

DRAFT 25 MAY 2010

THE QUALITY ASSURANCE OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

1. INTRODUCTION

date May 25th 2010
subject
your reference
our reference
annex

In almost all European countries private higher education institutions (PHEI's) form a considerable part of the Higher Education sector. In some countries the number of PHEI's even outnumbers the public HEI's. The reasons for the rise of PHEI's are manifold: in some countries the number of students has grown so hard that the public sector has been unable (maybe even unwilling) to accommodate the enormous number of new students. PHEI's have jumped into this hole and have developed themselves as a necessary part of the sector. In other countries governments explicitly organized competition between public and private HEI's to challenge the public ones to become more responsive and innovative. A closely connected reason for the rise and growth of PHEI's has been the liberal ideology of governments to open up "markets" where educational entrepreneurs have discovered new possibilities. And it is for sure that in the field of lifelong learning the need and the demand for "executive programmes" has become important as a tool for personal development, career possibilities and prestige. A large part of public HEI's are not very well equipped to deal with these requests from an older, more experienced, working student population. A last reason for the success of PHEI's are the possibilities for specialization they deliver: in private higher education the number of "niche players" is relatively large.

In almost all countries, except for Denmark, the ECA-members are confronted with the existence of (a considerable number of) private HEI's. The rules for evaluating or accrediting them or their programmes in general are not different from those for public HEI's (with the exception of Austria and to a lesser extent in Germany), and there doesn't seem to be a legal need to do so. In some countries though quite some experiences with the evaluations of (programmes of) PHEI's have been gained, which throw specific lights on the ways PHEI's function and on some risks in their behaviour. That is the reason why the ECA-partners think it wise to publish a paper with special attention for the risks in evaluating or accrediting these institutions and/or their programmes.

page 2 of 12 After all, one of the goals of the ECA-consortium is to facilitate the development of the European Higher Education Area through the mutual recognition of accreditation decisions. That should mean that not every single decision should be checked by the partners or the recognition authorities, but that partners accept the results from the accreditation systems as a whole. This goal can only be reached through trust in the ways the accreditation decisions are reached: trust in the procedures, trust in the outcomes and thus also trust in the way the accreditation agencies deal with all types of HEI's they are responsible for. From this perspective one should read this paper as an "eye opener", as an overview of theoretical and empirical risks, and thus as a facility to the review committees and the agencies.

In this paper we deal with the specific characteristics of the private higher education sector (chapter 2), with the definition of "private higher education institutions" (chapter 3) and with the diversity of this sector, which has been translated into a number of dimensions to classify the PHEI's (chapter 4). Based on these dimensions we concentrate ourselves on the risks we see in the accreditation or evaluation of the programmes the PHEI's deliver (chapter 5), and in the institutional accreditation or evaluation (chapter 6). We conclude in chapter 7 with recommendations for the QA-agencies in evaluating PHEI's.

2. SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PHEI's

Obviously, it would be interesting to know more about the reasons for the existence and the growth of the PHEI's. But on the other hand, it is not the concern of quality agencies to call into question whether private higher education is desirable or not: they are just part of "quality assurance life": PHEI's are here to stay and it is more important to identify the possible strengths but also the risks and feasible weaknesses involved in order to cope with them adequately.

A caveat however may be necessary: by pointing out the characteristics of the sector we don't intend a value judgement, but we want to underline the importance and the meaning of the sector, in so far as it is contributing to the development of the EHEA and the goals that are set by Bologna- and Lisbon-declarations.

At large we distinguish a number of specific characteristics of PHEI's:

- a. **demand-driven**: quite a number of PHEI's are established because of specific demands from the labour market. Employers, corporations and even governments may have specific wishes for education of their staff, especially after they have been working for a couple of years. Private institutions seem to be more apt to react to these wishes;

