ED 381 082   HE 028 220

AUTHOR   Sterian, Paul Enache
TITLE   Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Higher
                Education: rapers on Higher Education Series.
INSTITUTION   United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural
                Organization, Bucharest (Romania). European Centre
                for Higher Education.
REPORT NO   ISBN-92-9069-123-9
PUB DATE   92
NOTE   95p.
AVAILABLE FROM CEPES UNESCO, 39 Stirbei Voda St., Bucharest, Romania
                R-70732.
PUB TYPE   Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions);
                Accrediting Agencies; Agency Role; Case Studies;
                *Educational Quality; Foreign Countries; Government
                Role; *Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation;
                Profiles; Quality Control; Standards
IDENTIFIERS   Australia; China; France; Germany; Hong Kong; India;
                Kenya; Netherlands; Nigeria; South Africa; Sweden;
                United Kingdom; United States

ABSTRACT
                This paper offers a broad look at accreditation and
quality assurance in higher education and how these issues are
addressed around the world. Section 1 is an overview of accreditation
and addresses the aims and objectives of accreditation, standards,
accreditation bodies, stages of the accreditation process, the
quality of that process, the role of government in the accreditation
process, some critical points of view concerning the process, and
present accreditation trends. Section 2 looks at accreditation and
quality assurance through brief national case studies. The nations
represented are France, Germany, United Kingdom, the Netherlands,
Sweden, the United States, China, India, Hong Kong, South Africa,
Nigeria, Kenya, and Australia. This section closes with a section
comparing accreditation and quality assurance in various regions.
Section 3 takes a closer and more detailed look at the accreditation
process in Romania, particularly in light of the recent political and
educational changes in this nation and the fairly recent decision to
introduc. accreditation of institutions of higher education. This
examination covers accreditation principles and objectives, standards
for initial and subsequent accreditation, application rules,
structure of the accreditation committee and its functions, and
provisions for financing accreditation. Appendixes contain
institutional evaluation standards and a glossary. (Contains 27
references.) (JB)

PAPERS ON HIGHER EDUCATION

CEPES

UNESCO

ACCREDITATION
AND
QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Paul Enache STERIAN

1992

ACCREDITATION
AND
QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Paul Enache STERIAN

CEPES

1992

3

1

CONTENTS

5

Foreword

Recent developments have brought the questions of quality and relevance of higher education to the fore. The scarcity of funding has made governments to look more closely at what universities deliver in terms of number of graduates, the contents of their education and the level achieved as compared to other countries. The results of research and studies are scrutinized not only by ministries of education but also by potential clients, such as other governmental agencies or enterprises, looking for and selecting institutions for the execution of training programmes or research projects.

Another contributing factor is the increasing internationalization of higher education and the academic mobility. Both international joint projects and recognition of studies ultimately address quality issues.

Concern with and interest for questions concerning the quality of higher education are thus steadily growing.

While a system for accreditation of institutions of higher education exists since long in the USA, this is not so in Europe. Traditionally, most of the European universities were set up and funded by public funds and thereby the state guaranteed the institutions as it were.

In the countries of western Europe, "quality assurance" prevails today as a conception. Different procedures have been set up in different countries and a rapid evolution is taking place.

In the central and eastern European countries (CEEC), on the other hand, where the systems of education are undergoing complete reforms in the framework of the reform of society, and where many new phenomena consequently appear, among them private universities, a need for accreditation has been voiced. Moving from an extremely stable, not to say rigid, situation to the present one of instability, both governments and other potential funding sources, as well as professors and students, strongly feel the need of having some 'guarantee' that a higher education institution be of at least an "acceptable level" - a term that of course remains to define.

Accreditation bodies and practices require the co-operation of representatives of state, academic, economic, and cultural institutions. Professional associations are also involved in the processes of accreditation. A combination of self-evaluation, carried out by each academic

7

institution, and of external evaluation, sometimes undertaken by a specific statutory body, leads to the formulation of independent opinions with regard to the academic standards of various degree courses in order to achieve their validation, as well as to steady increases in the autonomy of given higher education institutions with regard to the validation of their own courses. The basic principle is that the quality assurance and accreditation process should focus on both educational inputs and on the assessment of educational outcomes. It should primarily lead to the improvement of the quality of instruction.

Quality assurance and accreditation both imply a search for ways and means of defining workable variables (indicators) and to qualify "good" education. There seems to be a consensus that there is a need for such procedures. Debatable are the variables (performance indicators) and even more so the use that is made of the outcome of these evaluations.

Indeed, in their search for efficiency and "getting their money's worth", some governments have started to allocate funds to individual institutions according to their levels of performance as evaluated by reference to certain quantitative indicators and qualitative peer judgements. Such procedures have in many places been sharply criticized by the institutions themselves. It is claimed that 'performance indicators' and other variables are neither objective nor always possible to adequately identify and apply.

By undertaking this project on quality assurance and accreditation, CEPES intends to provide those in charge of monitoring the standards of degrees and of higher education institutions with the basic information regarding the practice of quality assurance and academic accreditation. The most important message is that standards must have international currency and that, at the same time, they should take national cultural traditions and options into account and be appropriate for regional or local needs.

In this present survey, CEPES wants to give a description of methods presently being used or developing in various countries. Given the fact that quality assurance and accreditation both involve evaluation and basically could use comparable procedures to perform this, a description on the methods and practices used in various countries is provided, be it in the framework of quality assurance or accreditation. As the concept of accreditation is less familiar in Europe, but now being considered seriously in CEEC, the first chapter presents this concept at some length along with its basic objectives and practices. The emphasis is put on academic accreditation. The second chapter is devoted to short apercus of various systems of quality

assurance and accreditation in order to outline in a comparative per-
spective certain points of convergence. Finally, a system of accredita-
tion, to be developed and implemented in the Romanian system of
higher education, is presented as a case study. A glossary of terms of
reference for academic accreditation is included, thus stressing the
informative nature of this document.

CEPES intends to further explore the possibility of setting up a data
base on higher education institutions accredited in Europe, including
objectives. methods, and procedures of quality assurance and accredi-
tation as practiced in various systems of higher education. A proposal
for organizing a European Group for Academic Assessment is currently
considered by CEPES in joint venture with the European Communities,
European Rectors' Conference, OECD and perhaps some other organ-
izations.

CEPES wishes to thank the author, Professor Paul Sterian, for the
valuable work he has done. Special thanks are also due to Dr. Leland
C. Barrows of the CEPES staff who has assured the linguistic editing,
and to Ms. Liliana Simionescu, Ms. Monica Cucoanes, Ms. Mariana
Patru. and Ms. Corina Parlea for the preparation of the camera-ready
manuscript.

<div align="right">
Carin Berg
Director of CEPES
</div>

9

Chapter 1

FUNDAMENTALS OF ACCREDITATION

Over the last few decades, higher education entered into "an era of mass production" which determined a rising concern, on the part of those responsible for the evolution of higher education, for the permanent improvement of the quality and of the effectiveness of the educational process.

This concern is manifested primarily in the elaboration, on a priority basis, of national policies concerning higher education in several countries. Various decrees, laws, decisions, etc., have been adopted in order to regulate the strategic objectives of higher education and the modalities by which to achieve them.

In the framework of this unprecedented interest in the improvement of higher education, *the accreditation of the public and private institutions of higher education* holds a central place. Accreditation has witnessed an impressive evolution of both its contents and its mechanisms.

This evolution is determined by the fact that accreditation is understood as a process of permanent evaluation of institutions of higher education with the aim of recognizing and of continuously improving the quality and the effectiveness of the educational process.

Academic recognition, the main objective of accreditation, has transcended national boundaries. It is now a constant concern of various international governmental and nongovernmental academic, professional, and social agencies.

Programmes like ERASMUS and TEMPUS, launched by the European Communities, are examples of concrete actions aimed at eliminating existing difficulties in the field of academic mobility and at facilitating inter-university co-operation.

1.1. Accreditation (concept, field)

Accreditation is a process by which a higher education institution is periodically submitted to an overall or partial evaluation of its educational activity. The aim of this evaluation is to determine whether and how the educational objectives of the institution are achieved. The results

obtained should comply with certain standards which are specific to other comparable institutions of higher education at a given time.

The process of accreditation implies the action of an external body, the accreditating institution or body. This institution, with the help of expert peers, assists the institution which has applied for accreditation in the evaluation and the improvement of its educational objectives. Finally, it reaches a decision as to the granting of the status of an accredited institution.

In the process of accreditation, a higher education institution adjusts itself and continuously improves its quality. It assumes its responsibilities with regard to the needs of society while upholding the rights conferred by university autonomy. Consequently, accreditation protects higher education institutions from political interference either by the executive or by the legislative bodies.

The above definition conforms to the concept of accreditation as established by COPA (the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation) of the USA [8a].

The process of accreditation should be clear, specific, attractive, and efficient. These characteristics regard not only the role and the aims of a creditation, but also the identification of sources of information necessary for accreditation, the firm belief that the process of accreditation is understood by its beneficiaries, and the lack of ambiguity with regard to situations tending to influence accreditation positively.

Accreditation is of concern to:

- newly established institutions of higher education and newly created course programmes;

- the renewal of the accreditation of institutions or course programmes which were accredited in the past;

- the decision as to whether or not to accredit institutions or course programmes when certain deficiencies are observed during the accreditation process.

Since accreditation refers to institutions or course programmes, it cannot be confused with *licensing* and *certification,* which refer to individuals or to certain activities (functions) which individuals may perform in various institutions. Thus the accrediting of an institution or a course programme does not guarantee individual quality (of a student, of a teaching activity, etc.). But it gives reasonable guarantees as to the quality of the educational process as a whole.

For an accrediting body, *adequate quality* of the educational process implies:

- the setting of suitable (proper) objectives;
- an appropriate strategy for the achievement of the objectives, in conformity with accepted standards;
- the obtaining of adequate resources, as well as the ability to use them in conformity with adopted strategies;
- the capacity to evaluate the achievement of set objectives.

An institution being evaluated for purposes of accreditation should be able to prove that:

- its educational objectives are well defined, thus allowing its students to achieve a good level of performance in their fields of study;
- its educational setting provides adequate conditions for the learning process;
- it makes use of such performance evaluation criteria as to give students the required competences in their fields of study;
- it promotes recognized and accented learning methods.

To be accredited, an institution must achieve minimum accreditation standards. Accreditation is renewed every 3 to 5 years.

The accreditating body can grant a *conditional accreditation* when certain aspects are found lacking or do not achieve minimal standards. In such cases, the institution must furnish reports indicating that improvements have been made within a period of 1 to 2 years from the date the *conditional or provisional accreditation* has been granted.

An institution has the status of *candidate for accreditation* if it has expressed a desire to be accredited and if an accreditating body has agreed to act on the request within a reasonable period. The status of candidate for accreditation does not mean that the respective institution is automatically granted accreditation.

The *approval for functioning* or *the authorization to function* are documents elaborated by a public authority. They certify that a given institution (or course programme) meets the legal minimum requirements to function. An essential difference exists between *accreditation* and *authorization of function*.

12

1.2. Airris and Objectives of Accreditation

Although the process of accreditation seems rather simple, the structures and connections implied are extremely complex and diversified. The statement tha* "accreditation is a process in which many people get involved without knowing what is in store for them" is not without substance.

