With the support of the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Union

„Identifying Barriers in Promoting the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at Institutional Level“

IBAR

Agreement number – 2010 – 4663/001 - 001

WP6

Quality and Access

National study – Czech Republic

2011

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Project "Identifying barriers in promoting European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at institutional level" (IBAR)

National study: Quality and access (WP 6)

Czech Republic

Authors: Jan Kohoutek, Josef Beneš

Project "Identifying barriers in promoting European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at institutional level" (IBAR)

I. Policy context

The major post-1989 changes made in progression from the Communist-Party governed to democratic higher education entailed systemic de-politisation and liberalisation (Cerych 1997). While the former referred to the removal of the ideological control and bias of the system including preferential treatment of students of workers' origin, the latter entailed changes in sectoral governance. These changes were represented by re-taking academic freedoms institutionally and removing systemically ideology-led barriers to access. In line with the stipulations of the HE Act of 1990, this meant abolition of the set quota for student admissions (numerus clausus). Hence, the only *legal* requirement for access to higher education was passing the secondary school leaving examination (SSLE). From 1992 onwards study places became funded on the formula-basis, with the aim to gradually work it up to objective measures of higher education funding and stimulate rise in student enrolments (Turner 1994).

As far as access to higher education was concerned in practical terms, entrance examinations, also in existence under Communism, were retained at HEIs. This was seen necessary at the time to cope with post-1989 keen demand for higher education studies, outstripping limited institutional capacities. The unsaturated demand could not be offset by private higher education provision, as private higher education was seen with a good dose of scepticism in the 1990s (Van der Wende, Westerheijden 2003), and disallowed legally till 1999 when the new HE Act of 1998 was passed (still valid these days).

Despite the limitations of the reviving economy (slump in the GDP in the early 1990s), the number of HE entrants rose steadily in the 1990s and even more so in the last decade, thus nearly tripling between 1990 and 2010 (see Table 1). The same trend applies to HE students, with the student numbers in 2010 more than three times higher compared to 1990. The number of HE graduates then shows more than a five fold increase since 1990 (also due to the effects of the introduction of the Bologna BA/MA study structure).

Table 1 **Participation in higher education**

Cat./Year	**1990**	**1995**	**2000**	**2005**	**2010**
Entrants	27 507	42 711	44 673	83 551	108 906
Students	*115 072*	*145 148*	*201 818*	*289 551*	*396 307*
Graduates	15 318	19 017	28 235	44 342	87 941

Numbers of students in Czech higher education by the type of a degree programme are given in Table 2. These data allow for several comparative observations. Up to the late 2000s, a clearly dominant type of programme studied was 5-6 year Master programme ("Long Master"), which was the traditional and the only type of higher education studies under Socialism. The attempts to diversify higher education study offer in the 1990s largely failed, also due to an ill-definition of a Bachelor degree programme as an integral part of higher education studies (the Act of 1990, § 21). It must be pointed out that this concept of Bachelor studies had nothing to do with the Bologna BA/MA template and the rationale behind it.

Table 2 **Higher education enrolments 1990-2010**

Programme/year	1990	1995	2000	2005	2010
Bachelor	x	34 414	36 335	154 045	248 187
Master (2-year)	x	x	x	23 972	86 284
Long Master (5/6-year)	115 072	102 475	149 253	93 453	40 762
Doctoral	n/a	8 259	16 230	22 313	25 993
Total	**115 072**	**145 148**	**201 818**	**289 551**	**396 307**

On-site	96 375	126 353	167 612	223 205	283 486
Distance/combined	18 693	18 795	34 206	68 710	117 097

The start and progress of the Bologna process exerted pressure on diversification of the degree programme structure of Czech higher education. Proclamation of the setting up of the Bologna system of degrees based on three cycles contributed to the passing of the 2001 Amendment to the Act of 1998. The 2001 Amendment made the Bologna three-cycle system of studies (BA/MA/PhD) obligatory, keeping the Long Master programmes only as exception bound to the standpoint of the Accreditation Commission in some of fields of study (typically, medicine, veterinary medicine, law). The restructuring along the lines of the Bologna template bore on the characteristics of HE programmes on offer. The mid and late 2000s were thus characterised by significant increases of enrolments into Bachelor and 2-year Master programmes. Hence, between 2000 and 2010, the number of Bachelor students went up nearly seven times, and the number of students in 2-year Masters by 86,284 (100%). Correspondingly, the number of students in Long Masters went down by 73% during the last decade. The positive effects of the restructuring process are, to a large extent, offset by the fact that about 85% of Bachelor graduates do continue their higher education studies in 2-year Masters.

Turning one's attention to the rates of entry shows that the entry rate was 17.1% in 1990, dropping to 16.6% in 1991, but rising in subsequent years to reach 52.3% of the 19-year-old cohort in 2007 (Prudký, Pabian, and Šima 2010). Applying Trow's concept, we can conclude that between 1990-2007, Czech higher education went full circle from the borderline between the elite phase and the mass phase to universal higher education (ibid.). These far-reaching changes in characteristics of student population entering HEIs did also affect admission proceedings – as a rule, admission to engineering, and natural science-oriented programmes is either based on the SSLE results or free, while some form of entrance examination has been kept for medicine, law, languages, and humanities. Last but not least, as the communist regime did not put up any noteworthy barriers to women's access to higher education, concerns of equity of access by applicant's gender were not considered a policy issue in the 1990s, gaining somewhat greater weight in HE policy-making in the 2000s (Baštová et al. 2006). The same can be said about equity of access of applicants from lower socio-economic groups.

The above-mentioned developments point to a significant quantitative expansion of the sector with total enrolments more than tripling in the last two decades, which has no parallel in modern history of Czech higher education. Under this quantitative expansion, the student/teacher ratio nearly doubled, rising from 10.1 in 1993 to 19.3 in 2009. Private HEIs, allowed since 1999 and charging tuition fees (non-existent at public HEIs), develop dynamically and currently register about 15% of the total enrolments. Overall, the current situation is characterised by mounting concerns about the drop in quality of tuition as well as graduates' knowledge, skills, and abilities under the universal access to higher education studies.