- b. **customer-oriented:** since the majority of PHEI's is dependent of all types of private funding and fees, they are more inclined to listen to their students and treat them as customers. The satisfaction of the students with the PHEI's is in general quite large. Of course the PHEI's have to satisfy their "customers", since they might stop their studies or move to another provider. That means a loss of income which might influence the existence of the PHEI;
- c. **innovation:** PHEI's seem to have more possibilities to develop innovative ways of teaching and learning. PHEI's have less trouble with vested interests, which may paralyze innovation. Some experiences suggest that PHEI's are therefore drivers for innovation, both in pedagogical methods and in the content of the programmes;
- d. **other types of students:** a large number of the public HEI's still is mainly directed towards their traditional clientele, young students in the age of 18-25 years. Most of these HEI's have trouble organizing themselves to be able to deliver programmes for other types of students: those that work, that combine jobs and studies, women entering the labour market after their motherhood, etc. PHEI's seem (better) able to respond to the specific wishes of these types of students;
- e. **lifelong learning:** in addition to that, PHEI's seem better inclined to open up to the necessity of lifelong learning. It might be true that students in their initial programmes are taught to develop an attitude of "learning to learn" and "continuous development", but in reality the same HEI's that teach those attitudes are not able to put that in practice. PHEI's are more "lean" and are able to react directly and quick to new questions and demands by offering courses, programmes, trainings, executive courses, modules etc.
- f. **success rates:** in some cases it is striking to see that PHEI's seem more efficient and effective than public HEI's. In quite a number of cases both the number of students that get their degrees and the duration of their periods of study are better than those in the public HEI's. Of course the customer-oriented attitude of the PHEI's will stimulate these results, but the way PHEI's have to take care of their finances might have led to more effective teaching methods as well!

3. DEFINITIONS OF PHEI's

It is probably impossible to find a definition which will cover all different types of private HEI's. It is evident that the legal form of the HEI is not decisive to characterize a HEI as a private one: we see associations, foundations, companies, private persons, even local or regional governments that might be the "owners" of PHEI's and look for the most appropriate legal form in which they will execute their activities.

page 4 of 12 The way the PHEI's are financed is neither decisive. The Austrian private universities, for instance, are not financed by the national government, but may be funded or subsidized by the regional or local governments. In the Netherlands some religious "private HEI's" are not financed but subsidized by the national government, which makes a difference for the legal relationship between the HEI and the government.

It seems therefore necessary to define in each national context separately what (type of) HEI's are defined as private ones. We again give two examples. In the Dutch case the term "private HEI" is used for those HEI's that don't have any financial relation with the government. These HEI's will receive their money through fees, contributions from employers, private money of the owners/entrepreneurs or other ways of private financing. In Austria the term "private university" is used in a strict legal form: it refers to institutions that are not established and governed by federal law, but must be a legal person based in Austria. The right to run a private university must be awarded state recognition by accreditation, and public funding or subsidies have been excluded only on the national federal level, but not on the regional or local level. The difference between only these two definitions is large and proves the difficulty of speaking about "private HEI's" as one type of institutions.

In presenting the different national, legal definitions of private HEI's we will restrict ourselves to those PHEI's that have to be accredited or evaluated by those agencies that are members of ECA. This leads to the following overview:

- Austria : "university", owned by a legal person in Austria and accredited by the Austrian Accreditation Council (AAC). No federal state funding allowed;
- Flanders : "registered" institutions, without public funding. Formal registration takes place through an assessment of the minister of education. Formal registration can take place after initial accreditation by the Dutch Flemish Accreditation Organisation (NVAO);
- France : PHEI may be founded by any EU citizen or association with obligation to submit "notification of existence" to the local rectorate and government authorities. No governmental funding;
- Germany : PHEI's are legal entities according to the laws of the "Land" in which they are established. To be able to grant degrees they need state approval. State approval may only be given after the initial institutional accreditation by the German Council of Science and Humanities (Wissenschaftsrat). No federal state funding, but "Länder"-funding allowed. Programme accreditation by agencies that have been accredited by the German Accreditation Council (GAC);

- page 5 of 12 – Netherlands : legal entities that have been “recognized” by the minister of education after accreditation of a programme by NVAO (quality) and the Inspectorate of Education (formal and legal rules). No state financing. All programmes have to be accredited;
- Poland : legal entity (no national or local authority!), non-public. Registration by minister of education after fulfilment of procedural and financial requirements. No public funding, but subsidies are possible. Extension of the initial registration of 5 years possible after positive assessment by the Polish Accreditation Organisation (PKA). All programmes have to be accredited;
- Spain : legal entities which have to comply with national rules. Most PHEI’s are not funded by the state, but in some cases the state can fund partially some PHEI’s. Institutions have to be authorized by regional governments. The programmes have to be accredited by the Consejo de Universidades which takes into account the reports issued by the agencies with the competences to do so;
- Switzerland : no federal legislation: PHEI’s receive cantonal licenses, no public funding. UoAS (Fachhochschulen) have to be accredited after federal recognition. For universities there exist different rules according to the cantonal legislation.