Accreditation is a process influenced by the following elements: the competence of the institution and its organization, the facilities offered, the plan of activity, the history of the institution, the teaching/learning process, the library, the number of students and teachers, the student facilities, the management and administration, the physical and financial resources, etc.

In addition to the characteristics of each institution, one must not overlook, in the process of accreditation, some common traits: the clear definition of aims and objectives; the correlation between objectives and outcomes; the programmes for basic training and the development of independent action in students; the interest of the latter in study itself not simply in study for obtaining a diploma; the sensitivity of students to the objectives of the educational process; the clear definition of academic responsibilities; the active interest of the institution in the development of resources, in planning, and in self-evaluation; the stability of resources for assuring the continuity and the quality of the educational process, etc.

In this context, the *aims* of the accreditation process can be explained as follows:

- the improvement of the quality and of the efficiency of higher education;

- the taking of actions to enable the beneficiaries of the educational process (the public, other institutions, etc.) to know the level of every institution.

We can now outline the *objectives* of the accreditation process:

- to provide assistance in the adequate definition of the objectives of the educational process and the determination of the conditions in which they can be achieved;

- to develop in higher education institutions the capacity for self-evaluation with the aim of continuous improvement;

- to provide assistance in the development of new programmes and institutions;

13

- to preserve university autonomy;
- to evaluate correctly the level and the position of each institution subjected to accreditation within the system of higher education.

1.3. Accreditation Standards

The *accreditation standards*, as constituents of a *system of reference* which helps accrediting institutions in their activity, are *requirements* or *criteria* expected to be met by the institutions or programmes which applied for accreditation.

The accreditation standards serve as guides in the complex process of evaluation of the way in which the institution being evaluated selects and achieves its objectives.

The evocation of standards of educational accreditation raises two types of questions:

- **conceptual** ones (what is meant by **standards** in education)

and

- **methodological** ones (how can one evaluate or measure these standards).

The concept of *standard* is correlated with the concepts of *value* and of *priority*. In fact, standards reflect those values and priorities which have led to the achievement of certain levels with regard to norms and criteria, in conformity with the objectives and expectations of beneficiaries.

The conceptual aspects concerning standards in education should be correlated with the methodological ones.

Thus, a certain standard implies a certain *measure of value*. As value in education is not represented by a collection of factual evaluations, it cannot be considered in a simplistic way, in a purely cognitive framework, as a logical deductive process. Although evaluations are usually made in purely cognitive terms, the resulting decisions also reflect non-cognitive sources of influence, including the emotional state of the person who is making the evaluation.

On the other hand, as the process of measuring is primarily comparative, standards in education are absolutely necessary, for they represent a *basis for comparison*.

These standards are not absolute and invariable. There is a certain *leeway* in education, which appears every time the question of defining "acceptable standards" is raised. One should not conclude, however, that *measurement* is not possible in education. Evaluation standards for education have crystallized over the years, resulting in a satisfactory conversion into qualifiers of use to society.

The apparent ambiguity of the term, *educational standard*, should not be considered in a simplistic way for, in actual fact, standards lead to certain expectations concerning the quality and the efficiency of the institution by a process of "finding out what the facts are".

For example, one should not understand "minimum standards" as external norms imposed dogmatically on the institution (i.e. the number of books in a library).

A standards-based self-evaluation should not be descriptive, leading to the gathering and the processing of information with the sole purpose of proving that the requirements for the standards have been met.

Although each accreditation institution determines its own standards, a common general framework exists. It includes requirements concerning the aims and objectives of the institution, the learning process, the performances of the institution, the course programmes, the leadership of the institution, the facilities, the material and financial resources, the development plan, etc.

Annex 4.1. to this study lists, as an illustration, the provisions of the system of institutional evaluation as proposed by Miller[7a]. It will serve as an aid for the better understanding of the complexity of the question of determining accreditation standards.

The use of standards in the evaluation of the quality and the efficiency of educational activity is sometimes skewed by the sorts of errors which are inevitably made in any measuring process.

Standards-based evaluation systems should allow for the identification of errors and the adequate correction of the results. In this process, the methods of mathematical statistics play an important role.

1.4.   Accreditation Bodies

An *accreditation body* (institution, agency, etc.) is a governmental or nongovernmental association which controls the accreditation process.

In countries with a nongovernmental system of accreditation, a body of this type *is recognized* if its activity is considered satisfactory by the relevant Department (the Ministry of Education) or by a national

accreditation agency.

The recognition is renewed periodically (every few years) with the purpose of offering the educational institutions a guide with regard to the status of the accreditation bodies.

In the United States, for example, there are over 50 accreditation bodies. They are recognized nationally and are members of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). These bodies justify their activity by their two main objectives: they assure the quality of education and, thus, the protection of the public.

The higher education institutions themselves are the first to profit from the activity of these bodies. But the institutions which finance the bodies, and those institutions which participate with their own experts in the accreditation process also benefit.

In the United States, for example, no laws, regulations, or grants of governmental approval are needed in order to enable accreditation bodies to function. They are created as nonprofit associations; however, the decisions which they take with regard to accreditation in higher education are not legally binding.

Nevertheless and despite the lack of legal powers, the various accreditation bodies develop great moral authority as the result of their reputations gained through competent and useful activities for their beneficiaries.

Some accreditation bodies act as counsellors for institutions of higher education or have contacts with governmental bodies, thus increasing the importance of their role by taking part in different national programmes.

The nongovernmental character of the accreditation bodies may favour attempts at fraud. Some bodies attempted to accredit their own diplomas, but they were exposed and their activities, declared illegal, both with regard to the services which they render to the public and their own statutes.

New accreditation bodies will have to work very hard to establish a good reputation for themselves. They will be helped in their efforts by the fact that many higher education institutions seek accreditation by as many institutions as possible with the purpose of facilitating comparisons among different accreditation licences.

We can distinguish, at this point, between *governmental* and *nongovernmental* accreditation bodies.

Irrespective of their character, these bodies must meet certain *requirements*:

a)   they must have adequate aims and objectives;

16

b) they must have the resources required for the fulfilment of these objectives;

c) they must prove that they are able to achieve their set objectives;

d) they must be able to prove that they are able to assure a continuing activity.

The last criterion is determined by the fact that accreditation is a lasting process, which implies the continuous improvement of the quality and the participation of the accreditation bodies.

An important characteristic of accreditation bodies is their close relationship with their respective professional associations, this aimed at the continuous improvement of the accreditation requirements on the basis of concrete developments.

The existence of accreditation institutions is justified by a social need. The latter implies the activity of experts the role of whom is not only to improve certain standards but to supervise the way in which given higher education institutions achieve their objectives through flexible policies characterized by diversity and innovation with regard to the educational processes.

A social need for accreditation exists, and it should be taken into account. Therefore, although accreditation is considered a costly process, the benefits accruing to the institutions are always more important than the costs involved.

An accreditation body has a typical formal *structure* consisting of expert committees and a governing body. The internal organization of each accreditation body includes departments for relations with the government or with other national bodies, other accreditation bodies, and institutions seeking accreditation.

Administrative problems can also be solved by the voluntary action of various experts. A member of the governing body usually accompanies the group of experts who visit the institution being evaluated. A good balance among the various departments of the institution is a guarantee of useful and efficient activity.

1.5. The Stages of the Accreditation Process. Types of Accreditation

The actual accreditation of an institution raises different problems depending on whether it refers to a complete institution or part of an institution (department, programme, etc.).

As a consequence, one can distinguish between *institutional accreditation* and *specialized accreditation,* both, to a large extent, being *complementary.*

Institutional accreditation is the status granted to a higher education institution. It refers to the whole institution, including all its activities and programmes.

The elements listed below are evaluated during the process of institutional accreditation:

- whether or not the objectives of the institution reflect its aims;

- whether or not the organization, the programmes, and the material and human resources meet objectives and satisfy standards;

- whether or not objectives are achieved satisfactorily.

Specialized accreditation is the status granted to a distinct part of a higher education institution (college, faculty, department, chair, programme, study plan. etc.). In specialized accreditation, attention is paid to the following:

- efficiency with regard to the achievement of the objectives set;

- how the educational standards of quality are put into practice;

- the relations betwen the programme of the unit subjected to evaluation and the programme of the institution to which the unit belongs.

For specialized accreditation, only a certain part of the institution is analyzed. In the case of so-called "single-purpose" institutions, the two types of accreditation - institutional and specialized - coincide.

1.5.1. The Stages of the Accreditation Process

Irrespective of the type of accreditation, the process comprises the following important stages:

- the integral self-evaluation of the institution or of a particular programme (implying the activity of the steering committee);

- the visit of an evaluation committee of experts (including peer review);

- the decision to accredit the institution.

18

The assessment based on the self-evaluation, the first stage of the accreditation process, implies the following conditions:

- the objectives of the evaluation programme must be clear and familiar to all those concerned;

- the evaluation methods must be up-to-date;

- the evaluation criteria must be known and agreed upon by all parties concerned;

- the evaluation process should involve all those concerned, including the students;

- the self-evaluation should be constructive and should reflect the level of achievement of the objectives;

- the positive feedback for self-control and development should be active in the self-evaluation process.

Central to self-evaluation is usually the activity of a steering committee which unifies all the elements of this complex process.

Peer review has an important role in the evolution process after the completion of a self-study and represents a crucial point in the second stage of the accreditation process.

The decision concerning the accreditation of the institution can be a positive, conditional or negative one.

1.5.2. Institutional Accreditation

Institutional accreditation is based on standards and general criteria concerning the efficiency of an institution.

The self-evaluation is the main stage in institutional accreditation. Through this process, the institution attempts to understand, to assess, and to improve the whole process which determines the achievement of the objectives set.

The objectivity and the intransigence in the elaboration of the self-evaluation assure a high level of success with regard to the accreditation and the consolidation of the institution.

However, self-evaluation is open to criticism because of its approach to the evaluation of perceived achievements in terms of student training in relation to the curriculum of the institution and its student facilities. Although students achievement is *measured* by titles, diplomas, degrees, and other recognized confirmations, a self-evaluation usually does not outline the connection between the outcomes and the

training received by graduates. The activity of experts should therefore attempt to fill this gap.

The expert evaluation is based on an independent analysis of the efficiency of the institution, of the quality of its performance, and of the resources available for the improvement of its activity. It is actually an analysis of the correspondence between what the institution *says* and what it *does*, of the coherence between the provisions of the documents and the actual performance.

The activity of the experts committee is independent and responsible. It is based on co-operation and discussion among its members. Because the expert is a colleague rather than an inspector, he evaluates the activity of the institution objectively, for he is aware of his role in the improvement of educational performance. To train these experts, accreditation agencies make use of appropriate selection and training criteria.

The written final report of the experts committee is part of the accreditation process. The report should be analytical, give interpretations, outline prospects, include various points of view, and emphasize the qualitative aspects of the educational process. It should not include suppositions or draw groundless generalizations. The critical points raised in the self-evaluation could negatively influence the evaluation made by the experts if they lacked tenacity and failed to insist on the "outcomes" of the educational process.

1.5.3. Specialized Accreditation

This type of accreditation has at its origin the activity of the professional associations. Their objective was to maintain the quality of education in different fields: medicine, law, etc.

Their model was followed by other professions which created self-regulation bodies. However, the latter have not become leaders.

In certain situations, the self-regulation and the experts' activity were developed by groups of institutions interested in preventing inequitable practices of student admissions and staff recruitment.

Later, the programmes linked to this activity became standards for specialized accreditation.