II. Methodology

Formulation of responses to the research questions for WP6 necessitated the use of document analysis and secondary data analysis. Document analysis centred mostly on plans of institutional development for the 2011-2015 period. Secondary data were mined from the respective institutional information systems and national databases (especially the national Student Register). Moreover, 23 actors at different positions at four HEIs under study, i.e. members of institutional top and mid-level management (vice rectors, deans, vice-deans),

academic staff members, administrative staff members and students, were interviewed to get a fuller picture of the situation. All selected actors were of the capacity to clarify several issues that cropped up during the document analysis, especially with regard to answering questions no. 1, 3, 5, 7. Last but not least, given the non-existence of the corresponding ESG Part 1 standard, the barriers indetified in the study should be considered as potential only.

III. Answering the research questions

1. *What is the institutional policy on access? To what extent does your institutional policy align with national policy? How is information made available to the secondary sector?*

As one of the first Czech public HEIs, Institution A has institutionalised an open access policy. Under it, no entrance examinations are held and applicants are admitted on the basis of their secondary school results including SSLE. This approach is adhered to in the institutional long-term plan for 2011-2015[1], the part of which aims at creating equal conditions and removing all inequities in access for students of any nationality or ethnicity. Quite similar statements can be found in the Ministry's long-term plan of higher education development for 2011-2015. Though instrumental in securing temporary increases in student enrolments in the mid 2000s (especially the number of entrants, which was again in line with the then national policy), the open-access policy at Institution A suffers by the minimal interest of applicants in chemistry-oriented studies. Generally, this makes Institution A "a second choice institution" to which only less than a half of the admitted actually get enrolled. A related negative factor is a high drop-out rate, reaching as high as 50%[2]. Coupled with unfavourable demographic situation suggesting an overall decrease in 19-23 year-old cohort till 2020, and demanding characteristics of chemistry studies as such, Institution A finds itself in a situation in which the open-access policy is not enough and additional measures have to be implemented.

The corresponding measures entail promotion and marketing of chemistry studies also in close cooperation with selected secondary schools. To this end, Institution A especially makes use of the following instruments: articles in popular press; distribution of promotional materials (booklets, leaflets and the like); special promotional projects (e.g. POPUCH – popularisation of chemistry studies); organisation of open days (twice a year), summer schools, lessons in modern chemistry, special laboratory tuition at selected secondary schools (7 schools in 2010), nationwide "Olympics in Chemistry" for gifted secondary school students (held since 1966, under aegis of Institution A from 2010); participation in GAUDEAMUS (annual nationwide fair of HE study opportunities) and in the Day of Science at Prague Universities (one day promotional event held every year). Most of these activities are funded from the Development Programmes of the Ministry or special grants. Importantly, Institution A takes steps to combat little study interest and high drop-out rates by:

- widening the study offer by Bachelor programmes enjoying greater general popularity, such as Restoration of works of art, Production of medicines, or Criminology;

[1] Major strategic policy document made every five years on a mandatory basis.

[2] The evidence obtained from automatic register points (turnstiles) suggests that a large part of students never even enters the respective buildings. Their drop-out is therefore quite likely to be premeditated (no intention to finish the studies at the time of admittance to studies) and enrolments to the first year made only for the sake of obtaining a claim for social benefits and payments of social and health insurance by the state.

- test in maths and chemistry at the beginning of the first semester of studies to cluster students according to their abilities and modify their study paths accordingly;
- close cooperation with selected secondary schools to make studies of chemistry more popular among prospective students (lessons in modern chemistry, special laboratory tuition, see above);
- opening of branch-off study centres in Velebudice and Tábor, which widen enrolment and study opportunities for those from local population who would be unlikely to take up on-site chemistry studies in Prague.

Hence, the range of instruments used for implementing the access policy at Institution A is fairly broad given the Czech standards. The setting-up of the institutional guidance and counselling centre (possibly with localised offices at faculties) might, however, be further instrumental for reducing the drop-out rates. The access policy of Institution A broadly follows the corresponding national policy lines as set in the Ministry's Long-term Plan for 2011-2015. Nonetheless, the institutional responses voiced significant reservations about system-level strategic policy documents other than the newest Long-term Plan of the Ministry[3]. The reservations concerned clarity and consistency of these documents, especially in view of the multiplicity of goals and still rather artificial support, i.e. "words only", of technology and chemistry oriented HE studies that reaches out beyond the higher education sector itself. Also, open criticism of the Bologna BA/MA study structure was made in terms of distribution of theory- and practice-based courses between the first and second cycle, as well as, to some extent, graduate employability.

Similarly as Institution A, the policy of Institution B on access is part of the text of the institutional long-term plan for 2011-2015. In it, Institution B declares the following policy goals:

> The estimate is that in 2015 a number of the newly admitted will reach approximately 4,000 for Bachelor programmes; 1,000 for long Masters, 2,500 for 2-year Masters, and 500 for doctoral studies. The estimated total student numbers will be 20,000. The aim is to increase the number of doctoral students to 10% of total student enrolments.

The enrolments figures rose continuously at Institution B in the last decade. The continuously rising enrolments in the 2000s were, to a large extent, made possible by incremental increases in state subsidisation of educational activities of public HEIs that publicly funded Institution B complied with and made use of. As the present day total enrolments at Institution B (21,935 for the academic year 2010/11) are about 10% higher than the 2015 estimate, in practical terms this may mean a corresponding reduction in five years' time. More concretely, the expected enrolments into Bachelor and long Master programmes, reaching 4,000, respectively 1,000, will have to be decreased by about 8% (currently 5,400 enrolled students in total). Conversely, steps will have to be taken to increase the ratio of doctoral enrolments to the total enrolments from the current 7.4% to the set 10%. The measures to be taken will also have to account for the comparatively below-average ratio between the admitted and the actually enrolled, reaching 48% in the mid-term perspective. The information on study possibilities at Institution B, including access conditions diversified by the faculty and field of study, are mediated via the institutional websites. No special measures targeted at the secondary sector (individual secondary schools) have been found.

Technically-oriented institution C has its access policy based on the following facets:

[3] Such as the White Paper for Tertiary Education, made in 2009.

- holding entrance examinations for all students at all faculties[4], including written tests plus aptitude tests in case of artistic and architecture studies;
- achievement of adequate but steady increases in total enrolments to reach the target level 25,000 [currently 22,200] with
- a special attention paid to the recruitment of applicants from other HEIs;
- extension of the range of study fields offered still ensuring graduate employability;
- improvement of the institutional image by presenting itself by modern institution also offering interdisciplinary and artistic studies;
- support and recruitment of especially talented students;
- development of *effective* cooperation with selected primary and secondary schools to increase study motivation of potentially prospective candidates for study;
- improvements of study conditions for students with special needs (lower socio-economic backgrounds, handicapped and the like).