4. DIMENSIONS OF RELEVANCE AND DIVERSITY

PHEI’s are not only an important part of the whole HE-sector, they also are at least as diverse as public HEI’s are. Some are small, some are very focussed, some are corporations, some are run by churches; others are large, very prestigious, specialized in distance education; others again are broad, regionally oriented, supported by employers. So overall, the diversity is enormous!

In the following, we have tried to distinguish the PHEI’s on a number of dimensions in order to highlight the most relevant aspects, to illustrate the diversity within the sector of private higher education and to provide a basis for a certain type of risk analysis. The number of dimensions we have distinguished is seven.

1. as regards to the financial dimension, there are some specifics on the revenue as well as on the expenditure side of the budget. Some legal frameworks restrict PHEI’s to be strictly financed by non-public resources while in other national contexts, some sort of co-financing by public funding and subsidies is admissible.

With private financing, the amount of tuition fees and their proportion of total revenues might be a sensitive issue as is the case with other sources of financing like private sponsorships, donations or shareholding private firms or specific interest groups. Then again on the expenditure side, we find the PHEI's with a clear "profit" goal and on the other side the HEI's which call themselves "not for profit". Of course all HEI's have to look after their financial continuity, but it might make a huge difference whether financial surpluses will be reinvested in the HEI itself or will help the owner or the shareholders to build up their own fortunes;

2. ownership as a second dimension is as heterogeneous and not at all decisive as is the financial dimension for characterising unambiguously the private sector in higher education: the owners of PHEI's might be private institutions like non-profit associations, private companies or foundations. Quite another significant proportion is run by churches or by associations with a specific religious or ideological conviction (as e.g. in Germany, in the Netherlands and in Spain). And finally, PHEI's in some countries might be even run by the public sector or at least are connected in some way to the federal, state or local government (as, e.g., is the case for some PHEI's in Austria and in Spain).
3. predominantly, and quite similar to the public sector, the private higher education sector shows a great variety in types of institutions. Depending on the legal restrictions in the specific country, the multiplicity is more or less pronounced: Denmark, as an extreme case on the one hand, reports no PHEI at all due to the prohibition of such institutions by law. In other countries, like the Netherlands, Poland, Germany and Switzerland, a wide spectrum of institutional forms is observable: PHEI's may provide academic programmes as (private) universities, universities of applied sciences, schools or institutes or just programme providers. It is obvious that if a PHEI wants to be a university it for sure will have to conduct research, and in the programmes the strong relationship between research and teaching and learning must be present. Does the PHEI want to be a university of applied science (Fachhochschule, hogeschool) it will be important to show the close relationship between the professional field and teaching and learning. That makes a significant and huge difference for the orientation of (the programmes of) the PHEI;
4. a fourth dimension is formed by the level of the programmes, that will be offered. Quite a number of institutions direct themselves only towards bachelor programmes, others are also (or only!) active in the domain of master programmes (with a special emphasis on professional and executive master programmes), and

others are also able to deliver doctorate programmes. Most Dutch PHEI's for instance are not allowed to deliver doctorates, while the Austrian ones – being universities – are in principle able to do so;

5. the fifth dimension refers to the orientation and scope of activities: on the one end of this dimension we find those PHEI's who direct themselves to the international market, either in their academic activities or in the labour market they envisage for their alumni. Some outstanding institutions like “private” business schools might be ambitious and want to play in the highly qualified and competitive league in international research and higher education. In order to direct themselves to the international labour market, the learning outcomes of their programmes will be international in outlook. At the other end we find the PHEI's with a mainly national, regional or even local orientation. The learning outcomes of the programmes of these PHEI's have a different outlook, and will be recognized by and most probably drafted together with representatives from the respective labour market.

6. the sixth dimension is closely linked with the former and takes attention of the type of students, the PHEI wants to attract. Some HEI's are only directed towards foreign students, from a different set of motives: financial-economic, social-cultural or – very simple – noble opinions on “solidarity” or “humanity”. Opposed to these, a large group of PHEI's is only interested in students from the own country, region or city. In order to attract students, innovative teaching methods and programmes on the basis of blended learning or distance learning can be differentiated from on-campus programmes. And some PHEI's even make efforts to establish several branch campuses in the home country or also abroad in order to follow the students instead of the other way around.

