

Quality Monitoring of International Chinese Language Education: Structure, Implementation, and Support—A Case Study of Guangxi’s Practical Exploration

Qiang Bao, Liyun Qin*

Guilin University, Guilin 541004, Guangxi, China

**Author to whom correspondence should be addressed.*

Copyright: © 2026 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: As International Chinese Language Education (ICLE) transitions from scale expansion to quality enhancement, establishing a systematic quality monitoring mechanism has become a critical research issue in the field. Taking Guangxi’s ICLE quality-monitoring practices as a case study, this paper analyzes the construction and operation of a provincial-level ICLE quality-monitoring mechanism from three dimensions: structure, implementation, and support. The Guangxi ICLE quality-monitoring mechanism features an indicator system built upon the survey framework developed by the Center for Language Education and Cooperation (CLEC) of the Ministry of Education, an organizational structure defined by “four-tier subjects and four-tier coordination,” an implementation process anchored in an annual fixed monitoring window, and an “embedded” personnel support model. At the operational level, data collection has achieved institutionalized operation, whereas quality early-warning and result-application components remain in their infancy. At the support level, institutional arrangements are relatively well-established, yet personnel, funding, and technical support still need to be strengthened. The construction logic and operational characteristics of this provincial-level ICLE quality-monitoring mechanism can offer references for theoretical discussions and practical innovations within this research domain.

Keywords: International Chinese Language Education; Quality-monitoring mechanism; Provincial level; Guangxi; Mechanism construction

Online publication: September 30, 2026

1. Introduction

The high-quality development of International Chinese Language Education (ICLE) constitutes an important component of building a strong education nation^[1]. Establishing a scientific and comprehensive quality-monitoring system for ICLE represents a key measure for advancing its high-quality development. In

recent years, as ICLE has shifted from scale expansion toward quality improvement, how to scientifically evaluate and continuously monitor educational quality has become a shared concern for both academics and industry practitioners. Educational quality monitoring is a value-laden activity. A developmental orientation constitutes a core value of educational quality monitoring; such monitoring should return to the essence of education^[2] so as to realize its developmental value. Center for Language Education and Cooperation (CLEC)'s nationwide survey on basic conditions of ICLE in higher-education institutions has provided unified indicator frameworks and data-collection specifications for building provincial-level monitoring mechanisms. At present, academic research on quality monitoring within ICLE remains in its early phase, and specialized studies concerning the construction and operation of provincial-level monitoring mechanisms are relatively scarce. Since 2022, drawing on the Secretariat of the Guangxi International Chinese Language Education Collaboration Mechanism, Guangxi has continuously explored the construction and practice of a provincial-level ICLE quality-monitoring mechanism. Against this backdrop, this study takes Guangxi's ICLE quality-monitoring practices as a case, focuses on the construction and operation of provincial-level ICLE quality-monitoring mechanisms, and analyzes the mechanism along three dimensions: structural design, implementation, and support. It aims to unpack the construction logic and operational features of provincial-level ICLE quality monitoring and provide references for relevant theoretical discussions and practical explorations.

2. Structural design of provincial-level International Chinese Language Education quality monitoring

Educational quality monitoring is a systematic undertaking whose effective operation hinges on scientifically designed organizational structures and rational functional allocation. To construct a regional educational quality-monitoring mechanism, the primary tasks are to set up robust organizational bodies, rationally allocate institutional functions, and develop sound, smooth operational workflows. The organizational structure for Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring is designed following exactly this logic.

2.1. Hierarchical structure of the organizational framework

Established educational quality-monitoring systems generally follow a hierarchical logic. Existing scholarship notes that mature basic-education quality-monitoring-and-evaluation systems “are not monolithic; instead, they consist of multiple subjects distributed across multiple tiers”^[3]. Although ICLE quality monitoring emerged later, it observes the same principle. The organizational structure of Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring follows the basic pattern of “four-tier subjects and four-tier coordination.”

The first tier is CLEC, which undertakes national-level overall coordination and guidance. Through its national-scale survey on basic ICLE conditions among higher-education institutions, CLEC has developed unified indicator frameworks and data-collection specifications, furnishing foundational references for provincial monitoring initiatives.