Specialized accreditation is also known as *programmatic* or *professional* accreditation, according to the direct objectives of the activity.

Specialized accreditation bodies may function in close contact with institutions or associations of institutions having the same types of

activity. They may also be represented by specially created institutions. Irrespective of their type, these bodies attempt to elaborate adequate standards for the benefit of both the profession in question and of society. In the first stage, the programme or the faculty which applies for accreditation elaborates the self-evaluation on the basis of accepted standards and criteria. The next step is the visit by the committee of experts and the decision of the accreditation body.

1.6. The Quality of the Accreditation Process

The carrying out of the accreditation process involves various specialists and different policies and methods of accreditation. All of these directly influence the efficiency of accreditation, assumed by society to be of the highest quality.

Therefore, the *quality of the accreditation process* must also be evaluated.

As for the educational process itself, the evaluation of the quality of accreditation is somewhat subjective. We are thus faced with the problem of *accrediting the accreditors.*

For an accreditation body to have a complete file of information on accreditation (handbooks, standards, criteria, methods, and information on the latest developments in the field) is not a sufficient guarantee of the quality of accreditation.

We should remember that an accreditation of good quality is more a matter of *substance* (it concerns the contents) than of *procedure.*

The impression of good quality which is given by the procedural part of the process should be strengthened by *the quality of the act of accreditation,* something which requires long experience and sustained efforts.

The principal factors which have a bearing on the quality of accreditation of a given institution are as follows:

- its autonomy;
- its sense of responsibility both towards its own objectives and towards the public;
- its fiscal independence;
- its qualifications;
- the competence and the independence of its decision-making;

21

- its use of adequate instruments for the complete processing of available information.

Although the quality of accreditation is somewhat subjective, the above-mentioned elements contribute to an exact evaluation of the capacity of accreditation of an institution.

It is admitted that, because of the complex relationship between the accreditors and the accredited in the process of accreditation, the supervision of the quality of the accreditation bodies is undertaken primarily the accredited institutions themselves.

1.7. The Role of Government in the Accreditation Process

In most countries, as we shall see in the second part of this study, governments supervise the educational system and thus all of its activities.

American higher education is a special case. Strong resistance on the part of higher education institutions to government control is combined with the existence of a well-organized system of voluntary accreditation. Improvements in the quality of higher education are undertaken with the help of nongovernmental institutions. The viability of this system in the USA is confirmed by the reputations of many universities with regard to fundamental and applied studies, by the training of many specialists in all fields, and by the trust which Americans have in the quality of their system of higher education. However, even in the USA, in several states, the departments of education are authorized to accredit higher education institutions.

Irrespective of the institutions which grant the accreditation, the process itself has great importance for governmental bodies, because it helps to:

- certify the upholding of certain standards;
- assist candidates in the selection of institutions of higher education;
- provide inter-institutional assistance for transfers and equivalences;
- understand the situation in order to better design development programmes, to allot funds, to award diploma equivalences, and to grant degrees;

22

- protect the integrity of higher education institutions from the undue influence of nongovernmental organizations;

- develop concern in institutions for their own improvement and development;

- understand the situation in order to be able to request specialized assistence, etc.

Consequently, even the nongovernmental accreditation bodies play a *quasi-governmental* role.

Note was taken latterly of the fact that the state accreditation agencies in many American states are playing increasingly important roles. Several self-evaluation projects have been elaborated in colleges and universities.

The increasingly active role played by governments in order to assure the quality of higher education is also demonstrated by the measures which they are taking with regard to the allocation of funds and the development of certain programmes, without, however, attempting to overinfluence or over regulate.

The interaction between the state bodies and the institutions is best qualified as one of collaboration, for it is subordinated to quality control by *co-operation* and *co-ordiantion*.

1.8. Critical Points of View Concerning the Accreditation Process

Although accreditation appeared and imposed itself as a necessity, no unanimity exists as to the role and importance of this process.

Even in the USA, where good networks of institutions and voluntary accreditation agencies exist, only 90 per cent of the institutions of higher education are accredited.

The following criticisms have been levelled with regard to the whole idea of accreditation:

- accreditation attempts to determine the quality of the teaching/learning process on the basis of criteria the validity of which has not been proved;

- the correlation between the requirements for meeting accreditation standards and future professional success is not clear;

- the fact that the varying opinions of the experts involved make the process subjeci ve is in itself suspicious;

- the imposition of standards as part of the accreditation process discourages the initiatives and limits university autonomy;

- although accreditation passes judgement as to whether or not institutions achieve their objectives, it does not have any control over the appropriateness of these objectives;

- the ever increasing dependence of institutions of higher education on financial support by the public authorities leads to a significant decrease in the voluntary character of accreditation;

- group interests cannot be disregarded by the accreditation process.

Other critical points of view are sometimes formulated as questions:

- Is accreditation really necessary?

- Does accreditation respond to a social need?

- Is accreditation worth the cost?

- Does accreditation actually help improve quality?

- Should accreditation be a governmental or a nongovernmental process?

- Does accreditation assure the integrity of institutions?

- Are there no other ways to supervise the quality of education?

The answers to these questions serve to emphasize that accreditation bodies, by their very activity, contribute to the maintenance of *standards* in higher education which protect society from the results of inadequate professional and practical training. These bodies help substantiate licences, make student exchanges and transfers possible, offer candidates and their parents criteria for the selection of higher education institutions, and contribute to the improvement of curricula.

The institutions of higher education which apply on their own accord for accreditation or for the renewal of accreditation give tacit recognition by their actions of the importance which they accord to this process. The status of "accredited" is all the more important in that it represents a criterion for the allotment of funds by governmental bodies. From this point of view, non-accreditation is correlated with poor educational quality.

1.9. Present Trends in Accreditation

Accreditation as an institutionalized function is over 70 years old, even though its functions and some of its methods crystallized even earlier.

In 1906, the National Association of State Universities (USA) organized a meeting in Williamstown, Massachusetts, of university representatives to discuss college admission standards with the aim of "accommodating" student migrations, etc.

Later, other functions and methods of accreditation were determined. The distinction between institutional and specialized accreditation was outlined, and accreditation agencies and co-ordinating bodies were created. A history of the evolution of accreditation in the United States can be found in [9a].

Over the years, accreditation continuously developed and refined itself. Resulting changes affected the various fields of accreditation, the participants in the process, accreditation methods, and the expectations of society with regard to the accreditation process.

In the USA, for example, the term, "higher education", was replaced, in some quarters, by the term, "postsecondary education". Several "nontraditional" institutions were created. A network of over 50 accreditation bodies was created, co-ordinated by national bodies. Increased importance was given to the quality of the educational process and to the preservation of the individuality of each institution. At the same time, the social demand for education increased, with major implications for the accreditation process.

During the last 10 to 15 years, accreditation matters became extremely complex, and the process itself has become very dynamic. Nowadays, there is a tendency in the evaluation of educational processes to focus on results.

From a systemic point of view, the traditional *incomes-process* model has been replaced by the *incomes-process-outcomes* model. This tendency is also present in the accreditation process.

The education process is represented to a large extent by the relations between means and consequences (outcomes; examples of educational means including faculties, libraries, and laboratories).

The consequences of the education process are defined so as to satisfy external needs, to put into practice the concepts of educational management, to represent elements of comparison in the evaluation of institutions, and to make possible the use of new technologies in data processing.

Certain institutions, however, have reservations about accreditation which is based on outcomes. These reservations can be explained by the long time frames and the high cost required for the design and implementation of effective self-evaluation programmes based on outcomes.

These institutions attempt to justify their position with the following arguments:

- it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the outcomes of the educational process;

- many of the consequences of the educational process can only be felt after long periods;

- the outcomes of the professor-student-education-means interaction, characteristic of the educational process, are unpredictable.

These objections will nevertheless not stop the new, objective accreditation orientation based on outcomes. However, traditional studies have not been completely eliminated.

Thus, while the traditional principles of evaluation continue to be observed, other aspects are developing. These include:

- the conversion of specific data into educationally measurable outcomes;

- the development of systemic methods for measuring efficiency which take outcomes into consideration;

- the use of computers for the collection, storage, and processing of data on educational outcomes;

- the use of the results of evaluation in reaching decisions as to the organisation, the planning, and the allocation of resources, etc.

Institutions should be able to prove their efficiency by citing the outcomes which they had in view.

Accreditation bodies should adapt themselves to this trend by elaborating adequate work methodologies. Doing so requires a new set of evaluation procedures and criteria which emphasize the role of the consequences of the educational process and the efficiency of the institution.

Thus, efficiency of the educational process is added to the quality-based accreditation model.

26

Chapter 2

ACCREDITATION AND QUALITY ASSURANCE
IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES:
NATIONAL CASE STUDIES
AND A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

The fundamental problems of accreditation, presented in the first part of this study, are common for the whole system of accreditation of higher education in the USA.

In the countries of Europe and elsewhere, where accreditation has not followed a similar path of development, interest in accreditation matters is growing.

The International Conference HKCAA on "Quality Assurance in Higher Education" (15-17 July 1991, Hong Kong)[6b], gave attention to the diversified activities related to accreditation which have been organized in several countries in recent years.

As the accreditation process is aimed at maintaining and improving both the quality and the effectiveness of higher education, this study uses the term "accreditation" itself to designate relevant results in the field.

Our intention is to "accredit" the idea of accreditation and to point out the actual status of accreditation in higher education in different countries which are involved in accreditation whether, or not they admit it.

The comparative analysis of accreditation which is undertaken implies the examination of several national cases, involving countries with different levels of development in different regions of the world.

Without being exhaustive, the presentation of national cases is based primarily on the data included in the Proceedings of the HKCAA Conference [6b], as well as on information gathered from other sources.

The attention of the reader is drawn to the fact that the general pattern of accreditation theory is not applicable in the following analysis because of the varying characteristics of each national system of higher education. For the purposes of this study, however, the consideration of several essential features, presented in the bibliography, is sufficient.

2.1. Quality Assurance in Several European Countries

We shall present some aspects of quality assurance in higher education in France, Germany, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Sweden. The situation in Romania, a country which has a very strong interest in accreditation, will be presented in Chapter 3.

2.1.1. Quality Assurance in Higher Education in France

The French system of higher education includes the universities, the university institutes of technology, the departments for advanced technicians, the *grandes écoles,* and the *collèges.* There are 1.5 million students, 60% of which are studying in universities, in a total population of 55 million. The State covers 90 per cent of the financing, by allocating 2 per cent of the gross domestic product to higher education. Research and development are allocated another 2.5 per cent of the gross domestic product. Selection in universities is a continuous process which goes on throughout the whole duration of studies.

Quality control in higher education consists of three types: administrative evaluation, evaluation by external partners, and the evaluation stipulated by law.

Administrative evaluation or control, which results from the centralized management of higher education, is undertaken mainly by the French Ministry of Education.

The following institutions are involved: the National Council of Universities (CNU); the Department of Cadres of Higher Education (DPES); and the Department for Research and Doctoral Studies (DRED).

These institutions have responsibilities for the nomination and the promotion of academic staff, the granting of authorizations for higher education institutions to award national degrees, the allocation of subsidies for research and of funds for education. These administrative institutions are not involved in the selection of students.

Evaluation by external partners is undertaken by the local authorities, the commercial sector, employers, etc. Their means for supervising the quality of education is derived from the fact that the allocation of funds to certain types of higher education depends on the number of specialists trained, and on the quality of services provided.

