

Risk-Based Secondary Oversight in University Postgraduate Admissions: An Internal-Control Perspective

Liao Ting

Jiangsu University, Zhenjiang, China
little_ting9003@ujs.edu.cn

Abstract: *Safeguarding integrity in postgraduate admissions depends not only on formal rules but also on whether universities can detect where those rules are most likely to fail. From an internal-control perspective, this paper examines risk-based secondary oversight by university discipline inspection and supervision bodies. Secondary oversight is understood here as an independent review of how admissions units exercise authority and perform their own control duties, rather than the direct substitution of supervisory personnel for operational staff. A practice-oriented analysis identifies three recurring difficulties: the large and dispersed group of participants, the technical complexity of the admissions workflow, and the long annual cycle over which evidence must be retained and reviewed. In response, the paper develops a framework centered on key personnel, high-risk procedures, and critical time windows. It links preventive integrity reminders and responsibility confirmation with targeted checks on examination security, marking, interviews, information disclosure, complaint handling, and rectification. The framework also emphasizes documented follow-up so that identified weaknesses lead to changes in routine controls. This approach can help universities use limited supervisory resources more selectively, preserve the primary responsibility of admissions units, and strengthen procedural fairness and accountability throughout the admissions cycle.*

Keywords: *Postgraduate Admissions Governance, Risk-Based Secondary Oversight, Institutional Internal Control, Procedural Integrity, Higher Education Governance*

1. Introduction

Postgraduate admissions is an institutional process through which universities translate academic policy into individual decisions about access to advanced study. Those decisions rely on confidential information, professional judgment, and a sequence of handoffs among administrative and academic participants. A control failure at any one point may therefore affect not only an individual applicant but also confidence in the fairness of talent selection and university governance. Admissions oversight should consequently extend beyond the final approval of results and examine whether the underlying procedures remain authorized, traceable, and open to later review.

The admissions process is governed by detailed rules, yet rules alone cannot remove the risks created by concentrated authority, professional judgment, and information asymmetry. Examination security depends on a small number of staff members, marking requires evaluative discretion, and interviews bring experts into direct contact with high-stakes decisions. A university therefore needs controls that operate within the admissions units and an independent mechanism capable of checking whether those controls work in practice. The two functions are related, but they should not be confused or assigned to the same actors.

This paper uses the term secondary oversight to describe the review performed by discipline inspection and supervision bodies over the exercise of responsibility by admissions departments. The emphasis is on risk selection, evidence review, and rectification rather than on accompanying every operational task. The discussion first explains why this form of oversight is compatible with university internal control, then examines implementation difficulties, and finally proposes a framework organized around personnel, procedures, and time windows. The purpose is to offer a practical governance approach rather than a replacement for existing admissions regulations.

2. The Practical Rationale for Secondary Oversight in Postgraduate Admissions

2.1. An Institutional Response to Discipline Inspection and Supervision Reform

Reform of university discipline inspection and supervision has gradually clarified the distinction between operational management and independent oversight. Political supervision has been strengthened, disciplinary responsibilities have become more explicit, and supervisory authority now covers a wider range of personnel exercising public power. Research on postgraduate admissions has likewise emphasized the need to place political and integrity requirements within concrete admissions procedures [1]. These developments require supervision bodies to focus on whether responsibility is properly exercised, not simply on whether a supervisor was present at an activity.

This distinction matters because routine participation can blur accountability. If a supervisory officer joins every meeting, checks every document, or informally approves each operational decision, the admissions department may begin to treat that presence as a substitute for its own controls. Secondary oversight follows a different logic: operational units retain primary responsibility, while supervisory bodies select important matters for independent verification. Such an arrangement makes it easier to identify who made a decision, which rule was applied, and who must correct a defect when a problem is found.

2.2. Integrating Secondary Oversight with Admissions Internal Control

University internal control consists of the policies, procedures, records, and responsibility arrangements used to keep institutional activities within authorized boundaries. The COSO framework treats internal control as an integrated process that provides reasonable assurance in relation to operations, reporting, and compliance, rather than as a collection of isolated checks [2]. In postgraduate admissions, this process is visible in the separation of sensitive duties, approval of examination materials, restricted access to confidential data, collective decision-making, score review, and disclosure of admission results. These controls belong to the daily management system and should operate even when no discipline inspection officer is present. Their effectiveness therefore depends on clear ownership and on records that can later be examined.