The second tier is the Department of Education of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region, which performs provincial-level policy-making and overall coordination. As the competent administrative authority for Guangxi's ICLE quality-monitoring work, it is responsible for macro-guidance, top-level design, and overall coordination; it approves annual monitoring plans and monitoring reports and promotes the uptake of monitoring results in policy adjustment and resource allocation.

The third tier is the Secretariat of the Guangxi International Chinese Language Education Collaboration Mechanism, which fulfills the implementation function. As the on-the-ground executing body for monitoring activities, the Secretariat handles day-to-day administrative work: maintaining and optimizing the monitoring indicator system; organizing monitoring-work implementation (including drafting official notifications, collecting data, and maintaining technical systems); cleaning, validating, and analyzing monitoring data; drafting annual monitoring reports; and building and maintaining the Guangxi ICLE quality-monitoring database.

The fourth tier comprises relevant higher-education institutions across Guangxi, which bear institutional-delivery responsibilities. Each institution constitutes a responsible entity for monitoring. It must appoint a supervising institutional leader and a dedicated liaison officer, and coordinate internal departments to complete data reporting in accordance with unified requirements, guarantee the authenticity, accuracy, and completeness of self-submitted data, and promptly identify existing problems and formulate corrective measures in response to monitoring feedback.

These four tiers jointly form a four-tier linkage working mechanism: Overall Coordination–Policy-making–Implementation–Institutional Delivery. CLEC acts as the overall-coordination tier, supplying standard frameworks and institutional guidance. The Department of Education serves as the policy-making tier, taking charge of directional steering and institutional provision. The Secretariat functions as the implementation tier, delivering specialized organizational execution. Local institutions occupy the institutional-delivery tier, responsible for concrete data submission and quality-improvement practices. With clearly defined powers and responsibilities, each tier performs its respective role and collectively forms a complete monitoring workflow chain.

2.2. Functional positioning and division of powers and responsibilities

Clear functional division among organizational bodies is critical for effective monitoring-mechanism operation. Defining functional scopes clarifies organizational tasks and activity domains and concretizes organizational objectives. Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring spans multiple administrative tiers, with each tier assuming differentiated responsibilities across different monitoring stages.

As the overall-coordination tier, CLEC mainly provides unified indicator frameworks and data-collection specifications and offers macro-level guidance for provincial-level monitoring work. At the provincial level below CLEC, functional responsibilities are divided across three tiers: policy-making, implementation, and institutional delivery.

As the policy-making tier, the Department of Education of Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region performs core functions, including approving annual monitoring plans and monitoring reports, promoting the application of monitoring results in policy adjustment and resource allocation, and supervising the full monitoring workflow. Within the whole monitoring system, the department fulfills the role of setting strategic directions, allocating resources, and strengthening oversight, ensuring that monitoring activities align with national policy orientations.

As the implementation tier, the Collaboration Mechanism Secretariat undertakes the core specialized functions for monitoring work. Specifically, it maintains and optimizes monitoring indicator systems: drawing on CLEC's survey framework, it makes minor indicator revisions in line with annual work priorities and implements revisions after filing records with the Department of Education. It organizes monitoring-

work implementation, including drafting annual monitoring notifications, collecting data, and maintaining supporting systems. It conducts data cleaning and validation, performing logical checks and reasonableness reviews on submitted datasets and applying analytical approaches such as descriptive statistics, comparative analysis, and trend analysis for in-depth data processing. It also drafts annual monitoring reports and builds and maintains the monitoring database. Covering the full workflow from data collection to report production, the Secretariat acts as the operational hub of the whole monitoring mechanism.

As the institutional-delivery tier, participating higher-education institutions carry out the following key responsibilities: coordinating internal departments to submit data following unified requirements; guaranteeing the authenticity, accuracy, and completeness of institutional submissions; establishing internal data-review mechanisms; and identifying deficiencies and developing corrective measures based on monitoring feedback. Institutions are both primary sources of monitoring data and ultimate implementers of result-driven improvements. The quality of their data submissions directly determines monitoring effectiveness.

