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Overview

- Context of HE
- Internal QA
- External QA
TRADITIONAL HE

• Place-bound colleges & universities – public or church related
• Programs and degrees/qualifications
• Selective admission
• Full-time students at a single institution
• Vision of an educated student
From traditional education to:

- Online education
- MOOCs, courses from private companies, badge platforms
- Private (for-profit) HE
- Internationalization: students, faculty, location, curricula
• Mass attendance/open admission
• Micro-credentials, nano-degrees
• Badges, specializations, certifications
• Episodic education: part-time students, LLL, multiple institutions

“The world is going to university”
The Economist, 3/28/15
TRENDS IN HE

- Increasing global demand for HE
- Demographic shifts and non-traditional students
- Competency–based education
- The academic profession will become more internationally oriented and mobile
- Assessment of prior learning
FINANCING AND POLITICS

• Presence of tuition and absence of public funding
• Spread of philanthropy
• Do politicians behave as if higher education is a public good?
• Cost-cutting practices at many universities
Europe:
- Funding down: BRITAIN, IRELAND, SPAIN, NETHERLANDS, HUNGARY, GREECE
- Funding up: SWEDEN, NORWAY, GERMANY
- Enrollment up: everywhere but HUNGARY
- US: Tuition increases, student debt
- ASIA: Tuition inflation
Classification of national HE systems

Trow (1972; 2006) HE systems according to gross enrollment ratio (GER):

- elitist (GER less than 15%)
- mass (GER between 15-50%)
- universal (GER above 50%).

ENROLLMENT GROWTH – Powerful access imperative

2000: 97 million
2012: 196.1 million
2030: 412 million (est)
“More and money is being spent on higher education. Too little is known about whether it is worth it.”

“Students...are not buying education....They are buying degrees....”

The Economist, 3/28/15
QUALITY CULTURE AT HEIs

- Formal quality assurance processes
  - Tools and processes to define, measure, evaluate, assure, and enhance quality

- Quality commitment
  - Individual level: personal commitment to strive for quality
  - Collective level: individual attitudes and awareness add up to culture

- Communication Participation Trust
EUA project - RATIO OF TYPES OF HEIs

- University: 79%
- University of Applied Sciences, Polytechnic, Fachhochschule or equivalent: 14%
- Other higher education institution: 6%
Structures supporting the internal QA processes

- The rector or specially assigned vice-rector is in charge of QA issues. 64.0%
- There is a centralised QA unit, with specialised staff. 62.2%
- There is an institutional level quality committee or equivalent. 53.6%
- There is a unit responsible for pedagogical innovation (or equivalent) that offers support to the teachers in developing teaching methods. 47.7%
- There are contact persons or persons in charge of QA within their unit, who also have other responsibilities. 45.0%
- There are faculty level and/or department and/or programme level quality committees or equivalent. 40.5%
- There is a unit responsible for staff development. 38.3%
- There is a person in charge of QA within the rectorate. 36.5%
- Other 9.9%
- There are QA units in each faculty with specialised staff. 9%
The involvement of stakeholders

- Through formal participation in governance bodies (with voting right)
- Through formal participation in consultation bodies
- Through formal involvement in self-evaluations or other evaluation activities
- By informally providing information on the issues at stake
- By responding to the surveys on a regular basis (e.g., end of each course, academic year...)
- They are not involved
### Internal evaluation processes

Do you have an internal evaluation process that provides feedback to the strategic planning in place? Please choose all applicable options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The institutional leadership evaluates annually the progress made in terms of achieving the goals set by the institution.</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The faculties (and/or relevant units) conduct regular self-evaluations to analyse their contribution to the achievement of institutional strategic goals.</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution conducts regular surveys among the members of the institutional community (staff and students) to analyse their perception of the institutional strategy and its implementation at grass-roots level.</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution has defined a set of key performance indicators and follows its progress based on them.</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institutional strategy and the achievement of the goals set in it are revisited when the document is revised (every 3, 5 or N years).</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Information included in the information system