These policy facets are, to a large extent, part of the institutional long-term plan for 2011-2015. In the main, they accord with the system-level policy lines. Despite the general trend of slowly increasing enrolments into technically-oriented studies in the Czech Republic, Institution C, offering predominantly technically-oriented degree programmes, has no such problem. Overall, the institutional access policy manifests in long-term increases in the number of applicants as well as total enrolments. The average completion rate at Institution C reaches 80%, thus exceeding the averages of other Czech HEIs with a similar profile.

The key towards such a successful policy lies in advanced cooperation with selected secondary schools, in recruitment of students from other HEIs into 2-year Masters, and in combining managerial and academic lines of responsibility (see questions no. 5 and 6). The cooperation with selected secondary schools (40-50 institutions in total, both grammar schools and secondary professional schools) entails a regular information exchange between academic staff of Institution C and secondary teaching staff. The information exchange results in modifications of the content and ways of delivery of selected study subjects at the secondary level (maths, physics, chemistry). Regular visits of Institution C teams at secondary schools, including not just academic staff members but also the respective university students doing presentations and promotions, take place every year in the autumn period.

The approach of Institution D is underlain by its status of a private HEI, which entitles it to the collection of tuition fees as the only major source of funding. Student enrolments are therefore closely monitored by institutional management. Although it might be in institution's interest to pursue continuous expansion in student numbers to increase the institutional funding base, in reality the policy of Institution D is moderate and quality (not quantity) oriented. The minimal manageable level of total student enrolments, declared in the institutional long-term plan for 2011-2015, has been set to 5,000. The corresponding policy development goal is to maintain the enrolments at the level of 5,500. The average acceptance rate is 77%, which compares favourably to other private HEIs (average acceptance rate 94%), and makes Institution D rather selective (on par in comparison to public HEIs providing studies of economics). The quality-oriented access policy of Institution D broadly corresponds to the national policy lines, though the latter have been rather changeable and hard to interpret recently (see above). Institution D is part of the School Union, comprising also 8-year grammar school, secondary school of economics and tertiary professional school of economics. Given that fact, it can be concluded that inter-institutional passage of information on study possibilities at Institution D within the union is maintained (information to other

[4] Can be dropped only for students with outstanding secondary study results.

secondary schools is given through the website of Institution D). Moreover, advertisements of Institution D in daily press, primarily aimed at student recruitment, can also be considered a communication channel to wider public, including the secondary sector.

2. *What data do you collect on offers/enrolments/non-completion/graduates? Within the student profile of your institution, can you disaggregate this data to provide information on different cohorts (e.g. mature learners, learners with disabilities, different ethnic groups)?*

Generally, data for HE statistics are collected at system and institutional level. In both cases, their collection and storage (in electronic institutional registers and the National Student Register) must follow the legal requirements of the Act on Personal Data Protection, which disallows gathering, processing, and storage of data on personal disability/ties, ethnicity, and religious belief. Hence, in terms of data availability, the groups for which the corresponding data exist for HEIs in CR are *women* and *foreign students*. The latter can be disaggregated into the first enrolled and graduates (see Tables 3-6).

Table 3 **Institution A: Students according to nationality and gender 2000-2010**

Year	CZ + foreign		Czech			Foreign		
	Students Total	Women	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates
2000			2804			69		
2001			2911			77		
2002			2859			89		
2003	3130	1667	3029	670	431	101	17	10
2004	3780	2083	3627	957	410	153	50	9
2005	3730	2060	3547	916	355	183	63	15
2006	3973	2247	3727	897	462	246	94	13
2007	3858	2205	3599	775	774	259	82	27
2008	3817	2177	3506	703	846	311	96	38
2009	3664	2110	3355	597	859	304	83	59
2010	3647	2099	3314	702	775	333	86	56

Table 4 **Institution B: Students according to nationality and gender 2000-2010**

Year	CZ + foreign		Czech			Foreign		
	Students Total	Women	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates
2000			12372			617		
2001			13089			715		
2002			14039			824		
2003	15857	10431	14925	2871	2065	932	185	57
2004	16684	11151	15615		2250	1069		71
2005	17144	11716	15899	3184	2391	1245	342	114
2006	18887	13039	17564	3699	2806	1323	296	177
2007	19504	13533	18147	3623	3116	1357	296	233
2008	20250	14233	18936	3532	3368	1314	211	235
2009	21290	15000	19928	3748	3922	1362	229	228
2010	21935	15300	20603	3748	4455	1332	228	287

Table 5 **Institution C: Students according to nationality and gender 2000-2010**

Year	CZ + foreign		Czech			Foreign		
	Students Total	Women	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates
2000			16523			343		
2001			14702			392		
2002			15249			508		
2003	17582	3244	17017	3997	2414	565	84	45
2004	18626	3606	17672	3679	2569	954	382	46
2005	20080	3966	18840	4219	2724	1240	432	137
2006	20736	4270	19374	4105	3620	1362	337	172
2007	20932	4348	19349	3936	4064	1583	399	274
2008	21176	4568	19315	3894	4979	1861	404	305
2009	21695	4884	19620	3683	4687	2075	534	464
2010	22211	5115	19755	3655	4795	2456	691	445

Table 6 **Institution D: Students according to nationality and gender 2000-2010**

Year	CZ + foreign		Czech			Foreign		
	Students Total	Women	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates	Students Total	First Enrolled	Graduates
2000			330			8		
2001			765			21		
2002			1242			31		
2003								
2004								
2005								
2006	4176	2204	4034	940	1081	142	55	17
2007	4421							
2008	5272	2835	4953	974	1299	319	115	33
2009	5610	3029	5190	800	1498	420	109	57
2010	5547	2937	5010	595	1458	537	110	49

The data analysis shows that average ratio of total female students to total student population at Institution A, B, C, and D reaches 56.2%, 68.9%, 20.1%, and 53.4% respectively. This points to a fairly high number of females studying chemistry-oriented study fields at Institution A (though it may be their "second choice") compared to just over 20% of female students out of the total student population taking up technically-oriented programmes at Institution C. The ratio in question at Institution D, i.e. 53.4%, comes closest to the systemic average, reaching 54.3%. As regards the average ratio of total foreign students to total student population at selected HEIs, the corresponding percentages are: 6.4% (Institution A), 6.5% (Institution B), 7.4% (Institution C), and 6.9% (Institution D). It should be pointed out that circa three quarters of these students come from Slovakia (Institution A, B, C) or from the former Soviet Union countries (Institution D).