2.3. Operational logic of the structural design

The operational logic of an organizational structure generalizes inter-tier relationships and reveals how differentiated functional roles enable effective coordination.

Guangxi's ICLE quality-monitoring mechanism demonstrates three major operational-logic features.

First, tiered nesting and functional differentiation. From CLEC to the Department of Education, and from the Secretariat to local institutions, a clear authority-transmission chain connects all four tiers. The overall-coordination tier provides indicator frameworks and reporting specifications; the policy-making tier governs approval and supervision; the implementation tier delivers specialized execution; the institutional-delivery tier conducts concrete operational tasks. Distinct yet interconnected tier-level functions jointly form a complete monitoring system. This multi-tiered structure echoes prior research findings on “nested vertical power structures, plural governance actors, and network-style cross-sector collaboration”^[4], reflecting general patterns for educational quality-monitoring systems.

Second, streamlined efficiency and professional reliance. The Secretariat is not an independent full-time monitoring agency. Instead, it is embedded within the existing collaboration-mechanism framework; monitoring tasks are undertaken by existing staff in concurrent roles. This organizational model avoids establishing new specialized agencies or creating additional staffing quotas, enabling monitoring activities to launch and operate at relatively low institutional costs. Nevertheless, this model places high demands on the Secretariat's coordination capacity and staff professional competence. How to safeguard monitoring professionalism and long-term sustainability with limited full-time staffing constitutes an inherent tension within this organizational model.

Third, tiered articulation and coordinated interaction. The four tiers follow the sequential logic of “Overall Coordination–Policy-Making–Implementation–Institutional Delivery.” While fulfilling their own duties, each tier must maintain information exchange and work coordination with other tiers. Smooth monitoring progress depends on clearly demarcated powers and responsibilities, unobstructed information flows, and coordinated cross-tier actions. Taken together, these three aspects—functional configuration across tiers, organizational-model characteristics, and cross-tier articulation relationships—constitute the operational logic of Guangxi's ICLE quality-monitoring organizational structure.

3. Implementation and operation of provincial-level International Chinese Language Education quality monitoring

Hierarchical organizational setup and functional division answer the question of “who conducts monitoring.” Nevertheless, the practical value of a monitoring mechanism depends on its operational design for data collection, analysis, and feedback. Implementation represents the core functional link of monitoring. Guangxi’s ICLE quality-monitoring implementation consists of interconnected work modules: data collection, indicator application, analytical assessment, and result feedback. These sequentially linked modules form the transformation chain from raw datasets toward actionable monitoring outputs.

3.1. Data collection

Data collection lays the foundation for monitoring work; its quality directly shapes the validity of subsequent analytical outputs. Guangxi’s ICLE quality monitoring adopts an annual fixed-monitoring-window system, with standardized multi-stage workflows.

To secure data continuity, comparability, and predictability, the monitoring cycle runs from March to July each year. This timeline is justified by two practical considerations. First, enrollment, teaching, employment, and financial data for the previous calendar year (January–December) are fully compiled by March of the subsequent year, allowing institutions to access complete datasets. Second, the March–July time-frame avoids peak workload periods for universities in September (new-student enrollment) and December (year-end administrative work), giving institutions sufficient time to guarantee reporting quality. The fixed monitoring window enables participating institutions to form stable work expectations and prepare in advance for internal data collection and coordination.

Operationally, data collection unfolds across four phases: deployment, reporting, verification, and archiving. In the deployment phase, the Secretariat drafts monitoring notifications and reporting requirements, which take formal effect upon approval by the Department of Education. In the reporting phase, lead institutional departments coordinate internal units for data collection and submission. All institutions use unified reporting templates to guarantee consistent data structures and facilitate subsequent data merging, comparison, and analysis. In the verification phase, the Secretariat conducts logical validation and reasonableness reviews on submitted datasets and returns questionable entries for re-examination. In the archiving phase, validated datasets are imported into the monitoring database to build annual monitoring datasets. This workflow design translates discrete data-collection steps into predictable annual work milestones. Monitoring activities thus operate via institutionalized procedures rather than ad-hoc individual efforts.

