth information flow, which affects the common development and progress of education in various countries. Although countries have accumulated rich data and experience in education quality assurance through years of educational development, the lack of an information exchange mechanism makes it difficult for education quality information to be smoothly disseminated and widely shared internationally <sup>[5]</sup>. Some countries have insufficient understanding of the education quality assurance measures and policies implemented by other countries, making it difficult to learn from countries that have been more successful in education quality assurance and preventing the recurrence of the same mistakes. In the cooperation of international education projects between different countries, there is a problem of information asymmetry, making it difficult for all parties to accurately understand the education quality of other participants, resulting in many uncertainties and risks in project cooperation. Due

to the insufficient smoothness of information dissemination, some international education research achievements are also difficult to be widely applied, which seriously hinders the improvement of education quality <sup>[6]</sup>.

### **3. Strategies for constructing public management mechanisms for international education quality assurance from a global perspective**

#### **3.1. Unifying frameworks while embracing differences**

In the context of global international education quality assurance, it is essential to proactively establish a unified public management mechanism framework to lay a solid foundation for the smooth construction of public management mechanisms. The purpose of formulating a unified framework is to standardize and regulate international education quality assurance, thereby better promoting the long-term development of international education and improving its quality. A unified framework can provide countries with a mutually recognized educational quality evaluation system, making international education more credible and transparent <sup>[7]</sup>.

However, developing a unified framework still faces numerous challenges and difficulties. Different educational institutions, regions, and countries have varying understandings and requirements for educational quality. Therefore, when formulating a unified framework, it is necessary to comprehensively analyze the demands and interests of all parties, enhance the inclusiveness of public management mechanisms, and accommodate diverse educational traditions, objectives, and philosophies across nations. For example, some countries prioritize theoretical knowledge imparting, while others emphasize practical ability development. The unified framework should embrace these differences through standardized criteria. During the specific formulation process, comprehensive research and consultation on the educational conditions of each country are required to enhance the flexibility, inclusiveness, and forward-looking nature of international education assurance, adapting to diverse international education needs and promoting its sustainable development <sup>[8]</sup>.

In addition, with the rapid progress and development of society and technology, the content and form of international education are also changing. Therefore, the formulated public management standards need to timely reflect these changes and provide effective guidance for the ever-changing educational needs and innovative educational models. To this end, various educational institutions, regions and countries need to carry out extensive discussions and coordination on the interests of all parties from multiple perspectives, such as economy, politics and culture, to reach a consensus.

#### **3.2. Scientific mechanisms for effective operation**

To effectively ensure the quality of international education and enable it to achieve ideal goals, it is necessary to focus on improving the scientificity of the public management mechanism and strengthening the formulation of supervision and evaluation systems to ensure the effective operation of the public management mechanism. When specifically formulating the supervision and evaluation system, it is necessary to ensure that it covers every link of international education, enhance the comprehensiveness, objectivity and fairness of supervision and evaluation, timely identify the deficiencies in the quality assurance of international education, and take corresponding measures for improvement promptly, to better realize its public management <sup>[9]</sup>.

In the specific development of supervision and evaluation systems, comprehensive considerations of educational quality should be made from different perspectives, including student development, educational objectives, teaching staff, and teaching processes. Such systems need to possess the characteristics of standardization, dynamism, participation, and fairness. Standardization is reflected in clear supervision and

evaluation procedures and criteria; dynamism lies in continuously adjusting supervision and evaluation methods and content with the development of international education; participation means the joint involvement of governments, educational institution teachers, students, parents, and other stakeholders in supervision and evaluation; fairness is embodied in fair and objective evaluation results free from human interference<sup>[10]</sup>.

Additionally, when constructing supervision and evaluation systems, the fundamental principle of scientificity must be consistently followed. More reliable and accurate supervision and evaluation results can be obtained through the application of scientific tools and methods. In the specific process of supervision and evaluation, relevant government departments must give full play to their macro-level supervisory and regulatory roles, providing a clear direction for international education quality assurance through the formulation of relevant laws, regulations, and policies. Educational institutions (including schools, training organizations, educational administrative agencies, and other types of institutions) serve as the main body for international education quality assurance and need to conduct regular internal self-evaluations and improvements<sup>[11]</sup>.

### **3.3. Multi-stakeholder collaboration for win-win outcomes**

In the process of constructing public management mechanisms for international education quality assurance from a global perspective, it is necessary to strengthen the integration of diverse stakeholder forces, including government departments, universities, industry associations, international organizations, and professional accreditation bodies, to jointly ensure the quality of international education. In the development of international education, no single entity can independently shoulder the responsibility of guaranteeing educational quality; only through the full cooperation of all parties can a win-win situation be achieved and the quality of international education be effectively ensured.

In this process, in addition to formulating relevant laws, regulations and policies to provide important guarantees for the quality of international education at the legal and policy levels, government departments also need to appropriately increase investment in education to continuously optimize and improve educational infrastructure, while continuously improving teaching staff conditions to ensure that the quality of education meets national and international standards. Higher education institutions, as the main body implementing educational work, need to actively build a sound internal education quality assurance mechanism, continuously improve scientific research capabilities and teaching standards, and promote the all-round development of students<sup>[12]</sup>. Industry associations need to scientifically formulate industry standards, evaluate education quality from a professional perspective, and strengthen the analysis of current industry professionals to closely integrate education with industry development. International organizations play a non-negligible role in promoting and coordinating the quality assurance of international education. By formulating international education quality standards, carrying out international exchange activities, cooperation projects, etc., they strengthen educational exchanges and cooperation among countries, to achieve the joint improvement of education quality in various countries<sup>[13]</sup>.