Evaluation stipulated by law: At the basis of this type of evaluation is an act of Parliament adopted in 1985 concerning the creation of the National Evaluation Council (CNE). The activities of this Council aim at

28

correcting the dysfunctions in higher education caused by centralized management. The role of the CNE is as follows:

- to evaluate each institution of higher education, paying particular attention to the quality of the services provided to students;

- to help the institutions of higher education assert themselves; and

- to eliminate contradictions between centralized management and university autonomy.

The setting up of the French National Evaluation Council was considered by President F. Mitterrand to be "a major innovation in French higher education".

The activity of the CNE is expected to assist the political decision-makers in understanding the situation; to guide the strategies and the reforms carried out by the various institutions themselves; to help the latter institutions overcome difficulties with which they are confronted; and to highlight the value of the institutions for the public, etc.

2.1.2. Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Germany

Some of the characteristics of German higher education are listed below:

- it has made the transition from "elitist" to "mass" higher education;

- developments in higher education are comparable to those in industry, in which the explicit and external (final) control of quality is replaced by implicit control carried out during the work process;

- all those involved in quality control focus more on individuals than on institutions. This emphasis has important repercussions with regard to the promotion of academic staff members and the selection of students.

Quality in higher education is measured according to the extent that the "necessary characteristics are similar to the real ones". Continuous improvement in terms of quality implies the identification and implementation of specific objectives and the monitoring and the verification of standards of excellence as the most important tasks.

As a result, *the main objectives* of quality control in German higher education are the monitoring of equality and equivalence in cases of comparable higher education institutions, and the laying down of minimum standards of quality.

The main *agents* for the assurance of quality control are:

1. The institution itself (i.e., the university): which assumes responsibility for the level of excellence.

2. The State (the public authorities): which assumes responsibility for equality and equivalence.

Mechanisms

1. *The institution* - ensures the quality of education by laying down standards and establishing methods (the input), and through the evaluation of performances (the output), using professional control (an internal mechanism) as the principal means of action.

2. *The State* - ensures equality and equivalence through external mechanisms: the national general regulations concerning examinations, staff promotion, etc., and the mobility of students and academics.

The Role of External Agents:

*   *the public:* because of the existing competitiveness and market forces, the public is paying increasing attention to the quality of education;

*   *the employer:* although he has no doubts about the quality of the education system which trained him, he has also elaborated his own ways of selecting graduates.

2.1.3. Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the United Kingdom

The first elements of an accreditation system appeared in the United Kingdom in 1966, with the creation of the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA). Some of the activities of CNAA concerned a self-test performed by institutions with regard to the meeting of standards.

For a long time, *verification of the quality of education* relied both on *external examiners* (for the award of degrees and to ensure compatibility among institutions), and on the system of selective admissions.

30

The *Group for Academic Standards* (GAS) was created in 1983. It was followed in 1990 by the *Academic Audit Unit* (AAU), the objective of which was to monitor the mechanisms which ensure the quality of education in universities.

Other institutions involved in the control of the quality of higher education are:

- the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP);

- Her Majesty's Inspectorate (HMI).

In 1986, the *Report of the Reynolds Committee* introduced formal codes of practices and provisions which offered the universities criteria for the making of comparisons. Actually, the Report laid the foundations for an effective system of excellence and standards in higher education.

The Council for Funds Allocation, created in 1989, focussed on quality in the financing of institutions.

The Activities of AAU

AAU monitors and comments on the structures and mechanisms by which the institutions of higher education ensure and improve the. quality and fulfil their responsibilities.

The *checklist* for quality assurance includes:

- the organization and the planning of course programmes and curricula;

- teaching and communication methods;

- the quality of the academic staff;

- the use of the reports of external examiners, of the opinions of students, etc.

- the examination of the documentation provided by universities;

- visits by groups of specialists (a guide book for examiners has been prepared);

- the preparation of final reports on the activity of institutions visited.

Types of documents useful for examiners include the following:

- official publications (booklets, calendars, annual reports);

- practice codes, regulations, internal handbooks;

● reports by external examiners, approval documents for course programmes, and other such documents.

The visit: usually lasts 3 days. The examiners hold discussions with approximately 90 persons (the vice-chancellor, teaching staff members, and students). They visit 2 or 3 departments selected randomly to "break through the façade". The programme of verification of an institution lasts 6 days. The process is performed every 3 years for each institution.

The activity of the AAU is financed by the institutions themselves.
Trends: ·

In 1991, the Government published a White Paper on Higher Education. This document foresees a three-level system of quality assurance:

● inside the institution itself;

● the activities of AAU to cover the whole system of higher education; *Quality Assurance Units* (QAU) will be created;

● units complementing the Committees for the Allocation of Funds to be created.

In 1991, the idea of creating a *Council for Academic Standards* appeared. It was intended to replace the GSA and to be responsible for the quality of education. The Council would be strongly oriented towards inspection, and would have the right to close institutions and course programmes.

The Council for Academic Standards plays the role of an accreditation institution, and aims at making the institutions of higher education fully aware of the importance of developing mechanisms for increasing the quality and the effectiveness of the educational process.

2.1.4. Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the Netherlands

Characteristic: The Dutch system of higher education is centrally managed, the government being considered fully capable of guiding and regulating the development of higher education.

In 1986, the Ministry of Education and Science and the institutions of higher education agreed upon the creation of a system of quality assurance in education on the basis of internal and external evaluations.

At the *institutional level,* the board of governors periodically evaluates the quality of the education process. Independent experts are also involved in this evaluation.

The Inspectorate for Higher Education in the Ministry of Education and Science is responsible for:

- the meta-evaluation of the activity of the institution (an evaluation of the way in which the evaluation of the institution was done);

- performing additional evaluations;

- holding the allocation of funds for several years in cases of inadequate quality;

- defining the standards (the terms of reference for self-evaluation).

In 1985, a new governmental policy came into force. According to *Document HEAQ* (Higher Education Autonomy and Quality), the government fulfils its constitutional obligation of ensuring educational quality by *restoring university autonomy.*

External quality assurance is based on self-evaluation and on peer examination, that is, by cadres with similar levels of education. The Inspectorate is no longer responsible for checking the observance of regulations; rather, it is responsible for evaluating the system of external quality assurance (distance control).

The objectives of external evaluation are as follows:

- the improvement of quality;

- the use of self-regulation instead of regulations;

- the promotion of responsibility towards the public (the external expert committees issue a "certificate").

The stages of the evaluation process include the following:

- the self-evaluation which has internal and external aspects;

- the visit performed by the Inspection Committee.

The evaluation is based on the self-evaluation report and on the findings of the Inspection Committee (external evaluation).

The meta-evaluation is done by the Inspectorate. It supervises the evaluation system and informs the Ministry.

33

2.1.5. Quality Assurance in Higher Education in Sweden

An accreditation system in Sweden Is being organized.

Principles

- the main objective is the promotion of quality and responsi-bility;

- the assurance of evaluation and of quality assurance are the responsibilities of the education system itself;

- evaluation is not conducted uniformly. There is an important degree of flexibility which is determined by necessity (the first things to be determined are the "areas" which need to be evaluated);

- the subsidies granted by the government for the forthcoming periods are influenced by the results of periodical evaluations (every 3 years).

In Sweden, the institutions themselves are responsible for the quality of the education which they offer.

The reports on evaluations of quality and national com-parative studies of curricula are used at the level of the central administration.

2.2.   Accreditation in the USA

By its very functions, accreditation may be considered a typical American phenomenon, having its origins at the beginning of this century. During its evolution, accreditation crystallized as a system of recognition of educational institutions and of their curricula, implying a certain level of achievement and quality which would guarantee prestige and the trust both of the educational community and of the public.

In the USA, accreditation is a voluntary, nongovernmental pro-cess. It accords a major role to self-regulation and self-evaluation while promoting improvements in the quality and the effectiveness of education.

Although accreditation is not compulsory, the fact that a given institution is accredited serves as a positive criterion in the allocation of funds by the public authorities. Accreditation is also important for the

34

public as well as for students, and for other beneficiaries of higher education. This status insulates institutions against the results of inadequate practices and offers students and parents criteria for the selection of institutions of higher education.

In the USA, accreditation is carried out both by private agencies and by governmental bodies from various countries.

Types of Accreditation

Regional (institutional) accreditation is performed by six private agencies with responsibilities for each region of the USA.

Professional accreditation is undertaken by some 80 professional associations, each having its own accreditation procedures.

The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) is responsible for the recognition of the accreditation agencies. COPA's main task is to periodically revise the actions and the standards used by accreditation agencies in American higher education.

The accreditation process is in permanent evolution. It is focussing nowadays on the outcomes of the education process to the extent that they reflect its effectiveness.

The following are the typical stages of an accreditation process:

- the self-evaluation of the institution which applied for accreditation;

- the visit of the group of experts from the accreditation agency;

- the decision concerning the accreditation of the institution.

Accreditation - by its very specificity - attests the overall quality of the institution. It cannot, however, guarantee the quality of particular curricula or course programmes or the possibility of credit transfer from one institution to another. Likewise, it cannot facilitate the classification of American higher education institutions or curricula. Along with COPA, the Federal Department of Education grants limited recognition to the accreditation agencies in order to establish criteria for the allocation of federal subsidies.

2.3. Accreditation and Quality Assurance in Several Countries of Asia

Several aspects of the quality control mechanisms of higher education in China, India, and Hong Kong are presented below.

2.3.1. Quality Assurance in Higher Education in China

Objectives: to ensure quality and to differentiate academic levels.
Academic degrees: licentiate (Bachelor's Degree, Master's Degree, and Doctorate (Ph.D.).

The Degree Conferring System:

The State Council;
The Committee for Academic Degrees;
Groups of specialists (53 groups with some 600 members).

Criteria (standards) for the selection of those who may supervise doctoral studies:

- numbers of papers published and places of publication;
- practical projects (contracts, patents) carried out;
- current stage in one's research activity;
- funds;
- equipment;
- structure of the research group.

The tasks of groups of specialists are as follows:

- to determine institutions which may award Doctor's and Master's degrees and the fields of study to be covered;
- to identify professors who may guide candidates for Doctor's and Master's degrees.

2.3.2. Accreditation of Higher Education in India

In 1986, the Indian government formulated a National Education Policy. Its Outline of Activities emphasized the necessity of creating a mechanism for the evaluation and the accreditation of education.

The University Grants Commission (UGC) founded the Council for Accreditation and Evaluation (CAE). The latter is an autonomous body, the object of which is to stimulate the self-evaluation and the accreditation of institutions of higher education.

CAE does not impose norms and standards; it is merely a catalyst for self-improvement.

36

Accreditation being a voluntary function, its costs are incurred by the institutions which apply for it.

In contrast with the situation in the USA, the Indian government is involved in the promotion and the development of accreditation. It does not, however, directly influence decisions concerning accreditation.

The Indian decision-making and accreditation bodies are the following:

- the All India Council for Technical Education (AICTE), and

- the University Grants Commission (UGC).

These bodies are assisted by the National Committee for Accreditation (for vocational education) and by the Council for Accreditation and Evaluation (for general education).

Accreditation aims at protecting students, the public, and employers from inadequate institutions.

2.3.3. Accreditation of Higher Education in Hong Kong

Special attention is paid to education in Hong Kong. Seventy per cent of its funding comes from the government budget. The authorities hope that their system of education will achieve a level similar to that of the best education systems throughout the world.