3.2. Monitoring indicator system

The monitoring indicator system provides the substantive basis for data collection and serves as the core framework for the whole monitoring initiative. Guangxi’s ICLE quality-monitoring indicator system is mainly built upon the indicator framework from CLEC’s nationwide survey on institutional ICLE basic conditions. The system covers five dimensions:

1. Discipline-and-program development and talent cultivation: discipline construction, degree conferral, and the scale and structure of talent training;
2. Faculty development: Chinese-language teaching staff, dispatched teachers, full-time talent reserves,

and training for local teachers;

3. International-student development: international-student enrollment scale, scholarship-supported students, self-funded students, training modes, and student career development;

4. Teaching and research: syllabus development, teaching-resource development, and research projects;

5. Domestic and international cooperation and exchange: university alliances, transnational education, special ICLE projects, and educational-cultural exchange activities.

These five dimensions contain both quantitative and qualitative indicators intended to comprehensively reflect ICLE development status across participating institutions. Monitoring targets cover all Guangxi higher-education institutions qualified to enroll international students. As reporting agents, each institution submits ICLE-relevant institutional data complying with unified requirements.

3.3. Data analysis

After data collection, raw datasets must be processed through rigorous analytical methods to generate actionable insights. Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring adopts diversified analytical approaches to process multi-dimensional data and support quality judgment.

Descriptive statistical analysis underpins data-analytical work. By calculating statistical metrics such as frequency, sum, and mean for each indicator, researchers can map the overall status and distribution patterns of Guangxi's ICLE landscape. This approach helps outline basic indicator profiles and identify data outliers.

Comparative analysis operates on three levels. Vertical comparison traces the same-indicator changes across different years to identify rising, falling, or fluctuating trends. Horizontal comparison identifies inter-institutional disparities for identical indicators and distinguishes high-performing and under-performing institutions. Structural comparison analyzes proportional composition and compositional changes within aggregate datasets. These three complementary comparative methods reveal dynamic developmental patterns for Guangxi's ICLE.

Trend analysis draws on multi-year continuous datasets to identify long-term indicator trajectories. By comparing current-year figures against base-year and historical datasets, analysts can distinguish sustained growth, sustained decline, and cyclical fluctuation patterns. Trend-analysis outputs constitute core content for annual monitoring reports and provide foundations for quality early-warning operations.

For cross-year comparative benchmarks, Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring sets 2022 as the base year. Data collection in 2022 covered all Guangxi institutions eligible for international-student admission with unified data specifications, establishing a long-term reference benchmark. The base-year setting furnishes a comparable reference point for subsequent annual datasets. By calculating the development index (the ratio of current-year indicator values against base-year indicator values), researchers can visually quantify the magnitude and direction of annual indicator change and support trend-related judgments.

3.4. Quality early warning

Built upon data analysis and trend assessment, the monitoring plan incorporates a tiered early-warning design. This mechanism intends to trigger timely alerts when indicators show abnormal fluctuations and furnish decision-making references for educational administrative authorities.

Tiered early warning uses base-year indexes as reference benchmarks. Annual development-index calculations reveal the magnitude and direction of indicator change relative to the base year. Within this framework, the degree of indicator fluctuation determines risk levels. Three warning tiers are defined:

normal, attention, and warning.

At the normal tier, indicator fluctuations fall within expected bounds, indicating stable educational-quality conditions without need for special intervention.

At the attention tier, indicators show notable fluctuations signaling latent quality risks. The Secretariat sends attention-reminder notices to relevant institutions. This tier serves a reminding rather than accountability function, granting institutions sufficient time for self-examination and adjustment before problems escalate.

At the warning tier, indicators exhibit substantial fluctuations that may reflect severe quality deficiencies. Affected institutions enter priority follow-up procedures.

This tiered early-warning logic implements progressive intervention: fluctuation magnitude determines intervention intensity. Minor fluctuations trigger reminders and preserve institutional space for self-adjustment; major fluctuations initiate formal priority follow-up and drive problem resolution via institutional channels. In current monitoring practice, however, this mechanism remains in the design phase and has not entered substantive operation.