#### Which of the following does the information system or systems include? Please choose all applicable options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student progression and success rates</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student ratio per faculty/department/institute or in the respective faculty/department/institute</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking graduates’ employment</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ satisfaction with their programmes</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of the student population (e.g., age, gender, education background, socio-cultural background...)</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available learning resources and, when applicable, their costs</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (such as the institution’s own performance indicators)</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Information on study programs

The information on your institution’s study programmes include:
Please choose all applicable options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of students currently involved in the programme</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of academic staff involved in the programme</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student ratio in the respective faculty/department/institute</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the intended learning outcomes of the programme</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on qualifications granted by the programme</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used within the programme</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on the learning opportunities (e.g., traineeships, exchange programmes, mobility possibilities, scholarships...) available to the students of the programme</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information on alumni employment</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile of the current student population</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific information targeting international students</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility and/or possibilities offered to disabled students</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITY ASSURANCE BUILT ON A PRE-DIVERSITY MODEL
EXTERNAL QA

- Europe: pick your own QA body across countries
- UK: opportunity to replace QAA-UK
- Ireland, Austria: consolidation of QA bodies
- US: more QA sources and government defines quality
- Macau: pick your own QA body
- Chile: proposed law to make accreditation mandatory, including a form of rankings
Diversity

• The emerging diversity of HE is a key driver

• The QA diversity is about both:
  – changes within traditional QA
  – development of QA actors and approaches outside traditional QA
TOOLS OUTSIDE TRADITIONAL QA

• New tools, practices, language for QA
  – Rankings
  – Benchmarking
  – Qualifications frameworks
  – Risk-based, differentiated review.

• New actors:
  Calls for new QA bodies
  Regional and international bodies.
UNESCO recognizes that QA:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Networks are platforms for information exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dissemination of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increasing the understanding of international developments and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improvement in the professional expertise of agency staff and quality assessors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
International cooperation

• International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) (1991), Global
• Nordic Network of Quality Assurance Agencies (1992)
• Central America: Consejo Superior Universitario Centroamericano (CSUCA) (1997)
• Central and Eastern European Network (CEEN) (2000/2002)
International cooperation

- Asia Pacific Quality Network (APQN) 2003)
- European Consortium for Accreditation in higher education (ECA) (2003)
- Countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States: Eurasian Education
The four most common objectives of the existing EQA networks are:

- Information Sharing
- Research & Policy Development
- Quality Improvement
- Liaising.
to encourage and develop the exchange of information and experience, in particular on methodological developments and examples of GP

to function as a policy forum, developing and proposing standards, procedures and guidelines for QA

to fulfil requests for expertise and advice from European Ministers of Education, national and regional public authorities and other bodies associated with the EHEA
ENQA objectives

- to facilitate QA activities in the area of transnational higher education
- to promote the development and implementation of effective peer-review systems for QA and accreditation agencies
- to maintain and develop co-operation with other appropriate European stakeholder organizations
- to contribute to the establishment of the EHEA.
INQAAHE survey in January 2008

The four highest priorities of EQA agencies are:

1. Capacity building
2. Showing that external QA is effective
3. Dealing with different types of Institutions
4. The cost and efficiency of EQA
Future challenges

- The continuing massification of systems - the expansion of enrollments worldwide
- Demand for higher education will come from separate sectors in different countries
- The traditional age cohort enrolling in HE declines
- Demand has grown among non-traditional populations.
Future challenges -

- Diversified academic systems-hierarchies
- Expand of the private sector
- New technologies and new providers
- Look for additional sources of income
- Growing need for professional management and leadership
- Quality will continue to be a major preoccupation for HE - standards that can be referenced internationally (shared standards)
Future challenges

• National programs for quality assurance will provide international validity
• Regional conferences and summits
• Integrating national quality-assurance schemes on an international level
Thank you for your attention!

vdjurkov@azvo.hr