With regard to the 19-27 student cohort[5], the data that are allowed to be collected include:

- newly enrolled;
- students;
- students interrupting studies;
- graduates;
- drop-out students;
- completion rate.

[5] Also including PhD students.

All these data can be disaggregated by the type of institution. *The data on the newly enrolled, students and graduates* are also regularly disaggregated by the type of degree programme[6]. All these disaggregations can be done from the year 2001[7], the time when the National Student Register, to which individual HEIs are obliged to send the data from their databases, was set up. Electronisation of the access agenda both at HEIs and at the state level was in its initial stage of development in the 1990s, hence only some of the data (newly enrolled, students, graduates) are available for HEIs surveyed for this period[8] (see Annex, Tables 1-3). These data attest to rises in new enrolments as well as in student and graduate numbers, except small-sized Institution A, where these numbers were rather stagnant in the 1990s. Disagregation of the data in question by nationality (Czech, foreign) for the period of the 1990s is possible and suggests that the highest number of foreign students had shifted from technically-oriented Institution C (315 foreign students in 1991) to comprehensive Institution B (318 foreign students in 1995). Nonetheless, the inter-institutional differences remain quite small and thus insignificant statistically.

The disaggregation of the aforementioned data on the 19-27 cohort, covering the 4 selected HEIs for the 2000-2010 period, is available in Tables 7-10.

Table 7 **Institution A, 19-27 cohort**

Total/year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Newly enrolled		825	660	807	1412	1310	1277	1132	1072	962	1112
Students	2654	2759	2755	2955	3484	3620	3865	3850	3817	3657	3647
Student interruptions	77	94	64	58	108	92	74	76	66	85	119
Graduates		465	488	434	419	377	475	804	885	920	831
Drop-outs		356	340	343	537	853	659	782	729	712	705
Completion rate		0.566	0.589	0.559	0.438	0.307	0.419	0.507	0.548	0.564	0.541

Table 8 **Institution B, 19-27 cohort**

Total/year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Newly enrolled		3402	3625	3979	4369	4726	5696	5803	5706	6275	6312
Students	12287	12918	13798	14790	15775	16656	18312	19506	20235	21271	21935
Student interruptions	337	361	422	389	527	650	691	777	845	821	772
Graduates		1877	1767	2116	2315	2506	2984	3349	3604	4150	4742
Drop-outs		897	931	1010	1091	1264	1334	1659	1888	1818	2107
Completion rate		0.677	0.655	0.677	0.680	0.665	0.691	0.669	0.656	0.695	0.692

Table 9 **Institution C, 19-27 cohort**

Total/year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Newly enrolled		4244	4233	5399	5670	6089	5930	6101	6085	5824	6200
Students	15928	14202	14879	16704	17631	19378	20107	20889	21165	21692	22211
Student interruptions	275	245	252	301	294	329	391	378	399	406	463
Graduates		2100	2306	2456	2621	2867	3797	4352	5285	5152	5240
Drop-outs		4353	1751	1868	2736	2470	2726	2841	3096	3132	3135
Completion rate		0.325	0.568	0.568	0.489	0.537	0.582	0.605	0.631	0.622	0.626

Table 10 **Institution D, 19-27 cohort**

Total/year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Newly enrolled		492	560	813	1171	1165	1550	1531	1752	1667	1469
Students	331	754	1208	1925	2713	3428	4084	4725	5274	5609	5547

[6] More detailed disaggregations, e.g. by the dropt-out rates in individual programmes and also courses, are possible, but these are not readily available and would have to be paid for.
[7] With study interruptions already available for 2000.
[8] Private Institution D was founded in 1999, so data for the period of 1990s are logically not available.

Student interruptions	2	23	36	52	73	110	104	119	152	191	241
Graduates		0	0	0	351	384	1099	1096	1332	1555	1507
Drop-outs		46	91	75	234	251	252	257	337	396	555
Completion rate		0	0	0	0.6	0.605	0.814	0.810	0.798	0.797	0.731

Expectably, the data for all 4 HEIs show steady increases in the newly enrolled, students, and to a significant extent, graduates, which is in line with the overall system progression to the universal access to higher education. Disaggregations of the newly enrolled, students and graduates by the type of degree programme for 4 analysed HEIs are given in the Annex (Tables 4-26). The statistics annexed also cover the completion rates and rates of admission to 2-year Masters sorted out by individual HEI. Taken as a whole, the data show steady increases in enrolments into Bachelor and two-year Masters and decreases in enrolments into long Masters (reaching zero at Institution A, respectively 4 students at Institution C, in 2010). These developments have been in line with the state policy and the Bologna BA/MA template. However, these have been, to some extent, "forced upon" the institutions by the formula funding of study places.

Furthermore, several observations for the 2000-2010 period, based on institutional comparisons of Institutions A, B, C, D, can be made. First, total 2010 completion rates range from 73% at Institution D to 54% at Institution A. Technically-oriented Institution C fares better than chemistry-oriented Institution A by about 10% on average, which nears Institution C to comprehensive Institution B. As suggested previously, the average completion rate of circa 73% makes private Institution D still rather selective and demanding in overall study requirements, especially when compared other private HEIs with completion rates as high as 90%. Second, comparisons of the rates of admission to 2-year Masters show that Institutions C and D, whose rates exceed 100%, succeed in taking on students from other HE institutions. Expectably again, taken by the type of programme, in case of all four HEIs, the lowest completion rates are attributable to doctoral study programmes. However, the completion rate in Bachelor programmes in Institution A, reaching about 40% in the last four years, are certainly of notice as well of concern. To combat this problem, apart from a range of measures described under its institutional policy on access[9], Institution A also did a special development project, but the reversion of the trend described can be expected to take place in the mid-term perspective only.