3.5. Result feedback

Monitoring and evaluation inherently involve value judgment, and feedback marks the starting point for value dissemination^[5]. The ultimate value of monitoring lies in its capacity to drive sustained educational-quality improvement. Within the monitoring-plan framework, result feedback includes the following components.

The annual monitoring report constitutes the consolidated output of monitoring work. Following data validation, the Secretariat compiles the report to reflect regional ICLE development status, evolutionary trends, and existing deficiencies. Reports are submitted to educational administrative authorities as policy-formulation references.

For institution-specific problems, the monitoring plan establishes a special feedback channel labeled “one letter per institution.” Based on prominent issues identified in monitoring datasets, the Secretariat issues formal letters listing institutional deficiencies for improvement reference. Institutions are required to formulate corrective actions responding to feedback points, and the Secretariat tracks progress in subsequent monitoring cycles.

Furthermore, annual monitoring datasets are archived centrally within the monitoring database with consistent formatting and statistical specifications, laying the groundwork for cross-year trend analysis and longitudinal follow-up.

Current practical experience shows that data collection and report production have become institutionalized workflows. Nevertheless, result-application practices remain at an early stage. Translating monitoring findings into tangible institutional improvement actions requires further exploration.

4. Support for provincial-level International Chinese Language Education quality monitoring

Sustained monitoring-mechanism operation demands not only clear structural design and standardized workflows but also systematic supporting conditions. Guangxi’s ICLE quality-monitoring support system covers four dimensions: institutional support, personnel support, funding support, and technical support. Mutually interconnected and reinforcing, these dimensions create foundational conditions for long-term

monitoring-mechanism operation.

4.1. Institutional support

Institutional support forms the cornerstone for long-term monitoring-mechanism sustainability. Three dimensions define institutional support for Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring.

First, integrating monitoring activities into regular management systems. After receiving endorsement from the Department of Education, the monitoring mechanism is embedded within Guangxi's regular ICLE management system. Monitoring thus evolves from one-off survey projects or ad-hoc tasks into a fixed component of the Department of Education's annual work agenda. This institutional arrangement creates stable work expectations: participating institutions know monitoring timelines and requirements in advance and can make corresponding preparations, lowering risks of monitoring discontinuity stemming from staff turnover or shifting administrative priorities.

Second, establishing dynamic-update mechanisms for institutional documents. Monitoring-related regulatory texts require appropriate flexibility. Through this dynamic-update mechanism, the Secretariat may make minor indicator adjustments responding to annual work priorities and national-policy shifts; adjustments take effect after filing records with the Department of Education. Regulatory documents, including monitoring plans, indicator dictionaries, and reporting specifications, receive regular revisions. This arrangement enables timely adjustments responding to practical feedback while avoiding frequent disruptive revisions that confuse institutional stakeholders.

Third, establishing data-management and quality-accountability systems. Data authenticity and security underpin monitoring practices. For data security: monitoring datasets are exclusively used for regional educational policy formulation, quality assessment, and academic research. For quality accountability: each participating institution bears responsibility for the authenticity, accuracy, and completeness of its self-submitted data. These institutional arrangements establish basic normative frameworks for data collection, storage, and utilization.

4.2. Personnel support

Quality monitoring is highly specialized work requiring staff with relevant professional backgrounds. Personnel deployment for Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring follows the pattern of "combining full-time and part-time staff, with part-time staff as the mainstay."

The Collaboration Mechanism Secretariat acts as the executing agency for end-to-end monitoring workflows: drafting notifications, collecting and validating data, conducting analysis, and composing reports. It is not set up as an independent full-time monitoring agency. Instead, monitoring duties are assigned to existing staff holding concurrent roles. Consequently, monitoring personnel must complete their original job responsibilities alongside monitoring assignments, creating substantial challenges for working time, energy allocation, and professional focus.