Characteristics - the assistance of external examiners, coming from well-known foreign and United Kingdom universities is required with the aim of:

- rapidly determining the standard of each graduate;

- enhancing the international prestige of the education system and of its recognition abroad;

- keeping pace with the worldwide development of education.

A system of validation, that is, of evaluation of course programmes was created. Its objective was to make each course programme compatible with international standards. Through the process of evaluation, the "control" relationship was gradually replaced by that of a "peer relationship".

In 1987, a proposal was made that Hong Kong create its own independent system of academic accreditation. The Government created the Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation (HKCAA) which began to function in 1990.

HKCAA is a nongovernmental, quasi-autonomous institution, which is financed by the Government, and is active in the field of

3'7

academic accreditation.

The Objectives of HKCAA:

- to recognize the capacity of an institution to validate or to invalidate course programmes;
- to contact accreditation agencies outside Hong Kong;
- to disseminate information on academic standards, to organize conferences, etc.;
- to advise the government and be answerable to it on matters related to academic accreditation;
- to co-operate with professional accreditation bodies.

2.4. Accreditation in Several African Countries

Several aspects of the quality control mechanisms of higher education in South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya are presented here.

2.4.1. Accreditation of Higher Education in South Africa

South African universities are granted statutory powers with regard to accreditation:

- they accredit course programmes and syllabi;
- they recognize certain degrees and diplomas awarded by certain institutions;
- they examine the certificates issued by non-accredited institutions and certify their validity.

Universities are protected by law against nonrecognized institutions active in the same domain.

The need appeared for a central accreditation body which would ensure the comparability of academic standards. Thus, the University Accreditation Committee (UAC) was created. The Committee has precise tasks and an adequate structure (7 members, consisting of 4 South African academics and 3 foreign specialists).

The Objectives of UAC:

- to co-operate with professional organizations;
- to assist institutions in the processes of self-evaluation;

- to nominate the members of the committees that visit the institutions which apply for accreditation;

- to examine the results of self-evaluation activities and the activities and conclusions of visiting committees.

2.4.2. Accreditation of Higher Education in Nigeria

In 1962, the National Universities Commission (NUC) was created and given responsibility for the development and the improvement of higher education.

Accreditation in Nigeria implies the determination of minimum standards and the validation of academic degrees and diplomas.

A Handbook of Methods of Accreditation of Academic Course Programmes was published in 1989.

Types of Accreditation

a) Full accreditation - granted for 3 years. Following this period, the institution must once again apply for accreditation.

b) Temporary (provisional) accreditation - granted for one year. The institution is asked to remedy its deficiencies.

c) Non-accreditation - if the requirements for minimum standards are not met. In such a situation, the university in question is not permitted to enroll students, and all subsidies are withdrawn.

Criteria Considered by Accreditation Committees

1. The philosophy and the objectives of the institution.

2. The curricula.

3. The number and the qualifications of the teaching staff.

4. Procedures for students' admission and graduation.

5. The standards set for the examinations leading to the granting of degrees.

6. Financial assistance.

7. Equipment.

8. Management procedures for departments.

9. Employers' evaluation of graduates.

10. Requests for new visits.

Each member of the visiting commission awards points fror.
to 10 for each standard. Full accreditation is granted for scores of
over 70 and provisional accreditation for scores varying from 60 to
69 points. When an institution receives less than 60 points it is not
accredil.ed.

2.4.3. Accreditation of Higher Education in Kenya

Accreditation is a late development in the higher education system
of Kenya.

In 1985, the Commission for Higher Education was created and
entrusted with the function of accrediting universities. It thus became
the accreditation institution of Kenya.

The *University Regulations,* published in 1989, set the legal frame-
work for the establishment and the functioning of universities. The same
Regulations refer to the creation, standardization, accreditation, and
supervision of universities.

Standards, ∩s they are evoked, concern the objectives, the aca-
demic character, the leadership, the equipment, the human resources,
the financial resources, the curricula, and the quality of education in the
newly created institutions.

Although additional measures were taken for the accreditation of
private universities, only one private university has so far been ac-
credited on the basis of these measures.

Public universities are established by act of Parliament.

Characteristics of Accreditation:

●   they set their own standards;

●   they have a mechanism for quality assurance;

●   they employ external examiners to validate the results.

2.5.   Quality Assurance in Australia

The Australian Rectors' Committee supervizes the *Commissions
for Academic Standards,*   which were created four years ago to
monitor standards.

Guideline: Australian universities should have similar curricula for similar fields of study, even though they do not have to offer course programmes in the same fields of study.

Characteristics: Although Australia inherited the English system of higher education, the external examiners have been replaced, because of the distances between universities - by small commissions of experts according to field of study, who visit the institutions of higher education and certify their activity.

The reports of these commissions are made public.

The commissions consist of 5 to 7 members, specialists in the respective field of study, who, in a period of 3 years, visit all the institutions.

The specialist commissions have made a considerable contribution to the increased comparability of standards. In the future, each of these commissions will include a specialist from outside the education system, a representative of a professional accrediting organization, and a specialist in the field of educational methodology.

2.6. A Comparative Analysis of Accreditation and Quality Assurance in the World

The rapid presentation of aspects of accreditation in higher education in different countries has inspired the comments presented below which may serve as a starting point for a discussion and an exchange of ideas on the development of accreditation activities in Europe and elsewhere.

a) The diversity of the quality assurance (control) systems for higher education throughout the world is striking, this despite the fact that the long tradition of international contacts in higher education would normally have implied the existence of a more uniform system of evaluation. A reasonable conclusion is that a system of evaluation, as developed as it might be, cannot be completely transferred from one country to another without considerable adaptation to local realities.

b) Note must be taken of the *explosive* interest in the improvement of the quality of higher education which has been manifested over the last ten years. An examination of the situation in different countries indicates that the organization of accreditation systems occurred "spontaneously" in many countries during the last decade. In countries with a tradition of accreditation, the process was improved during this period.

41

c) A major difference among systems of higher education in various countries concerns the relationship between government and higher education, particularly with regard to the funding of higher education.

In some systems of higher education, institutions have equal status, and funds are allocated according to the need to provide equal opportunities for students and curricula of equal quality. Another approach to the management of higher education emphasizes such aspects as variety, diversity of institutions, and selectivity in the granting of subsidies.

In the first case, management is centralized but tends towards decentralization through the granting of autonomy to individual institutions. In the second case, management is decentralized. Government uses subsidies as a means of control and of setting general strategies in the field. In both cases, accreditation plays an essential role in the allocation of funds (even in the USA, where accreditation institutions are generally nongovernmental).

d) The concepts of *equivalence* and *variety* influence the formulation of higher education policy. They are adequately reflected in accreditation mechanisms.

In those countries in which stress is laid on *equivalence, internal methods* of *quality control* develop as a matter of priority. When the focus is on *variety, external control* and *comparative evaluation* of quality are predominant.

e) When tackling the problem of the quality of education, various countries are confronted with the difficulty of defining *the concept* of *"quality of education"*.

The conviction exists that one cannot speak of an absolute value of academic level, that quality can only be defined through requirements. As the requirements for quality differ greatly, depending on the user, we have a multitude of standards and criteria which prevent accreditation from being approached in exact terms or formulae.

42

It is therefore advisable to seek international systems of evaluation and to identify common criteria and indicators of quality, while hoping that they will not necessarily lead to an undesired uniformity and to less diversified curricula.

Exchanges of experience should be emphasized, for they enhance the capacity for improvement and the responsibility of institutions of higher education for quality.

Each country should create its own system of evaluation and quality control. However, all these systems should adopt similar concepts of quality, effectiveness, evaluation, and accreditation, and have the same basic objective: an international level of education.

f)   We note the general tendency of stressing the role of *outcon,es* as compared to *inputs* in the evaluation of educational processes. Thus, in the process of accreditation, emphasis is placed on a characteristic of higher education, its effectiveness, which has not been taken very much into consideration in the past. This tendency is a consequence of the increasing role of higher education as a "productive force" in society.

g)   The reduction of the differences existing among the various systems of accreditation is determined by the relationship between *governments and higher education institutions.* In the USA, for example, a tendency to increase governmental control of education is observable, while in countries with centralized systems of education (France, for example), governments and parliaments are tending to increase the autonomy granted to individual institutions.

The aim of these two tendencies is to reduce or to eliminate certain procedural dysfunction. At the same time, they are determining an *increase in the importance given to accreditation* in the reform strategies of institutions.

h)   The rapid changes which have occurred in several central and eastern European countries and in countries of other regions of the world require *dynamic systems of accreditation,* adapted to existing conditions, which develop along with these conditions. The accreditation system proposed for Romania is specific for a country with an explosive development

4 ɔ

of public and private education. It is adapted to a public higher education sector which is rigourously selective. It is also being conditioned by the fact that a new law of education is in the process of being elaborated.

l) Considering the increasing number of exchanges of students, academics, graduates, etc., the need to make *international comparisons* has greatly increased. The importance of the role played by accreditation is increasing, even if universal criteria of quality have not yet been laid down.

An essential objective, resulting from this situation, and correlated with the accreditation process, is that of a *priori academic recognition*.

Efforts must be made, which may give rise to conventions on academic recognition among different states, to the creation of information centres on academic recognition, and to inter-university or inter-departmental approaches to matters of academic recognition by the implementation of networks of institutions for a *priori* recognition by means of study visits for information purposes, etc.

44

Chapter 3

THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS IN AN EASTERN EUROPEAN SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION: ROMANIA

In the last few years, the development of Romanian higher education was influenced both by the creation of new university centres and by the opening of several private universities.

As the Romanian Ministry of Education is responsible for the quality of the training of specialists, a decision was taken, in conformity with practices in countries with advanced systems of education, to intro-duce *the accreditation of higher education institutions.* The results of this decision are detailed below.

3.1. Objectives

In order for an accreditation process to develop, certain objectives need to be identified from the very beginning. The Romanian authorities accordingly formulated the following basic objectives of accreditation:

- development of the capacity of higher education institutions for self-evaluation and improvement by a continuous rise in the quality and the effectiveness of the educational process;

- the determination of whether or not the institutions of higher education have the necessary resources for their present and future activities;

- an assessment according to international standards of the possibilities of Romanian higher education;

- the provision of realistic evaluations of the competences of the specialists who will work in various branches of the economy;

- the orientation of secondary school leavers in terms of their professional options, given the possibilities offered by the different institutions of higher education in Romania.

45

3.2. Accreditation Principles

Accreditation is a process of evaluation of the educational activity of an institution of higher education with the aim of bringing about its constant self-regulation and improvement. Therefore, this process implies the evaluation of the structure, of the resources, and of the scientific and pedagogical potential of the institution, with a view to integrating it more fully into the educational system as a whole.

Following the favorable recommendation of the Accreditation Committee, the Ministry of Education may integrate a given institution of higher education into the educational system.

The accreditation process has two stages:

a. The *initial accreditation* which is linked to the grant of an authorization to operate. It assumes fulfilment of several compulsory minimum conditions, expressed in terms of several *initial accreditation standards.*

b. *Determination of the level of accreditation* refers to the evaluation of the training of specialists by means of *compatibility tests.* The average achievement level thus obtained can receive three possible grades: A, B, and C.

The *accreditation order,* which attests the completion of the two stages of the process, explicitly certifies that the objectives have been met. Although *all the Romanian institutions of higher education* might be subject to the accreditation process, it might be carried out in different ways according to the following types of institutions: 1. **Traditional institutions** (universities and institutes) (IT), some of which are considered *standard* institutions (IT-S) and serve as points of reference for other types of institutions. 2. **New state institutions** (IN) 3. **Private institutions** (IP).