As regards the collection of the above type of data, no principal problems have been found in case of the 19-27 cohort at selected HEIs. This finding can be made general given the fact that all HEIs are obligated to collect these data in an aggregated way by set rules, store the data in the National Student Register[10], and make them available to the Ministry. However, as a rule and corroborated by findings at Institution A, B, C, as well as, to a lesser extent D, *HEIs annually further disaggregate these data by individual categories for their own statistical purposes* (monitoring of development trends including BA/MA study structure, correlations and relations). The same applies to the Institute for Information on Education, processing the data for the respective national statistics. As to the category of foreign students, they can be disaggregated by the type of a degree programme. Nonetheless, *this disaggregation is not done* either by HEIs surveyed or the Institute for Information on Education and would have to be paid for on special request.

[9] See pages 4-5.

[10] The only exception to this obligation applies to private HEIs not obtaining any public subsidies for accommodation and social scholarships via the Ministry of Education (*very rare and not the case of* private Institution D).

For mature students, e.g. students in LLL courses, statistics are typically available for organisations units within individual HEIs (different classifications used, also applicable to Institution A, B, C) and subsequently clustered by the Ministry Department of Higher Education. This data handling suggests a likelihood of low internal validity of the outputs that find their way into the annual reports of the Ministry on higher education as well as into institutional annual reports on activities.

3. What is done to support the admission and progression of distinct cohorts of students? How does this vary by academic programme?

In the policy context section, it is suggested that attention to removing barriers in inequality of access (incl. students with disabilities and students from lower socio-economic groups) rose during the last decade system wide. The major type of support, *that analysed HEIs make use of in their organisational arrangements*, entails:

a) social scholarships: allotment based on the living standard of a student family, i.e. parents' wages (1,620 CZK per student/month).

In addition, to enhance enrolments of distinct cohorts of students, analysed HEIs also provide three types of sholarships[11]. These are:

b) accommodation subsidy: allotted to students with the permanent place of residence outside the location of a given HEI (circa 580 CZK per student/month);
c) doctoral scholarships: for doctoral students in the on-site mode of study (8,900 CZK per student/month);
d) merit-based scholarships: allotted for outstanding study results.

All these allowances are provided per head. Hence, there is no variation by degree programme in principle[12]. Allowances a)-b) are allotted from the state HE budgetary chapter and channelled to individual claimants through HEIs they study at (regardless the type of HEI they study at). Doctoral scholarships (c) are allotted to the respective students at public HEIs only, following their entry into the programme; hence private Institution D is not entitled to this kind of support. Overall, in 2011, the measures a)-c) for supporting distinct student cohorts make up for circa 10% of the total state subsidy for higher education (out of which circa 5% is channelled through doctoral scholarships). Detailed conditions of obtaining merit-based scholarships at 4 analysed HEIs are stipulated in *Scholarship Regulations* valid for the whole institution (hence, there are not special faculty by-regulations). To make an example, in the academic year 2009/2010, Institution D allotted 800,000 CZK for merit-based scholarships (funds obtained through sponsors, sales of merchandise, rental profits and the like). Moreover, at Institution A, C, and D a student can apply for a special scholarship if he/she finds himself in social distress (one-time allowance).

As to students with disabilities (special needs), they are entitled to certain social allowances based on the type of affliction. However, these are not associated with the HE student status. Nonetheless, public HEIs *can* use financial support from the Development Programmes of the Ministry to fund activities aimed at reducing access and study barriers of the handicapped on a mid-term basis (up to 5-years). This is done by comprehensive Institution B. Although reflecting on students with special needs in the long-term plans,

[11] Though these types of scholarships are also available to HE students that do not belong to any of the distinct (disadvantaged) groups.
[12] Although it is obviously possible to cover e.g. numbers of merit scholarships per degree programme at a given organisational level (typically faculty), these statistics are not created and left to the discretion of faculty staff.

technology and chemistry-oriented Institution A and C are less active in this respect, largely because of minimal number of the enrolled with disabilities. Hence the very character of the study field (such as chemistry including a high amount of laboratory tuition) *can also* work as a barrier to access and progression (in connection with safety, security, and hygienic reasons). Still, for students with disabilities, chemistry-oriented Institution A offers programme and course modifications so that special needs of these students would be accounted for.

Financial support through the Development Programmes for students with disabilities is mostly used for building alternations (barrier-free access), purchase of special equipment and literature, creation of study supports according to the type of affliction, and personal assistants. Importantly, the relevant financial support is also used for setting up and running of the guidance and counselling centres. These centres are operational at Institution B and C, the latter also providing LLL-oriented services.

Although private Institution D is not entitled to this kind of systemic support for the disabled, it finances the corresponding activities for their own sources. The activities especially entail securing barrier-free access to all buildings. In the academic year 2009/2010, Institution D allotted 155,000 CZK for direct support to two students with disabilities. Students are entitled to indicate the type of affliction in the application form.

4. *How has the pattern of enrolments changed in the last decade (by academic programme/cohort)? What are perceived to be the main drivers of change?*

As suggested in Section 2, the pattern of enrolment in the last decade at 4 analysed HEIs is characterised by steady increases of enrolments into Bachelor and 2-year Master programmes, as well as correspondingly, steady decreases of enrolments into long Masters. This pattern is most visible in case of Institution B with BA-enrolments as well as student numbers almost doubling between 2000 and 2010. The respective increases can, however, also be identified in case of Institution A and C. The skyrocketing enrolment numbers at Institution D – overall increase by 299% for the period in question (222% for admission to Bachelor programmes) – testify to the expansion of private HE provision after 1999. By all means, the major driver of change is diversification by programme represented by implementation of the Bologna BA/MA template. However, it must be pointed out that the ratio of admission to 2-year Masters, averaging out at the level of 85%, attests strongly to this implementation being rather formal. The second major driver is sectoral massification, made possible by modifications of the mechanism of funding study places (formula funding), and the growth of private HE provision legally enabled since 1999. More specifically, the corresponding measures at institutional level entailed re-structuring study offer in line with the BA/MA template as well as dropping entrance examinations completely (Institution A). Overall, these developments lead to a more diversified student population as regards student expectations, needs, knowledge, skills, and abilities, to which HEIs, including 4 analysed ones, react by widening their study offer (range of programmes, portfolio of courses). Relatedly, third, enrolment patterns at 4 analysed HEIs are to be affected by the demographic decrease within the 19-27cohort till the years 2020-2025. This means the ratio of mature students in the total HE student population is expected to rise in the long-term perspective. Finally, the implementation of a unified, state-guaranteed secondary school leaving examination system, starting 2011, may also have an impact on enrolments patterns in the mid- and long-term perspective.