Institutional liaison-officer teams coordinate internal data-reporting workflows within each institution. Liaison officers serve as bridges linking the Secretariat and individual institutions: the Secretariat disseminates reporting requirements and addresses technical inquiries via liaison officers, while liaison officers coordinate internal departments to complete institutional data submission. Still, liaison officers also operate on a concurrent-duty basis, and frequent staff turnover creates uncertainty for monitoring continuity and consistent data specifications.

Overall, personnel support for Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring exhibits an "embedded" feature. No new agencies or staffing quotas are created; monitoring activities build upon pre-existing organizations and human resources. This model delivers low startup costs and limited institutional resistance, yet it constrains monitoring professionalism and long-term sustainability to some extent. How to maintain professional monitoring quality within an embedded organizational setup represents a key challenge for personnel-support arrangements.

4.3. Funding support

Funding support constitutes a prerequisite for sustained monitoring-work advancement. Funding sources and expenditure patterns for Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring demonstrate the following characteristics.

Monitoring work is mainly financed by project-specific grants. This funding model ties monitoring budget scales closely to project lifecycles. Funding is guaranteed while projects remain active; after project completion, funding sources become uncertain.

In terms of expenditure categories, monitoring funds are mainly allocated for data collection and validation, database maintenance and management, drafting and releasing annual monitoring reports, and organizing reporting-training workshops. From an expenditure-structure perspective, most resources cover direct operational costs, while investments for long-term capacity-building, such as information-system development and specialized professional training, remain limited.

On balance, Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring has not yet built stable long-term funding mechanisms. Funding sources remain relatively narrow, relying primarily on project grants rather than regular fiscal-budget appropriations. This objectively constrains in-depth development for monitoring activities.

4.4. Technical support

Information and digital technologies are increasingly vital for educational quality monitoring. Educational digitalization and educational monitoring and evaluation constitute a mutually empowering two-way process^[6]. National-level educational quality-monitoring initiatives have gradually realized informatized management covering tool development through report generation^[6]. Technical support for Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring is still in its early developmental phase.

During data collection, monitoring data are primarily gathered via standardized spreadsheet reporting templates. Built-in logical-validation formulas enable preliminary intra-form logical checks during the reporting stage. This spreadsheet-driven collection approach features low costs and easy implementation; institutions can operate templates without specialized training. Nonetheless, notable limitations persist: datasets are scattered across separate institutional files, and aggregation and validation require extensive manual labor, leading to low efficiency and elevated error risks.

During data management, validated datasets are imported centrally into the monitoring database to generate annual monitoring datasets. Database construction enables unified multi-year data archiving with consistent formats and specifications, laying the foundation for cross-year trend analysis. At present, however, database functions remain largely confined to data storage; capabilities for automatic validation, intelligent analysis, and data visualization remain underdeveloped.

Looking ahead, digitalization and intelligentization represent major developmental directions for educational quality monitoring. "Enriching research perspectives and methodologies for educational quality monitoring and evaluation by integrating high-level algorithms and analytical techniques"^[7], big-data and artificial-intelligence applications create new opportunities for in-depth mining and efficient utilization of

monitoring datasets. Within this context, substantial room remains for improving technical-support capacities for Guangxi's ICLE quality monitoring.

4.5 Current challenges

As shown in the preceding four-dimensional analysis, although institutional-design aspects of Guangxi's ICLE quality-monitoring support system are preliminarily established, practical implementation still faces multiple challenges.

First, shortages of full-time staff and insufficient professional capacity. Secretariat monitoring work is performed by concurrent staff without dedicated full-time monitoring personnel; institutional liaison officers similarly work on a concurrent basis. Meanwhile, monitoring covers multidisciplinary competencies, including educational statistics, data analysis, and report writing, imposing high professional requirements on practitioners. Gaps exist between existing staff backgrounds/skill sets and actual monitoring-work demands.

Second, narrow funding sources and absent long-term institutional arrangements. Monitoring activities mainly rely on project-grant support and have not been incorporated within regular fiscal-budget allocations. Funding-source uncertainty hinders long-term planning and cumulative development for monitoring work.

Third, underdeveloped result-application mechanisms. Current practice prioritizes data collection, validation, and report generation. Mature institutional designs and practical experience for translating monitoring outputs into tangible institutional improvements remain lacking; the transformation pipeline from data generation toward educational quality improvement requires further development.