Secondary oversight adds an independent checking function to this arrangement. Scholarship on risk management and internal control has shown that the expansion of risk-based governance also changes what organizations expect from assurance functions [3]. Current internal-audit standards similarly emphasize objective assurance over governance, risk management, and control while preserving management's responsibility for operations [4]. Applied to admissions, this means that supervisors may compare written procedures with actual records, examine whether incompatible duties were separated, and follow a complaint from receipt through investigation and reply without taking over the underlying decision. A finding is useful only when it leads to a specific correction, such as revising an approval route, narrowing system permissions, or preserving a missing record. The relationship is consequently cyclical: internal controls generate evidence, oversight tests that evidence, and rectification feeds the lessons back into the next admissions cycle.

2.3. A Risk-Governance Perspective

Admissions activities do not carry the same probability or consequence of failure. A minor delay in publishing general information is different from a leak of examination content, an unauthorized alteration of a score, or undisclosed contact with an interview candidate. Treating all activities as equally risky spreads supervisory attention too thinly and encourages formal checks that produce little useful evidence. Consistent with ISO 31000, risk-based governance should identify, analyze, evaluate, and monitor risks in relation to institutional objectives and context [5]. For a university, this requires attention to both the likelihood of a problem and the seriousness of its possible impact.

For postgraduate admissions, three dimensions are especially useful when setting priorities. The first is the person or position that controls sensitive information or possesses substantial discretion; the second is the procedure in which a failure could directly affect examination security or admission results; and the third is the period when decisions are concentrated and correction is still possible. Considering these dimensions together allows supervision bodies to explain why a matter was selected for review. It also reduces the temptation to equate a large number of inspections with effective oversight.

3. Implementation Challenges for Risk-Based Secondary Oversight

3.1. Wide Coverage of Personnel Involved

Postgraduate admissions involves far more than the graduate school or admissions office. University leaders approve major arrangements, academic departments nominate experts, staff members prepare and transport examination materials, technical personnel maintain information systems, and panels conduct interviews and make professional judgments. Some participants work throughout the year, while others join for only a single task. This changing group makes it difficult to rely on a uniform method of education, authorization, and accountability.

The main vulnerability often lies at the handoff between people rather than within one job description. A sealed examination paper may pass through setting, printing, storage, transport, and distribution, with each transfer creating a new point at which custody must be documented. Confidentiality agreements are necessary, but a signature does not show whether access was limited or whether an unusual event was reported. Effective oversight must therefore examine role assignments, access lists, transfer records, and the response to exceptions instead of relying primarily on personal self-discipline.

3.2. Complex Workflow and High Professional Requirements

The admissions workflow includes quota planning, publication of catalogs, examination setting, printing and transportation, test administration, marking, interviews, score verification, adjustment, and final admission decisions. Each stage is governed by different professional rules and produces a different type of evidence. A reviewer who understands meeting discipline but not score processing may notice that minutes exist while overlooking an unexplained change in the underlying data. Procedural familiarity is therefore a basic condition for meaningful oversight.

This professional requirement creates a practical tension. Discipline inspection staff cannot become specialists in every academic field or replace the judgment of interview experts, yet they must be able to question how that judgment was organized and recorded. Useful review points include whether standards were announced in advance, whether the same standard was applied to comparable candidates, whether score changes were approved, and whether dissenting opinions were retained. Without process maps and review criteria of this kind, supervision can easily become a check of signatures rather than a check of substance.

3.3. Long Operational Cycle and High Supervisory Burden

A postgraduate admissions cycle extends across most of the academic year. Planning and catalog preparation begin well before registration, the initial examination is followed by marking and score review, and interviews and adjustment continue into the spring. Risks that appear late in the cycle may have originated months earlier, when a quota was allocated, an expert list was formed, or a system permission was granted. A review based only on the final admission list cannot reconstruct those earlier decisions reliably.

Continuity is therefore as important as intensity. Supervision bodies need a small set of records that follows each high-risk matter through the cycle, together with clear dates, responsible persons, and the result of any correction. Staff rotation and departmental handoffs make this harder, particularly when records are stored in separate systems or personal files. The burden cannot be solved by adding inspections at every stage; it must be managed through early planning, selective sampling, and consistent evidence retention.

4. A Risk-Based Secondary Oversight Framework

The proposed framework begins with an annual risk assessment conducted before the main admissions activities. Discipline inspection bodies and admissions units should identify changes in policy, personnel, technology, and workflow that may alter the existing risk profile. Oversight priorities can then be stated in a short work plan that names the issue to be checked, the evidence required, and the point at which a result will be reported. This makes supervisory choices visible and prevents urgent tasks from displacing the most important risks without explanation.