Finally, even more important than the previous distinctions might be the distinction between those PHEI's that look for “mature students”, with work experience, or those that look for the “regular students”, those between 18 and 24 years of age;

7. a last dimension we see is the size of the institution and the width of the programmes offered. Some institutions strive for a large palette of programmes, others restrict themselves to one domain or even to one programme! This difference in strategies makes the size of the PHEI's quite different. While the Austrian private university sector and the private higher education sector in Flanders in total count only for some thousands of students, in other countries (in particular, e.g., in the Netherlands, Poland and Spain) PHEI's on their own might have up to 10.000 or even more students! In general, however, there is a tendency towards smaller PHEI's in comparison to the public sector of HE. Notably, in

almost all countries in our sample experiences also revealed some “HEI’s” with only 10 to 50 students! Though this results in a favourable students to faculty ratio, it there again puts the critical mass into question.

In total, the majority of programmes is provided in the field of social sciences, business and law. It seems obvious that this clear dominance can be traced back to commercial considerations: at least such an orientation is able to attract more (solvent) students than other emphases. Additionally, in some countries the scope of programmes offered by PHEI’s is concentrated on this narrow field, while in other countries – like in Austria, France, Poland or Spain – a broad variety of programmes and disciplines is present including humanities and arts, medical science and engineering, manufacturing and construction. Though public financing might contribute to this variety to arise and persist, it is not clear how important this factor is.

5. RISK ANALYSIS FOR PROGRAMME ACCREDITATION/EVALUATION

In making our analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the private HEI-sector we have concentrated on those points we see as major risks in evaluating the quality of the PHEI’s, as the critical elements and not the virtues are most relevant for quality assurance and accreditation. Of course we agree that the PHEI’s should not be evaluated in another way than the other HEI’s, but due to the special situation of the private ones, some specific risks can be identified. These critical elements are assessed on a general basis and it should be kept in mind that there are exceptions and the risks don’t apply to all private institutions: some might be risks which are realistic for (very) small ones, others for those which direct themselves towards the foreign market, others again for those that are private companies owned by shareholders. Based on both, theoretical reasoning and evidence found in ECA countries so far, we have classified the risks on the level of programme accreditation/evaluation in four groups.

- a. a specific and main risk for PHEI’s is the level of the learning outcomes achieved by the students. Both in accreditations and in initial accreditations (and even in the phase before those), there is evidence that the level of the achieved learning outcomes turned out to be rather low. That might have a number of reasons being quite generally related to the financial situation and budgetary restrictions:
 - the policy to keep students in the university because of the fees that the university needs;

- too much emphasis and attention is paid to the satisfaction of the students, while it is not self evident that these are critical towards the level of the programme that is offered to them;
 - too much emphasis and attention is paid to the satisfaction of the employers. While this of course is important in a demand driven situation, not all employers might have the knowledge about the international necessary level of bachelor and master programmes. Sometimes they might be over - enthusiast about the skills and attitude of the students and therefore don't pay enough attention to the knowledge-part of the programmes;
 - a lack of critical attitude of the teachers themselves, because of "ignorance" or a lack in theoretical knowledge, which is thought to be compensated by their thorough knowledge of the professional field. That might and will be true in certain circumstances, but certainly not in all types of programmes! This will be shown clearly in those circumstances where the suitable qualification and competences have to be accredited by a quality assurance agency (as it is, e.g., mandatory for teachers in PHEI's in Spain).
- b. a second risk is related to the way the PHEI's execute their marketing. In order to attract students there are incentives to advertise attractive study conditions and obviously it is critical whether these promises hold. In some cases there are publicised rather unrealistic lengths of the courses and students are told to receive dispensation for parts of the courses due to "work" or even "life" experiences. If the results of these PHEI's are analyzed some striking examples can be found of extremely low numbers of students who actually succeeded in finishing the programme in the time the PHEI promised.
- c. a third and serious risk is caused by the necessity of the private HEI's in spending their money. Of course this problem exists in almost all HEI's, but might be more risky in those circumstances where owners (or shareholders) want a short term return on their investments. Problems that might arise and examples that exist are:
- the quantity and quality of the staff, especially in those circumstances where staff consists of "flying faculty": the flexibility due to the changing number of students often leads to very small contracts, which gives a problem for the coherence in courses and programmes. In a number of PHEI's only a very small part of one person's contract is devoted to supervising and coordinating the overall coherence of a programme;
 - the quantity and quality of the provisions: a library or access to well developed libraries of other universities seems necessary as well a sufficient number of other facilities, like computers;

- the pedagogical system is not always adequate to accomplish the goals of the programmes (the intended learning outcomes). Too often the students are considered to be “independent” and – to a certain extent – to find their way in the materials offered! In addition, courses on a distance learning basis are attractive for students and on a financial basis but might lack the adequate pedagogical concept, staff and technical support.