5. *Have any of these developments altered the approach to the way that your university manages quality?*

Sectoral massification along with programme diversification as two major change factors did alter institutional approaches to quality management – but *unevenly*, taken the sample of 4 analysed HEIs. The approach of Institution A entailed institutionalising free access which still has to show its potential for combating high drop-out rates.The currently used internal quality evaluation system, based preferably on annual students' evaluations of study programmes and performance of teachers (except the complex evaluation of all institutional activities provided within 3-6 year time period) has been discussed with the aim to develop the new, more detailed questionnaires. It is expected, that the students' views on BA/MA template, study demands and reasons of high drop-out, credit system and other important issues will provide valuable feedback for the institutional management. .

The approach of Institution B seems to be oriented more on quantity- than quality-management. Even with the total student numbers nearly doubling during the last decade (from 12,281 in 2000 to 21,935 in 2010), which is likely to affect quality of teaching and learning, there has been little evidence to suggest corresponding initiatives taking place beyond the very threshold regulation done externally by the Accreditation Commission. With the exception of the university guidance and counselling centre, the initiatives are mostly left at the faculty level. In this respect, the difference between quality-oriented faculty of medicine and quantitative expansion-focused faculty of law has been noticed. Relegation of trust in and commitment to quality management to individuals is a basis for effective quality management. However, the question remains whether this approach, free of institutionalisation of measures becoming standard in increasingly competitive Czech HE landscape (esp. coordinating and statistical unit at the university level, training of personnel responsible for quality management), is enough.

Put succinctly, the approach of Institution C in the wake of sectoral diversification and massification is largely opposite to that of Institution B. Institution C develops its quality management as one of the strategic development goals by integrating available resources (material, capital, human) – see the establishment of Quality Management Unit and the LLL Centre at the rectorate – whilst respecting specifics of individual faculties. Training of managerial and administrative staff takes place to profesionalise and optimise their activities so that minimal interference with core-academic duties occurs. Despite the largely pro-active approach of Institution C, two barriers to quality management have been identified. The first one concerns significant competition among university units (faculty teams) for obtaining grant money. This competition, seen by some as excessive, inhibits effective intra-institutional cooperation. Problematic (low) mid-term employability of graduates from the Faculty of Chemistry also represents challenge for managing implementation of university quality policy. Attitude of Institution D is underlain by its status of a private institution, founded in 1999. Hence, a "customer-oriented approach" has been noticed. Putting this approach into operation involves funding scholarships and student services (including those for handicapped students) from university profits. The long-term plan of keeping to the total student numbers of 5,500 seems to work against uncontrolled quantitative expansion, which would be likely to cripple quality of tuition provided.

6. Where does responsibility lie for ensuring and monitoring access?

In case of publicly funded Institution A, B, C, the responsibility in question lies at the faculty level, executed by the dean. The conditions for admission to degree programmes, including the numbers of entrants, are bound to the approval of the faculty academic senate comprising student representatives. Nonetheless, the Ministry finances only a set number of study places. As publicly funded HEIs are not entitled to collect tuition fees, in reality this means that any increases above the set number have to be covered from faculty/institutional profitable activities –as in case of Institution C in the past decade. Hence, at Institution A, B, C, there are every year negotiations between the deans and the rector plus the bursar on the number of entrant-study places. These lines of responsibility are delineated institutionally (Statute) contingent on the wording of the HE Act no. 111/1998 Coll. As to private Institution D, the responsibility inheres in the rector. However, the recent organisational changes (setting-up 2 faculties) are likely, to some extent, to result in relegation of the responsibility for ensuring and monitoring access to the respective deans.

7. Are there any problematic issues surrounding access and quality in your system?

The most problematic systemic issue affecting access and quality is the quantitative expansion in the 2000s, with the total enrolments doubling, that was, to a large extent, not accompanied by implementation of corresponding quality enhancing measures at either system or institutional level. In this respect, the setting-up the Development Programmes by the Ministry in 2011, aimed at facilitating institutional development in HEI-preferred areas, or the establishment and functioning of the rectorate Department for Quality Assurance at Institution C, are exceptions to the rule rather than characteristic facets of system and institutional QA policies.

As already indicated, the expansion was largely made possible by modifications of the funding mechanism. The setting-up of the respective formula parameters resulted in orientation of HEIs on inputs rather than throughputs (see the average ratio of admission to two-year Masters being 85%) and outputs (including graduate employability), though some modifications to the parameters have been done recently to combat this problem.

At institutional level, this formula funding mechanism manifests in the same pattern of public funding of study places for Institution A, with long-term unsatisfactory drop-out rates (reaching as high as 60% in Bachelor programmes), and C, having less problems in this regard, though showing similar "hard science" orientation. Overall, from an analytical view, these developments point to the close relationship between funding and access affecting quality; so called the funding-quality-access trinity (cf. Jongbloed, 2003). It is worth stating that the access-related development at analysed HEIs correspond to the system policy lines. However, once the limitations of the systemic expansion have become widely known, these system lines turned to be somewhat contestable (see especially modifications of parameters of formula funding or different viewpoints on (possible) introduction of tuition fees).

IV. Major findings including identification of barriers

Overall, the analysis of access-related issues, contingent on quality assurance/enhancement mechanisms at four selected HEIs, has given rise to the following major findings:

- Programme diversification along the lines of the Bologna BA/MA template took place in the 2000-2010 period. The admission rate into 2-year Masters, averaging out at 85%, however, attests to this implementation being rather formal in practice;
- Total enrolment numbers nearly doubled during the period in question without the institutionalisation of adequate quality assurance or enhancement measures; for exception see Institution C;
- Quantitative expansion and programme diversification have caused adverse access-related effects at Institution A, especially in terms of high drop-out rates in the first (BA) cycle;
- Relatedly, institutional approaches to quality management in the wake of sectoral massification and programme diversification have varied among the analysed institutions. More pro-active institutional measures, beyond currently prevailing practice of organising student surveys, have been noticed especially at Institution C;
- No barriers in data collection and handling have been identified, except for mature students in LLL courses;
- As regards support of distinct cohorts of students as well as the disabled, private Institution D does not, in general, fall behind the other three analysed HEIs of the public type;
- Responsibility for student admission and enrolments lies at the faculty level, with negotiations concerning enrolment increases held between the faculty and the rectorate, as well as between the rector and the Ministry;

Although institutional access measures are in correspondence to system policy lines, these lines have been rather difficult to interpret clearly in the recent years (e.g. modifications of parameters of formula funding).