### **3.4. Standardizing processes to enhance mutual recognition**

Standardized international education quality assurance certification processes, including curriculum certification, professional certification, and educational institution certification, are key to enhancing mutual recognition among countries. Through standardized certification, quality compliance with corresponding standards can be ensured, thereby gaining wide international recognition.

International education certification bodies (such as the Council of International Schools, Western



Association of Schools and Colleges, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, and World Organization for Advanced Education) need to establish clear certification procedures and standards. During certification, they must comprehensively collect and analyze relevant information, conduct on-site comprehensive evaluations and inspections, strengthen communication with educational institutions, and actively adopt reasonable suggestions put forward by them <sup>[14]</sup>. After determining certification results, they should be promptly announced, and scientific guidance should be provided for the improvement of institutions with shortcomings.

In addition, certification bodies in various countries should strengthen cooperation to achieve mutual recognition of certification results, avoid duplicate certifications, and reduce unnecessary educational costs.

### **3.5. Statistical analysis and extensive sharing**

Data statistics and analysis play a vital role in constructing the public management mechanism for international education quality assurance from a global perspective. Through comprehensive statistics and analysis of relevant data, we can not only accurately understand the current actual situation of international education, but also provide important reference for the scientific formulation of public management decisions on education quality assurance <sup>[15]</sup>. For example, by statistically analyzing the employment rate, graduation rate, and student performance of various countries, we can understand the differences and problems in education quality and formulate more targeted measures to improve education quality.

Data and information sharing are key to achieving common improvements in educational quality across nations. Different countries have accumulated diverse experiences and data in their educational development processes. By establishing extensive information-sharing platforms, communication and cooperation among government departments, educational institutions, and international education organizations can be strengthened. Through sharing successful experiences and lessons learned, educational quality can be improved more rapidly.

## **4. Conclusion**

In summary, constructing a public management mechanism for international education quality assurance from a global perspective is a complex and systematic project that requires all countries to collaborate closely, proactively address various challenges in educational development, and embrace and respect the differences exhibited by nations in the field of education. This approach will better facilitate the common improvement of educational quality worldwide.

## **Disclosure statement**

The author declares no conflict of interest.

## **References**

- [1] Liu Y, Ji G, 2024, From Global to National: Creating International Public Value in Higher Education with Strategic Thinking. *Jiangsu Higher Education*, 2024(2): 28–37.
- [2] Mo L, Li M, Feng Y, 2025, Exploration of International Talent Training Models in Public Administration. *Beijing Education*, 2025(5): 71–74.
- [3] Li M, Ge X, 2024, Digital Progress in International Education Quality Assessment Projects. *Journal of Comparative*

Education, 2024(3): 89–100.

- [4] Zhu G, Wang Y, Shi K, 2023, Comparative Study on Teacher Education Reform Policies of International Organizations: From the Perspective of 4R Crisis Management. *World Education Information*, 36(2): 52–59.
- [5] Yu J, Shi X, Ma L, 2023, Annual Hotspots in Chinese Public Management Research: Analysis Based on 2022 English Journal Papers. *Public Management Review*, 5(4): 178–195.
- [6] Qiao X, Liang Y, Wei M, 2025, Research on the Measurement, Spatiotemporal Differences, and Influencing Factors of Higher Vocational Education Internationalization under the “Vocational Education Going Global” Strategy. *Vocational Education Forum*, 40(1): 110–119.
- [7] Chen K, Zhang X, Zhang Z, 2025, Characteristics and Development of China’s Education Digital Transformation Policies from an International Comparative Perspective. *Shandong Higher Education*, 2025(1): 11–20.
- [8] Zhang J, Liu Y, Li R, et al., 2024, Research on the Informatization Reform Path of Public Management Majors in Colleges and Universities under the “Internet+” Background. *Theory and Practice of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 7(5): 100–102 + 124.
- [9] Ren L, Jiang B, 2024, Digital Technology-Driven Local Internationalization of Higher Education. *Tsinghua Journal of Education*, 45(6): 83–90.
- [10] Ju J, 2024, Pathways for High-Quality Development of Higher Vocational Education Internationalization under the “Double High-Level Plan” Background. *Journal of Huanggang Polytechnic*, 26(3): 11–14.
- [11] Jiang C, Sun M, 2024, Diverse Pathways for High-Quality Development of Higher Vocational Education Internationalization under the Background of Education Opening-Up. *Vocational and Technical Education*, 45(25): 13–22.
- [12] Xiong S, 2023, Analysis of Practical Experience in Labor Education from an International Perspective. *Basic Education Reference*, 2023(3): 3–17.
- [13] Li X, Jiang X, Yang W, 2023, Research on the Local Internationalization of Higher Education in Malaysia from the Perspective of “the Belt and Road”. *World Education Information*, 36(9): 62–69.
- [14] Liu Y, Zhang J, Li R, et al., 2023, Innovative Research on the Training Model of Innovation and Entrepreneurship Talents in Public Management at Colleges and Universities. *Theory and Practice of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 6(21): 69–71.
- [15] Zhuo Z, 2024, Global Vision and Chinese Actions for Higher Education Participation in International Science and Technology Innovation Center Construction. *Comparative Education Studies*, 46(10): 42–51 + 102.

**Publisher’s note**

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.