Accreditation standards would be established with reference to the IT-S because the level and status of these institutions are already confirmed by experience and by comparison with advanced institutions of higher education in other countries.

Thus, in a *first stage,* the IT-S would be accredited and awarded level A. (As of this point comparisons would be possible and the accreditation processes for other types of institutions of higher education would begin.) We should emphasize that accreditation standards would be constantly tightened along with the evolution of Romanian higher education.

In a *second stage,* the other IT institutions would be accredited, they having not yet been granted the status of standard.

During the *third stage*, the IN and IP institutions would be evaluated for accreditation. There might be some question as to their compliance with the *accreditation standards.*

Although non-compliance may be the result of factors beyond the control of the institutions concerned, the importance of the educational process does not permit the granting of leeway beyond certain limits. Thus, accreditation is an essential means for the upholding of standards.

The determination both of initial accreditation and of level of accreditation would be undertaken every five years.

3.2.1. Initial Accreditation

The process would be undertaken upon the request of the institution of higher education in question at least six months before the institution began to operate. After the accreditation had been requested, the Ministry of Education would order an investigation relative to the fulfilment of the standards for initial accreditation as it appeared in documentation submitted by the institution.

3.2.2. Determination of the Level of Accreditation

The level would be determined according to two alternative methods after the granting of the initial accreditation.

a) The alternative of *competitivity*, according to which the admission of candidates would be by examinations similar to those organized in the IT-S. In this case, the level of accreditation would be awarded one month after the entrance examinations had been corrected. The level awarded would normally be "A". This alternative, while referring to the first year of study, would only be applicable to newly created institutions. As a consequence, these institutions might begin their activity on the 1st of October of the current academic year with a level A accreditation. The Ministry of Education would issue the accreditation order a month earlier, on the 1st of September.

b) The alternative of *autonomy*, according to which the admission of candidates is undertaken in conformity with regulations which are specific to each institution. In this case, the level of accreditation could not be determined until the end of the first year of study, and after the *compatibility tests* had

47

been successfully passed. As in the first situation, however, the Ministry of Education would issue an order of accreditation or of non-accreditation of the institution before the 1st of September of the current academic year.

It should be noted that beginning with the second year of study, the level of accreditation would be determined only on the basis of compatibility tests.

In case the Ministry of Education decided, on the basis of the results of the compatibility tests, not to accredit the institution, the students enrolled in the faculties or the departments *which were dissolved* might take complementary examinations in other state or private institutions of higher education. These institutions could supplement the number of places for the respective disciplines and years of study up to a maximum of 10 per cent of current figures.

The principles of elaboration of the *standards for initial accreditation* are presented in Section 3.3. below. The principles according to which the *compatibility tests* would be conducted are presented in Section 3.4.

3.3. Standards for Initial Accreditation

The initial accreditation evaluation will be carried out on the basis of the following set of standards: S1 - Standard relating to the integrity; S2 - Standard relating to planning; S3 - Standard relating to management; S4 - Standard relating to the instructional programmes; S5 - Standard relative to teaching personnel; S6 - Standard relating to documentation, information, and eductional facilities; S7 - Standard relating to student facilities; S8 - Standard relating to material resources; S9 - Standard relating to financial resources.

Some of the basic requirements for the meeting of these standards are presented below, along with suggestions as to the assessment of their fulfilment.

Important notice: The fulfilment of the requirements for each standard would be graded according to a ten-point goals.

Initial accreditation would be granted if the number of points per standard were 7 or higher. Therefore, an institute would earn the AI7, AI8, AI9, or AI10 initial accreditation according to the average number of points obtained for S1-S9.

3.3.1. Standard Relating to Integrity (S1)

Requirements: This standard is based on the principle of academic integrity and probity. Although education must finance itself totally or partly, an institution of higher education is neither a business nor an industry. Neither is it a political institution.

Evaluation of the following:

- The booklet (self-report), elaborated by the institution of higher education, presenting its objectives, its structure, its organisation, its financing, etc.
- Detailed reports requested by the Accreditation Committee of the Ministry of Education.
- The real situation as observed during the visit.

3.3.2. Standard Relating to Planning (S2)

Requirements: The institution of higher education being evaluated should have a well-designed long-term plan. This plan should take internal and external elements into account. It should set objectives with regard to structure, possibilities of development, organization, financing, etc. The institution should have its own well-functioning mechanism for the plan and for self-evaluation.

Evaluation of the following:

- The brochure of the institution.
- Studies, performance tests.
- Prospects for graduates, etc.
- The real situation as observed during the visit.

3.3.3. Standard Relating to Management (S3)

Requirements: Academic management would be based on progressive principles. Students should participate in the management of institutions. The heads of departments and of institutions should take necessary measures to meet accreditation standards and to promote the good functioning and the development of the institution.

49

Evaluation of the following:

● The system of internal regulations as well as other information.

● The documentation relating to the structure of management, the criteria for student selection, reports of activities, etc.

● The real situation as observed during the visit.

3.3.4. Standard Relating to Instructional Programmes (S4)

The instruction offered should be coherent and competitive. The curricula and the course programmes, the productive work periods, the study trips, the award of degrees, academic certificates, diplomas, and study and research grants, should be carefully organized. Exchanges with similar foreign institutions should be encouraged.

Evaluation of the following:

● Catalogues, booklets, curricula, course programmes, announcements.

● Additional documentation as requested by the Accreditation Committee.

● The real situation as observed during the visit.

3.3.5. Standard Relating to Teaching Personnel (S5)

Requirements

A certified, stable, and ethical teaching personnel, able to achieve the objectives of the institution, and to fulfil its role as the heart of the educational process. The institution should provide for the professional development of the teaching staff, and for adequate wages. It should offer the staff equitable work contracts.

Evaluation of the following:

The list of employed teaching personnel, of the heads of departments and of the institution, their wages, the criteria used in the calculation of the wages, and brief activity reports. The evaluation methods will make use of annual grades. Minimum performance criteria will be introduced for the teaching personnel: an average of 9 at graduation, and the Ph.D. as the basic requirement for being responsible for a course programme. At least 50 per cent of the teaching personnel working at the institution, which applied for accreditation

should be employed full time. The real situation as observed during the visit is another criterion.

3.3.6. Standard Relating to Documentation, Information and Educational Facilities (S6)

Requirements

- Adequate libraries, textbooks, laboratories, and computers, adequate learning spaces with appropriate equipment, supervised and maintained by a qualified personnel. A domestic and international system of exchanges of information.

Evaluation of the following:

- Statistical data about the use of the books, photocopiers, and computers available.

- The real situation as observed during the visit.

3.3.7. The Standard Relating to Student Facilities (S7)

Requirements

- The provision of adequate conditions for the normal intellectual and personal development of students, including canteens, residence halls, camps, field trips, etc.

- A suitable system of tuition fees.

- An admissions system based on the testing of the capacity of candidates, all of whom are to have equal opportunities.

- Easily available information for students on financial assistance which can be granted by the institution.

- Additional facilities for foreign students.

Evaluation of the following:

- The self-evaluation report of the institution of higher education in question.

- The student regulations.

- The statutes of the student organizations.

- The real situation as observed during the visit.

51

3.3.8. Standard Relating to Material Resources (S8)

Requirements

- The existence of the necessary material resources needed in order to achieve the objectives of the institution: classes, laboratories, residence halls, etc.

- Contracts with enterprises, hospitals, schools, etc., for the sponsorship of student work periods.

- Safety equipment, etc.

Evaluation of the following:

- Visits by experts' committee.

- Examination of the long-term contracts and similar types of arrangements established by the departments.

3.3.9. Standard Relating to Financial Resources (S9)

Requirements

- The existence of financial resources sufficient for the achievement of stated objectives and for long-term improvements.

- Stable and adequate sources of funding; one which is free of external influences and pressures.

- Clear relations with fiscal organs

Evaluation of the following:

- Financial plans, subsidy programmes, annual reports, balance sheets.

- The real situation as observed during the visit.

3.4. Standards for the Determination of Accreditation Levels (the Compatibility Tests)

The determination of accreditation level could be accomplished by means of *compatibility tests* which set the standards for the various accreditation levels.

The compatibility tests consist of tests or examinations taken by all the students of the institution having applied for accreditation (IN or IP),

and a representative sample of similar tests drawn from an IT-S institute (for example, the examinations for the winter or summer sessions, in one or more disciplines) having been administered under the supervision of a neutral commission.

The level of accreditation of the institution subjected to accreditation would be determined according to a comparison of the results of the two sets of tests. The results could be the following:

- level A: if 85% or more of the results of the tests of the two institutions which are compared overlap;

- level B: if the overlapping represents only 70 to 85 per cent of the results;

- level C: if the overlapping represents 55 to 70 per cent.

In case the overlapping were lower than 55%, the institution would be dissolved. The decision would be officially communicated by a formal letter from the Ministry of Education. The higher education institution might contest the decision and appeal to the Rectors' Conference. The latter would make the final decision within 60 days from receipt of intention to contest the first decision.

Until the final decision was communicated, the institution of higher education might continue to function.

On the basis of the results of tests, the Ministry of Education would issue an order of accreditation (as a university or an "A", "B", or "C" level institute), or an order of partial or total dissolution.

The average level of accreditation during the period of studies of graduates would be indicated on the diplomas awarded, which would require certification by the Ministry of Education.

A level "C" accreditation is not acceptable for institutions which offer instruction in the medical sciences and in education. For these institutions, only "A" and "B" levels of accreditation are acceptable.

3.5. Application Rules

The standards for and the mechanisms of accreditation would be communicated to the various universities and institutions of higher education.

The costs of the accreditation process would be borne by the institutions being evaluated. The evaluation process would be directly supervised by a specialized department of the Ministry of Education.

53

3.6. The Structure of the Accreditation Committee

In conformity with Article 19 of the projected Law on Higher Education, the Accreditation Committee would be an independent body in terms of its relations with the various institutions of higher education. It would consist of 41 well-known Romanian specialists in the sciences and the humanities. Foreign specialists would be invited to take part in the activities of the Committee and give pertinent advice.

The members of the Committee would be nominated by the Minister of Education.

To better fulfil its tasks, the Committee would consist of several subcommittees:

1. Subcommittee I-C - to deal with questions of co-ordination. Its members would be representatives of the Ministry of Education and of Science.

2. Subcommittee II-CE - the central, expert subcommittee, to consist of five prominent specialists in the sciences and the humanities.

3. Subcommittee III-DS - for fields of specialization. It would consist of 29 specialists: 22 Romanians and 7 foreign consult- ants. These specialists would be members of the 6 subcom- mittees dealing with the following fields of study:

a) Subcommittee III-U (university), 5 members;

b) Subcommittee III-T (technical), 5 members;

c) Subcommittee III-M (medical), 3 members;

d) Subcommittee III-E (economics), 3 members;

e) Subcommittee III-A (agronomy), 3 members;

f) Subcommittee III-C (the humanities and the fine arts), 3 members.

The activity of the Accreditation Committee might be supported by other specialists and researchers, on a voluntary basis, upon the request of the Ministry of Education and Science.