In line with these major finding, the main barriers to the ESG access-relevant issues have been identified as follows:

- Funding mechanisms (system level) not discriminating between pro-active and reactive institutional approaches to quantitative expansion;
- Guidance and counselling services lacking in development, including services for students with disabilities and foreign students (other than Slovak nationality);
- Low interest in HE study of technically-oriented programmes which, however, can be improved by more intensive cooperation between HEIs and prospective secondary schools sucha s in case of Institution A and C;
- Lack of (financial) incentives for HEIs to attune access-related measures to their QA policies also due to demand prevailing over supply; for exception see the Development Programmes of the Ministry;
- Excessive competition for development grants, killing intra-institutional cooperation, which would, if in place, increase overall chances for obtaining the grants;
- Also, though trust in core academic values is upheld and not questioned, some cases of low accountability of academic and managerial staff can be a concern (due to still unsaturated demand for HE study in some study fields – law, economy, arts, humanities);
- Lastly but importantly, the non-existence of the very relevant ESG standard works against improving access conditions at HEIs.

References

Instituce A. 2010. *Dlouhodobý záměr vzdělávací a vědecké, výzkumné, vývojové, umělecké a další tvůrčí činnosti na období 2011-2015*.

Instituce B. 2010. *Dlouhodobý záměr vzdělávací a vědecké, výzkumné, vývojové, umělecké a další tvůrčí činnosti na období 2011-2015*.

Instituce C. 2010. *Dlouhodobý záměr vzdělávací a vědecké, výzkumné, vývojové, umělecké a další tvůrčí činnosti na období 2011-2015*.

Instituce D. 2010. *Dlouhodobý záměr vzdělávací a vědecké, výzkumné, vývojové, umělecké a další tvůrčí činnosti na období 2011-2015*.

Institute for information on education. 1990-2011. Statistical yearbooks on higher education.

Jongbloed, B. 2003. Institutional funding and institutional change. In *Real-time systems: Reflections on higher education in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia*, ed. J. File, and L. Goedegebuure, 115–146. Brno: CHEPS and VUTIUM Press.

MEYS. 2005. *Long-term plan of educational and scientific, research, developmental, artistic or other creative activities in the area of higher education for 2006-2010*. Prague: Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports.

MŠMT. 2010. *Dlouhodobý záměr vzdělávací a vědecké, výzkumné, vývojové a inovační, umělecké a další tvůrčí činnosti pro oblast vysokých škol na období 2011-2015*. Praha: Ministerstvo školství, mládeže a tělovýchovy.

National student register (SIMS database). 2000-2011.

Turner, D.A. 1994. Formula funding of higher education in the Czech Republic: Creating an open system. *Studies in Higher Education* 19, no. 2: 139–51.

Wende, M., van der, and D. F. Westerheijden. 2003. Degrees of trust or trust of degrees? Quality assurance and recognition. In *Real-time systems: Reflections on higher education in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia*, ed. J. File, and L. Goedegebuure, 177–206. Brno: CHEPS and VUTIUM Press.

Project "Identifying barriers in promoting European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance at institutional level" (IBAR)

Annex

Table 1 **Students at analysed institutions in 1991 and 1995* (including nationality)**

Institution	1991			1995		
	Total	**Czech**	**Foreign**	**Total**	**Czech**	**Foreign**
Institution A	2789	2685	104	2742	2677	65
Institution B	6921	6767	154	10029	9711	318
Institution C	10840	10525	315	12119	11986	133

*Institution D in existence since 1999

Table 2 **Newly enrolled at analysed institutions in 1991 and 1995* (including nationality)**

Institution	1991			1995		
	Total	**Czech**	**Foreign**	**Total**	**Czech**	**Foreign**
Institution A	693			1019	1017	2
Institution B	1136			2420	2339	81
Institution C	1811			3586	3556	30

*Institution D in existence since 1999

Table 3 **Graduates at analysed institutions in 1991 and 1995* (including nationality)**

Institution	1991			1995		
	Total	**Czech**	**Foreign**	**Total**	**Czech**	**Foreign**
Institution A	368	351	17	375	361	14
Institution B	1051	1039	12	1476	1449	27
Institution C	2041	2010	31	1475	1434	41

*Institution D in existence since 1999

Table 4 **Institution A: newly enrolled by programme**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	100	120	171	1432	1292	1235	1049	1002	890	1056
Long Master	734	546	678	61	53	9	4	3	2	0
2-year Master	0	0	0	0	0	0	436	431	414	350
PhD	202	232	230	208	144	200	161	165	210	196
Total	825	660	807	1412	1310	1277	1132	1072	962	1112

Table 5 **Institution A: student numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	164	169	186	260	1413	1823	2396	2271	2189	1998	2045
Long Master	1954	2018	1878	1924	1255	1000	654	340	14	0	0
2-year Master	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	428	829	861	780
PhD	616	647	751	844	884	850	858	849	822	851	872
Total	**2654**	**2759**	**2755**	**2955**	**3484**	**3620**	**3865**	**3850**	**3817**	**3657**	**3647**

Table 6 **Institution A: student ratios by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	0.062	0.061	0.068	0.088	0.406	0.504	0.620	0.590	0.573	0.546	0.561
Long Master	0.736	0.731	0.682	0.651	0.360	0.276	0.169	0.088	0.004	0.000	0.000
2-year Master	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.111	0.217	0.235	0.214
PhD	0.232	0.235	0.273	0.286	0.254	0.235	0.222	0.221	0.215	0.233	0.239
Total	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 7 **Institution A: graduate numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	62	54	52	46	89	59	430	472	457	390
Long Master	352	366	334	297	204	317	289	317	15	0
2-year Master	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	358	368
PhD	52	70	56	80	87	102	93	102	92	80
Total	465	488	434	419	377	475	804	885	920	831

Table 8 **Institution A: rate of admission to 2-year Masters (%)**

Year	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
BAgraduates	62	54	52	46	89	59	430	472	457	390
MA enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	436	431	414	350
%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	101.4	91.3	90.6	89.7