Fourth, inherent tensions within the embedded organizational model. While avoiding new agency construction lowers startup costs, the Secretariat's embedded setup creates deep-seated tensions: time-and-energy competition between monitoring tasks and regular job duties, role coordination between administrative routines and specialized professional work, and resource allocation between short-term tasks and long-term institutional building. These issues need gradual resolution through future institutional refinement.

5. Conclusion

Constructing Guangxi's ICLE quality-monitoring mechanism represents a provincial-level practical exploration. Following plan formulation, indicator specification, workflow standardization, and initial operational testing, the monitoring mechanism has completed its foundational framework. It comprises an indicator system drawing on CLEC's survey framework, an organizational structure defined by "four-tier subjects and four-tier coordination," an implementation system institutionalized through an annual fixed monitoring window, and a support system characterized by an embedded organizational model.

In terms of overall mechanism performance, its defining feature can be summarized as "framework initially established, operational depth yet to be achieved." Structurally, powers and responsibilities among the policy-making, implementation, and institutional-delivery tiers are clarified, and coordination mechanisms have taken initial shape. In implementation, data-collection workflows operate institutionally, with clear timelines and operational standards for each stage from deployment to archiving. In support-system dimensions, institutional arrangements are relatively complete, yet personnel, funding, and technical capacities require further strengthening. In particular, the Secretariat's embedded organizational model, while advantageous for lowering startup costs, creates risks for monitoring professionalism and sustainability. How to sustain deepened monitoring practice under constrained staffing and funding constitutes a key issue for

future work. Meanwhile, result-application activities remain in early stages, and transformation mechanisms converting monitoring outputs into educational improvements demand further exploration.

Given that Guangxi's ICLE quality-monitoring work is still nascent, multi-year data accumulation remains limited, and result-application practices are not fully mature. This study mainly draws on institutional-design documents and preliminary operational experience and lacks support from long-cycle operational datasets. As monitoring activities continue and datasets accumulate year-on-year, future research can advance along several directions: first, quantitative analysis using multi-year monitoring datasets to test indicator validity and early-warning-mechanism accuracy; second, practical exploration and effectiveness evaluation for monitoring-result-application mechanisms; third, research on efficiency gains brought by information-platform construction. These questions require further investigation as monitoring work deepens, ultimately realizing an operational pattern featuring “aligned goals, matched powers and responsibilities, closed-loop processes, and continuous improvement”^[4].

Funding

2024–2025 International Chinese Education Collaboration Mechanism Grant Project (24YHXZ013), the Center for Language Exchange and Cooperation of the Ministry of Education of the PRC

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Wang X, Cui XL, 2026, Eight Characteristics and Eight Pathways to High-Quality Development in International Chinese Language Education. *Journal of International Chinese Teaching*, (2): 25–33.
- [2] Wu YY, 2022, On the Developmental Value of Education Quality Monitoring and Its Implementation. *Global Education*, 51(3): 20–32.
- [3] Xin T, Zhao Q, 2020, Orientation, Structure and Guarantee of the Basic Education Quality Monitoring and Evaluation System. *Journal of National Academy of Education Administration*, (9): 16–23 + 43.
- [4] Zhang H, Liu LZ, 2026, Research on the Application of National Compulsory Education Quality Monitoring Results from the Perspective of Multi-Level Governance. *Teaching & Administration*, (15): 26–30.
- [5] Ren CR, 2022, How to Effectively Feedback Educational Quality Monitoring Results. *People's Education*, (7): 34–37.
- [6] Xin T, 2024, Technology-Empowered Education Monitoring and Evaluation: current status and prospects. *Journal of China Examinations*, (1): 21–22.
- [7] Zhang J, Xie D, Xie ZH, 2025, Research on Progress, Hot Topics, and Trends of Education Quality Monitoring and Evaluation: A Bibliometric Analysis of International and Domestic Literature from Core Databases. *Journal of Qinghai Minzu University (Social Sciences)*, 51(3): 186–195.

Publisher's note

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