- d. a fourth and last risk we see is the admission policy of new students in some private HEI's. Due to a number of reasons (mainly, but not only financial!) students which are not enough qualified seem sometimes to be admitted to the PHEI's. That of course is a reason for problems: the “level” of the classroom might become too low or too diverse to reach the intended learning outcomes.

6. RISK ANALYSIS FOR INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION/EVALUATION

We have also tried to make a risk analysis for the accreditation or evaluation on the level of the institution as a whole. This type of risks is especially relevant for the Austrian context, since the ÖAR has to accredit institutions (and the programmes as well), but might be relevant for other countries and organizations as well as a contextual variable. We have also distinguished some specific categories of risk:

- a. the first one is the possible lack of financial possibilities for achieving the level of education and research that is needed. There are examples where one comes across absolutely minimal levels of staff and facilities, and this diagnosis is even aggravated by the tendency to open new branch campuses at home and abroad;

- b. the second and very serious risk is the lack of interest in “academic performance”: the staff is only supposed to deliver its part of the educational programme and will not have any possibility for development, doing research, keeping up with the standards and developments in the academic and/or professional fields. This is both a long term and a short term risk for the quality of the programmes;

- c. lack of interest in the necessary “academic freedom”: private HEI's may be free in choosing their own way of organization. Certainly in those circumstances where “profit” is the main *raison d'être*, there is little room for discussion, for keeping up academic standards, for finding a balance between the managerial goals and the academic performance. But so much the worse, academic freedom might not only be threatened by commercial reasons, but also when the independence in

academic affairs is hindered by religious or ideological considerations and particular interests of the owners of the PHEI;

- d. a lacking “academic culture” because of the small size of the institution: in some cases the size of the staff is simply too small to be able to speak of a “higher education institution”. The phenomena of ‘flying faculty’ and ‘moonlighting’, with the staff having multiple jobs at different institutions and places are connected with this diagnosis. Although the learning outcomes and also the results of this type of institution or programme might be valid, the size of the institution forms an extra risk, which should be taken into account. This is one of the reasons why the Austrian colleagues ask for a revised basic governmental regulation on the institutional organization;
- e. the academic culture might also be lacking due to the way participation of students, staff and external stakeholders has been organized. Some “owners” of private institutions don’t seem interested at all in establishing a culture which is apt for enhancement or improving the quality of the programmes, the research or the facilities for students and staff.

7. RECOMMENDATION FOR THE QA AGENCIES

We hope that our short note makes sufficiently clear that it might be worthwhile in evaluating HEI’s or their programmes, to take notice of the special characteristics of private HEI’s. We don’t think it to be necessary to make special “regulations” for this type of HEI’s (at least on the programme level), but it seems wise to share some recommendations for the evaluation. After all, also this type of HEI’s and their programmes might be the subject of mutual recognition of qualifications, accreditation results or even degrees. Our responsibility makes it therefore necessary to pay attention to all kind of pitfalls that may threaten the validity of our work and the quality of teaching and learning. Our recommendations are:

- a. define the status of the private HEI and pay attention to the internal organization and the way quality assurance (which supposes “an open mind and a critical attitude”) has been organized and functions;
- b. consider carefully and especially how independence in academic affairs is ensured;
- c. be aware of the financial situation of the institution by asking for the budget and the report of an external revisor (if obliged by law);

- d. talk to an “at random” composed delegation of staff and students in order to check whether the conditions for an “academic culture and attitude” are present and protected;
- e. give through attention to the coherence of the programmes;
- f. check (the consequences of) the quantity and quality of staff;
- g. give special attention to the presence and the quality of the facilities;
- h. give extensive attention to the intended learning outcomes and certainly to the achieved learning outcomes. Opinions of employers are important, but a check by peers on the level of the achieved learning outcomes seems necessary;
- i. in the panel that evaluates the (programmes of the) private HEI at least one “expert” on this type of institutions, should be present. This makes for an extra legitimization towards these HEI's and the external world;
- j. check extensively on the legal conditions of the HEI's and on the particular institution's mission in order to understand fully what the tasks of the HEI should be according to the law and the ambition of the HEI itself!