4.1. Key Personnel: Strengthening Preventive Oversight

Key personnel should be identified by function rather than by administrative rank alone. Admissions office leaders and department heads are important because they authorize arrangements, but staff members who manage candidate data, prepare examination materials, or coordinate interview panels may control equally sensitive points in the process. The list should be reviewed whenever duties change, so that reminders and access restrictions follow the actual work instead of an outdated organization chart.

Preventive oversight can combine responsibility confirmation, integrity conversations, case-based warning education, and observation of meetings where major arrangements are approved. These actions are most useful when they refer to a person's specific duties: an interview coordinator should understand conflict-of-interest reporting, while a system administrator should understand account separation and log retention. If a minor problem is found, an early reminder should be recorded together with the required correction and a date for review. The objective is not to create a disciplinary file for every mistake, but to stop a correctable weakness from becoming an integrity incident.

4.2. High-Risk Procedures: Controlling Major Operational Risks

Examination setting and paper management require controls over both content and custody. The university should document the selection and avoidance rules for exam setters, limit access to draft materials, and record each transfer during printing, storage, and delivery. Secondary oversight can sample these records and investigate exceptions, such as an access outside the approved period or a package whose seal information is incomplete. A targeted check of such anomalies provides more assurance than a general statement that confidentiality requirements were communicated.

Marking and score processing create a different risk because judgments and data operations interact. Double marking, score verification, and controlled correction procedures can reduce error, but only if changes remain traceable to an authorized person and a stated reason. Supervision should compare samples of original scores, corrected records, and approval logs, with additional attention to unusual distributions or repeated adjustments. The purpose of such review is not to re-mark academic work; it is to determine whether the scoring process was consistent, documented, and protected from unauthorized intervention.

Interviews and adjustment decisions involve the greatest degree of face-to-face discretion. Before interviews, conflict-of-interest declarations, evaluation criteria, panel composition, and recording arrangements should be confirmed. Afterward, score sheets and collective decision records should be checked against the published rules, while candidate questions or complaints should be linked to a documented response. Public disclosure remains an important control, but disclosure is effective only when the underlying information is complete enough for an applicant to understand the decision and use the available review channel.

4.3. Critical Time Windows: Reinforcing Timely Intervention

Oversight should be intensified when an intervention can still prevent or limit harm. Before the initial examination in December, attention should be directed to confidentiality, paper custody, examination-room arrangements, emergency plans, and permissions in relevant systems. From March to May, the emphasis shifts to marking, score review, interviews, adjustment, and disclosure. A calendar of these points helps supervisors prepare evidence requests in advance instead of reacting after a disputed result has already become difficult to change.

Timely intervention must be followed by closure. A supervision notice should identify the observed fact, the rule or control involved, the responsible unit, and the expected completion date, while leaving operational departments to choose an appropriate correction within their authority. The supervisory body should then verify evidence of completion and note any issue that must be carried into the next annual risk assessment. This final step turns a one-time finding into institutional learning and prevents the same weakness from being rediscovered each year.

5. Conclusions

Risk-based secondary oversight provides a way to strengthen postgraduate admissions without transferring operational responsibility to discipline inspection and supervision bodies. Its value lies in

selecting matters that deserve independent attention, examining evidence rather than appearances, and ensuring that identified weaknesses are corrected. The framework of key personnel, high-risk procedures, and critical time windows gives universities a practical basis for making those choices across a long and complex admissions cycle.

The framework should nevertheless be adapted to institutional size, program structure, and available supervisory capacity. A small university may use a compact annual checklist and focused sampling, whereas a larger institution may need cross-departmental data review and specialized inspection teams. In either case, effectiveness should be judged by clearer responsibility, better evidence, timely correction, and fewer repeated control failures, not by the number of meetings attended or documents collected. Keeping this distinction visible can improve accountability and procedural fairness while supporting the broader modernization of university governance.

References

- [1] Xing Dali, et al. *Political supervision in postgraduate admissions*[J]. *Continuing Education Research*, 2021.
- [2] Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. *Internal Control—Integrated Framework: Executive Summary*[R]. Durham, NC: COSO, 2013.
- [3] Spira LF, Page M. Risk management: The reinvention of internal control and the changing role of internal audit[J]. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 2003, 16(4): 640-661. DOI: 10.1108/09513570310492335.
- [4] Institute of Internal Auditors. *Global Internal Audit Standards*[S]. Lake Mary, FL: The IIA, 2024.
- [5] International Organization for Standardization. *ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management—Guidelines*[S]. Geneva: ISO, 2018.