3.7. The Proposed Functions of the Subcommittees

3.7.1. The Functions of Subcommittees I-C and II-CE

a) to elaborate accreditation strategies;

b) to formulate standards for initial accreditation and for the determination of accreditation level;

c) to set deadlines and stages for the accreditation process;

d) to determine the network of standard institutions;

e) to supervise the activity of the specialized subcommittees;

f) to propose changes in the structures of the specialized sub-committees;

g) to prepare estimates for the accreditation fees;

h) to provide interested parties with accreditation standards and rules of application;

i) to conserve and to update accreditation documents;

j) to elaborate the documentation necessary for the issuance of accreditation orders;

k) to inform institutions of higher education about decisions concerning their accreditation or non-accreditation;

l) to submit to the Rectors' Conference the replies given by Accreditation Committees to contestations initiated by institutions;

m) to mediate disagreements over evaluations made by specialized subcommittees;

n) to grant approval of the ways in which compatibility tests for determining levels of accreditation are carried out;

o) to check that the standards with regard to curricula, material and financial resources, and relations with fiscal entities are met;

p) to elaborate and to put into practice standards of remuneration for the members of the Accreditation Committee.

55

3.7.2. The Functions of Subcommittees III-DS

a) to examine applications for accreditation by discipline;

b) to make requests to Institutions subjected to accreditation that they complete requested the documentation;

c) to verify the fulfilment of accreditation standards;

d) to organize visits to institutions which have applied for accreditation;

e) to grant individual scores, with the help of each specialist and in conformity with the accreditation standards, and to calculate the mean values per standard;

f) to determine, together with the institutions which have applied for accreditation, the administrative chart for the determination of accreditation levels;

g) to participate in the elaboration of compatibility tests for the determination of accreditation level;

h) to solve all matters related to accreditation.

3.8.   Provisions concerning the Financing of Accreditation

In conformity with the functions, presented above, the aim of the activity of the Accreditation Committee would be to perform the evaluation for the initial accreditation of institutions of higher education and thus to determine the level of accreditation. This activity refers both to institutional and specialized accreditation.

Both subcommittees, SI-C and SII-CE, as well as one or several SIII-DS subcommittees would be involved in the accreditation process. Consequently, many specialists would be involved and would have to be paid for their work.

The funds necessary for the accreditation activities would be accumulated through the collection of accreditation fees. The amount of these fees would be established according to the number of specialists involved and the average length of time needed for the Accreditation Committee to complete its work. As the granting of a level of accreditation would presuppose that initial accreditation had been awarded the fees for both services would be calculated and collected separately.

4. ANNEXES

4.1. Institutional Evaluation Standards according to Miller [7a]

The main provisions of the proposed system of evaluation refer to the following:

1) **The aims and objectives of the institution** (the aims should serve as a guide for present and future activity; the objectives should be harmonized with and emphasize the aims; the institution should be able to plan its activity; the activity of the institution should correspond to its aims and objectives; the aims and objectives should be compatible with those of similar institutions).

2) **The learning process** (students should evaluate positively the learning system; the percentage of passing grades should be reasonable; a wide range of learning resources must be available; student problems must be managed efficiently; constant progress must be made in the achievement of educational objectives).

3) **Faculty achievements** (the methods and techniques of assessment of the members of the faculty should be satisfactory; development programmes should serve the aims set; the wage and income system should be competitive; the qualitative achievements of the faculty should meet certain optimization requirements).

4) **The curricula** (the institution should aim at developing new curricula and revising existing ones; their quality should be compatible with the aims and objectives of the institution; the library and the learning sources should be adapted to the academic aims).

5) **The institutional facilities** (the physical possibilities should correspond to the number of students and to the characteristics of the curricula; the institution should consider the future development of these facilities; the wage and income system should stimulate individual competence; the possibility should exist to systematically evaluate the performances of academic staff members).

57

6)   **The administrative management** (the administration should
          pay due attention to planning; adequate work relations
should exist among the members of the administrative personnel; the
policy adopted by the leadership of the institution should allow for
institutional management; the models and methods of evaluation and
development should be satisfactory; the institution should have a
positive work plan).

7)   **The financial management** (the fee system should meet
          both the needs of the institution and the students' possi-
bilities; the financial management system should be efficient; the costs
of the institution should be comparable with incomes; the institution
should have a sound policy of investments to be able to prove its
financial independence at any moment).

8)   **The leadership of the institution** (the methods used should
          be satisfactory, it should permanently be considering the
relationship between theoretical aspects and the implementation of
requirements; an effective collaboration should be maintained with the
external staff involved in the leadership of the institution who should
make a positive contribution to the development of the institution).

9)   **The external relations** (the activity of the institution should
          contribute to the improvement of the quality of life in its field
of action; the institution should have good relations with the state
co-ordinating bodies as well as with other institutions; the institution
should acquire part of its financial resources from private sources or
foundations).

10)   **The institutional progress** (the institution should keep per-
          manently abreast with and apply the latest discoveries in
science and technology; efforts at self-improvement, both at the central
and at the local levels should be constantly made; the institution should
be able to assess its own efficiency).

4.2. Glossary of Terms of Reference for the Accreditation

of Higher Education Institutions

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
1.	Ability	a) The power to perform acts or to give appro- piate authpr- izations. b) Assessment of ability, objective testing of ability, wide range of abil- ity, etc.	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 4a,4b
2.	Accomodation	a) The pro- cess by which an individual modifies cur- rent behaviour in order to adjust to and meet new or additional conditions in the environ- ment b) see adaptation	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 4a, 8b

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
3. Nr. crt	Accountability	a) Educational accountability is a concept in which the school system, and especially teachers, are held responsible for the learning and academic progress of students. b) effects on assessement of accountability, etc.	accreditation theory	a) General b) 4a,7a
4.	Accounting	a) A subject in which students learn the functions involved and methods required by the accounting profession for keeping financial records of transactions of a business, other organization, or individual including the sumarization and explanation of these transactions b) accountability, etc.	accreditation theory	a) General b) 4a,7a,1b

60

| Nr. crt | KEYWORD | TEXT | SUBJECT | a) Country |
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
5.	Accreditation	a) A process by which an institutions, programme or a specialized unit of post-secondary edu-cation pericd-ically evalu-ates its edu-cational ac-tivities and seeks an inde-pendent judg-ement by ex-perts that it achives sub-stantially its own education-al objectives and meets the established standards of the body by which it is seeking ac-creditation. b) accredi-tation con-cept, accredi-tation pro-cess, accred-iting body, accreditation liaison offi-cer, accred-iting agency, accrediting association, accrediting procedure, accrediting commission, institutional	accred-itation theory	a) USA b) 8a, 7b

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
5.	Accreditation (cont.)	accreditation, regional accreditation, specialized accreditation, quality of accreditation, governance in accreditation, role and value of accredi- tation, pur- poses of ac- creditation, etc.		

62

| Nr. crt | KEYWORD | TEXT | SUBJECT | a) Country |
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
6.	Accredit	a) To designate an educational institution as meeting required standards or accepted criteria of quality established by a competent agency. b) see "accreditation"	accreditation theory	a) USA b) 8a,7b

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
7.	Accrediting agency (body)	a) An organization that sets up criteria for judging the quality of educational institutions and programmes, determines the extent to which institutions and programmes meet these criteria, and issues some sort of public announcement concerning the institutions and programmes found to be of acceptable quality; may be either a governamental bureau, such as a state department of education, or a voluntary organization, such as a regional association, etc. b) accrediting bodies, accreditation board, accrediting bureau, accrediting commission, accrediting association,	Institutions of accreditation	a) General b) 8a,6b

64

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
7.	Accrediting agency (body) (cont.)	regional asso- ciation, ac- crediting council.		
8.	Accrediting procedure	a) The pro- cess by which an accrediting agency deter- mines whether an educational institutions or a programme is to be ac- credited. Gen- erally this process in- volves: 1) a clear state- ment of the institution's or unit's edu- cational ob- jectives; 2) a self-study by the institu- tion or unit; 3) an on-site evaluation by a selected group of ex- perts; 4) a decision by the accredi- ting body concerning the accreditation of the insti- tution. b) see ac- creditation; application.	Concept of ac- credi- tation Type of accred- itation Insti- tutions of ac- credi- tation	a) General b) 8a,6b

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
9.	Achievement	a) Successful accomplishment or performance in particular subjects, areas, or courses, usually by reasons of skill, hard work and interest. Typically summarized in various types of grades, marks, scores, or descriptive commentary. b) achievement motivation, achievement need, achievement test, achiever, overachiever, underachiever, achievement mark, achievement quotient, achievement scale, achievement score, achievement standards, achievement measurement, etc.	accreditation theory stan- dards of ac- credi- tation	a) General b) 7a, 5b

66

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
10.	Achievement motivation	a) A psycho- logical need and energetic drive that prompts an individual to strive for and work toward mastering his or her envi- ronment by the successful accomplishment of a goal or goals, accom- panied by a sense of sat- isfaction and self-worth. b) see achievement.	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 7a, 5b
11.	Adaptation	a) The process by which an individual alters his or her current mental, phys- ical, or emo- tional behav- iour to meet and deal with new conditions in a learning situation. b) see accommodation.	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 8a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
12.	Application	a) The formal request submitted to an accrediting body by an institution of postsecondary education when it or one of its specialized units wishes to be considered for accreditation or for candidacy for accreditation. b) accrediting procedure.	accreditation process	a) USA b) 8a
13.	Approval	a) Is an act of an officially authorized state governmental agency certifying that a unit or programme within an institution of postsecondary education complies with established minimum legal requirements. b)	accreditation process	a) General b) 1a, 8a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
14.	Assessment	a) Measurement of the extent of learning in individuals. b) criteria of assessment, levels of assessment, principles of assessment, methods of assessment, continuous assessment, convergent assessment, etc.	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 4a, 5b
15.	Average Performance	a) The total score obtained by a group of pupils for a specified task or set of tasks, divided by the number of pupils in the group. b) average mark, etc.	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 4a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
16.	Candidate for accreditation	a) Is a status that may be granted by an accrediting body indicating that an institution or unit has expressed its desire to become accredited and that the accrediting body judges the institution or unit to have the potential for achieving accreditation within a reasonable period of time. Candidacy, however, does not assure accreditation. b)	accreditation theory	a) USA b) 7a, 8a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
17.	Certification	a) Is a process by which a nongovernmental organization grants recognition to a person who has met certain predetermined qualifications specified by that organization and who voluntarily seeks such recognition. b)	accreditation theory	a) General b) 8a, 6b
18.	Conditional Accreditation	a) Is a status indicating that an institution or a unit has certain deficiencies which must be corrected within a specified period of time in order for the institution or unit to remain accredited. b) probationary accreditation, provisional accreditation.	types of accreditation	a) General b) 8a

71

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
19.	Criteria of accreditation	a) Are statements reflecting the expectations of an accrediting association with regard to an accreditable institution or specialized unit. The criteria provide a common frame of reference within which institutions or specialized units are evaluated and accredited. b) standards, requirements, essentials, criteria of assessment, criteria of evaluation, criteria of mastery.	standards of accreditation	a) General b) 8a, 9a, 8b
20.	Deviation	a) The extent to which scores are spread around the mean. b) standard deviation, mean square deviation	accreditation theory	a) General b) 4a

72

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
21.	Education	a) It is not simply psychology, or sociology, or communication theory, or even philosophy. It is not confined to the cognitive, or affective, or psychomotor, or even the moral domain. Education embraces all these things, and probably much more. b) educational objectives, educational programme, postsecondary education, educational evaluation, educational opportunity, etc.	accreditation	a) General b) 12a, 2b

| Nr. crt | KEYWORD | TEXT | SUBJECT | a) Country |
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
22.	Educational Objectives	a) Are statements developed by post-secondary educational institutions which describe the goals of the teaching/ learning process within an institution or unit and in the context of which an ac-crediting body makes its evaluation. b) evaluation, accreditation, education, educational quality	accred-itation theory	a) General b) 8a, 12a, 4b
23.	Eligibility	a) Is a status granted by an agency of a federal or state government indicat-ing that an institution of postsecondary education qualifies as a recipient of a specified funding programme. b) criteria of eligibility	govern-ance in accred-itation	a) USA b) 8a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
24.	Evaluation	a) A process by which the effects and the effective- ness of teaching or other activ- ities can be determined b) purposes of evaluation	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 4a, 1b
25.	Governance in accreditation	a) We define governance as the structures and the pro- cesses of decision- making. We thus distin- guish it from administration or management. (Government is not an exact science. LOUIS D. BRANDEIS) b) government regulation, governmental funding agencies, etc.	govern- ance in accred- itation	a) General b) 8a, 3b

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
26.	Guidance	a) Assistance given to pupils in making decision about their future. b)	accreditation theory	a) General b) 4a, 9a, 3b

76

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
27.	Guidelines	a) Are explanatory statements which amplify the criteria (standards) for accreditation. They usually provide examples of the way criteria may be interpreted to allow for flexibility while remaining within the framework of the criteria. b) guide to accreditation	standards in accreditation	a) General b) 8a, 3b

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
28.	Institutional Accreditation	a) Is a status accorded an institution of postsecondary education which embraces the whole institution as it defines itself and therefore includes all areas, activities and pro- grammes. Ac- creditation of the institu- tion as a whole is not, and should not be interpreted as being equivalent to specialized accreditation of a part or programme of the institu- tion. b) specialized accreditation, regional ac- creditation, etc.	types of ac- credi- tation	a) General b) 7a, 8a
29.	Institutions of accredi- tation	a) See "ac- crediting agency" b)		a) b)

78

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
30.	Institution of Postsecondary Education	a) Is an enterprise the main objective of which is the offering of educational programmes and/or the evaluation of educational attainments primarily for persons who have completed secondary school. b) institutions of higher education (colleges, universities, etc.)	accreditation theory	a) USA b) 7a, 8a

79

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
31.	Institutional Integrity	a) An institution exhibits a high degree of integrity when it conducts all its activities fairly and justly, providing adequate notice of its policies and procedures and conscientiously adhering to accepted good practices. b) institutional policies, institutional management, institutional performance, institutional planning, institutional purpose, etc.	standards of accreditation	a) General b) 8a, 6b

30

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
32.	Licensure	a) Is a pro-cess by which an agency of government grants permis-sion: a) to a person meeting predetermined qualifications to engage in a given occupa-tion and/or to use a particu-lar title; b) to institu-tions to per-form specified functions b)	accred-itation concept	a) General b) 8a, 3b
33.	Listing	a) Is the ac-tivity re-quired by legislation of the secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, who maintains a list of na-tionally rec-ognized ac-crediting bodies deter-mined to be reliable au-thorities on educational quality. b)	accred-iting agen-cies	a) USA b) 8a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
34.	Membership	a) Is the status held by an accredited institution or unit with some accrediting bodies. b)	accred- iting insti- tutions	a) USA b) 8a
35.	On-Site Evaluation	a) Consists of the visit to an institution of education or educational unit by a team of experts appointed by the accredit- ing body spe- cifically for their compe- tencies rele- vant to the institution or unit to be evaluated. This visit determines the accuracy and completeness of the self- study and evaluates the applicant's effectiveness in light of the accred- iting body's standards. b) assessment, personnel evaluation	accred- itation theory	a) General b) 8a

32

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
36.	Public Interest	a) Arises from the effects of the accredita- tion activity on the general welfare. There is a public interest in . the proper operation of instituticns of postsec- ondary educa- tion and in the activity of accrediting bodies, be- cause their activities result in the education and training of persons who will take res- ponsible posi- tions in society. b) public relations, public re- presentative, etc.	accred- itation theory accred- iting insti- tutions	a) General b) 4a, 8b

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
37.	Public relations	a) The links by which a school maintains its credibility within the community which it serves

b) see "public interest" | accreditation theory | a) General

b) 4a, 5b |
| 38. | Public Representative | a) Are usually drawn from persons who do not have other interests in accreditation, to ensure appropriate representation of the public interest in accrediting bodies.

b) see "public interest" | accrediting institutions | a) USA

b) 8a |

| Nr. crt | KEYWORD | TEXT | SUBJECT | a) Country |
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
39.	Recognition	a) Is the process followed by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) whereby accrediting bodies apply and are reviewed at least every five years in accordance with established provisions and procedures. The purpose of this recognition is to provide the users of accreditation with guidance concerning accrediting bodies. b) state recognition.	accrediting institutions	a) USA b) 4a, 7a, 8a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT a) Description b) Derivation	SUBJECT	a) Country b) Bibliography
40.	Regional Accreditation	a) Is institutional accreditation by regional associations which review and accredit the programme of an institution as a whole. Regional accreditation is important for the academic scope and recognition of institutions of higher learning. There are six private agencies, each with responsibility for one region of the United States. b) Institutional accreditation, specialized accreditation, etc.	Types of accreditation	a) USA b) 81

| Nr. crt | KEYWORD | TEXT | SUBJECT | a) Country |
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
41.	Self-Regulation	a) Is based on the recognition that most human activities are ruled satisfactorily through the awareness of their effects on or acceptance by others. Accreditation, as a process organized around self-study, plays a major role in preserving the self-regulatory quality of American postsecondary education. b) Self-study, etc.	Accreditation theory	a) USA 8a

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
42.	Self-Study	a) Is a comprehensive analysis of the educational resources and effectiveness of an institution or specialized unit in relation to its educational objectives. The self-study report is the essential document in the accreditation process. b) Self-regulation, etc.	Accreditation theory	a) General b) 8a,8b

Nr. crt	KEYWORD	TEXT	SUBJECT	a) Country
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
43.	Specialized accreditation	a) Is a status accorded to a special unit within an institution of postsecondary education, which may be a college, school, faculty, division, department, programme or curriculum. Specialized accreditation does not purport to pass judgement on the institution as a whole, except in the cases of single-purpose institutions. b) institutional accreditation, regional accreditation, accreditation types.	Types of accreditation	a) USA b)8a
44.	Standards of accreditation	a) see "criteria" b)	accreditation theory	a) General b) 7a,8a,9a

89

| Nr. crt | KEYWORD | TEXT | SUBJECT | a) Country |
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
45.	Substantive change	a) Á substantive change within an accredited institution or a specialized unit is one which significantly alters its objectives, scope or control. b)	accreditation theory	a) General b) 8a
46.	Undergraduate school	a) An instructional unit of a college or university offering a curriculum leading to the Bachelor's degree, or the first professional degree b) graduate school, graduation, undergraduate.	theory	a) General b)

90

| Nr. crt | KEYWORD | TEXT | SUBJECT | a) Country |
		a) Description b) Derivation		b) Bibliography
47.	Unit	a) A major subdivision of a course of study, a text-book, or a subject field, particularly a subdivision in the social studies, the practical arts or the sciences. b) unit activity, unit appreciation, unit learning.	theory	a) General b)

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

a.   Books, Papers

1.   BURTON, R. The Higher Education System: Academic Organization in Cross-National Perspective. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

2.   CRAIG, R.L., ed. Training and Development Handbook. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1976.

3.   CRAVEN, E.D., ed. Academic Program Evaluation New Directions for Institutional Research, No. 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

4.   FRITH, D.S. and H.G. MACINTOSH. A Teacher's Guide to Assessment. Cheltenham: Stanley Thrones, 1984.

5.   HAROLD, O. Private Accreditation and Public Eligibility. Lexington: Lexington Books, 1975.

6.   HUSSAIN, K.M. Systèmes d'information pour la gestion adaptés aux établissements d'enseignement supérieur.

7.   JEDAMUS, P.; M.W. PETERSON et al. Improving Academic Management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

8.   KELLS, H.R. Self-Study Processes: A Guide for Postsecondary Institutions. American Council on Education, New York, MacMillan Publishing Company, 1983.

9.   KENNETH, E.; CH. CHAMBERS; H.R. KELLS, et al. Understanding Accreditation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

92

10. MIALARET, G. Vocabulaire de l'éducation. P., is: Presses Universitaires de France, 1979.

11. MOODIE, G.C., ed. Standards and Criteria in Higher Education. The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 1986.

12. NASH, S.N., and M.E. HAWTHORNE. Formal Recognition of Employer Sponsored Instruction: Conflict and Collegiality in Postsecondary Education. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 3. Washington D.C.: George Washington University, 1987.

13. SHERRY, S., ed. 1990-91 Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education - Programs Candidates. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1991.

14. SCHULLER, T., ed. The Future of Higher Education. The Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, 1991.

15. STAMAN, E.M. A Catalogue on Planning in Higher Education. Halifax: Society for College and University Planning, 1978.

16. STRAUGHAN, R. and J. WRIGLEY, eds. Values and Evaluation in Education. New York: Harper and Row.

b. Journals, Guides, Reports

1. Cambridge University Guide to Courses 1990-1991. Cambridge: Heffers, 1990.

2. Education and Computing. 7 1-2 (1991).

93

3.   Governance of Higher Education: A Report and Recommendations by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

4.   Higher Education in Europe. 16 3 (1991).

5.   Journal of Higher Education. 49 2 (1978).

6.   Quality Assurance in Higher Education. International Conference. Hong Kong: HKCAA, 1991.

7.   Research in Higher Education. A 4 (1976): 69-111.

8.   Training and Development Journal. 40 (January 1986): 18.

9.   UNESCO's Educational Activities in the Europe Region (1990-1991). Report to the 17th Session of the Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education, Vienna, 16-17 October 1991.

10.   Accreditation Handbook. 1983 Edition, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Inc., Winchester, Massachusetts, USA.

11.   Guide for External Program Review, December 1990, VSNU, Vereniging von Samenwerkende Nederlande Universiteiten, Nederlande.

CEPES

UNESCO

CEPES is the acronym for
CENTRE EUROPEEN POUR L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR
(European Centre for Higher Education). It is an integral part
of the UNESCO Secretariat, with headquarters in Bucharest.
The Centre was created in 1972 to contribute to the
development of higher education in the Member States
of the Europe Region by promoting international
co-operation in this field.
CEPES works in three domains:
- It gathers, processes and disseminates information;
- It organizes meetings and collaborates in joint studies;
- It co-operates with other organizations and institutions,
both national and international, to accomplish its goals.

CEPES est le sigle du
CENTRE EUROPEEN POUR L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPERIEUR.
Il fait partie intégrante du Secrétariat de l'UNESCO et
se trouve à Bucarest. Le Centre a été créé en 1972 afin de
contribuer au développement de l'enseignement supérieur
dans les Etats membres de la région Europe
par la promotion de la coopération internationale
dans ce domaine.
Les activités du CEPES sont:
- la collecte, le traitement et la distribution de l'information;
- l'organisation de réunions et la participation dans
des projets communs;
- la coopération avec d'autres organisations et institutions,
nationales ou internationales,
pour la réalisation de ses objectifs.

95