Table 9 **Institution A: success rate by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	0.705	0.563	0.553	0.207	0.107	0.093	0.373	0.432	0.421	0.396
Long Master	0.544	0.541	0.531	0.410	0.654	0.873	0.912	0.972	0.882	
2-year Master							0.000	0.000	0.937	0.880
PhD	0.406	0.631	0.487	0.584	0.576	0.604	0.616	0.518	0.568	0.488
Total	0.566	0.589	0.559	0.438	0.307	0.419	0.507	0.548	0.564	0.541

Table 10 **Institution B: newly enrolled by programme**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	909	1068	2012	2625	2887	3603	4115	4034	4571	4627
Long Master	2360	2425	1958	1768	1886	1851	1294	1143	1190	1041
2-year Master	149	166	217	264	237	778	1094	1216	1381	1869
PhD	245	301	323	336	328	374	378	413	471	459
Total	3402	3625	3979	4369	4726	5696	5803	5706	6275	6312

Table 11 **Institution B: student numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	1709	2033	2503	3779	5231	6580	8044	9407	10266	11312	11819
Long Master	9270	9612	9921	9506	8863	8360	7997	7078	6355	5718	5179
2-year Master	272	271	345	426	552	568	1051	1834	2435	2909	3633
PhD	1116	1083	1147	1231	1265	1285	1375	1371	1388	1564	1574
Total	12287	12918	13798	14790	15775	16656	18312	19506	20235	21271	21935

Table 12 **Institution B: student ratios by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	0.139	0.157	0.181	0.256	0.332	0.395	0.439	0.482	0.507	0.532	0.539
Long Master	0.754	0.744	0.719	0.643	0.562	0.502	0.437	0.363	0.314	0.269	0.236
2-year Master	0.022	0.021	0.025	0.029	0.035	0.034	0.057	0.094	0.120	0.137	0.166
PhD	0.091	0.084	0.083	0.083	0.080	0.077	0.075	0.070	0.069	0.074	0.072
Total	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 13 **Institution B: graduate numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	355	331	444	598	695	1136	1444	1604	1938	2443
Long Master	1294	1263	1462	1495	1507	1491	1562	1373	1443	1292
2-year Master	126	61	102	102	176	221	201	451	651	880
PhD	107	113	109	123	133	139	144	179	120	136
Total	1877	1767	2116	2315	2506	2984	3349	3604	4150	4742

Table 13 **Institution B: rate of admission to 2-year Masters (%)**

Year	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
BAgraduates	355	331	444	598	695	1136	1444	1604	1938	2443
MA enrolled	149	166	217	264	237	778	1094	1216	1381	1869
%	42.0	50.2	48.9	44.1	34.1	68.5	75.8	75.8	71.3	76.5

Table 14 **Institution B: success rate by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	0.631	0.587	0.630	0.547	0.493	0.573	0.564	0.535	0.576	0.606
Long Master	0.672	0.638	0.644	0.667	0.682	0.713	0.742	0.777	0.839	0.811
2-year Master	0.851	0.701	0.739	0.767	0.842	0.822	0.726	0.779	0.784	0.796
PhD	0.478	0.608	0.502	0.513	0.536	0.678	0.529	0.585	0.515	0.420
Total	0.677	0.655	0.677	0.680	0.665	0.691	0.669	0.656	0.695	0.692

Table 15 **Institution C: newly enrolled by programme**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	839	2086	2710	5213	5631	5413	5419	5400	5217	5472
Long Master	3240	2014	2570	423	172	109	94	37	15	4
2-year Master	606	667	777	755	1393	1670	2270	2962	3242	3071
PhD	395	453	552	455	376	477	485	481	474	506
Total	4244	4233	5399	5670	6089	5930	6101	6085	5824	6200

Table 16 **Institution C: student numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	2984	1730	3093	4650	8130	10816	12534	13583	13821	13469	13730
Long Master	9785	9701	8839	8835	6249	4625	2760	1428	194	39	17
2-year Master	1758	1348	1436	1530	1493	2168	2961	3942	5251	6303	6594
PhD	1475	1477	1603	1806	1825	1823	1903	1985	1950	1920	1918
Total	15928	14202	14879	16704	17631	19378	20107	20889	21165	21692	22211

Table 17 **Institution C: student ratios by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	0.187	0.122	0.208	0.278	0.461	0.558	0.623	0.650	0.653	0.621	0.618
Long Master	0.614	0.683	0.594	0.529	0.354	0.239	0.137	0.068	0.009	0.002	0.001
2-year	0.110	0.095	0.097	0.092	0.085	0.112	0.147	0.189	0.248	0.291	0.297
PhD	0.093	0.104	0.108	0.108	0.104	0.094	0.095	0.095	0.092	0.089	0.086
Total	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 18 **Institution C: graduate numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	362	344	447	493	1097	1391	1954	2607	3014	2691
Long Master	1223	1415	1359	1421	1133	1662	1275	1229	134	25
2-year Master	433	438	513	544	493	587	959	1276	1799	2363
PhD	82	109	138	163	146	157	165	173	207	162
Total	2100	2306	2456	2621	2867	3797	4352	5285	5152	5240

Table 19 **Institution C: rate of admission to 2-year Masters (%)**

Year	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
BAgraduates	362	344	447	493	1097	1391	1954	2607	3014	2691
MA enrolled	606	667	777	755	1393	1670	2270	2962	3242	3071
%	167.4	193.9	173.83	153.14	126.98	120.06	116.17	113.62	107.56	114.12

Table 20 **Institution C: success rate by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**2010**
Bachelor	0.172	0.504	0.413	0.295	0.390	0.390	0.463	0.517	0.551	0.528
Long Master	0.371	0.497	0.520	0.477	0.638	0.858	0.903	0.959	0.766	0.641
2-year Master	0.437	0.804	0.795	0.719	0.749	0.743	0.763	0.782	0.803	0.833
PhD	0.237	0.395	0.460	0.414	0.437	0.445	0.445	0.348	0.437	0.344
Total	0.325	0.568	0.568	0.489	0.537	0.582	0.605	0.631	0.622	0.626

Table 21 **Institution D: newly enrolled by programme**

Year/progr.	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Bachelor	492	560	813	1015	980	1289	1261	1429	1276	1093
2-year Master	0	0	0	396	420	739	775	844	1072	964
PhD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Total	492	560	813	1171	1165	1550	1531	1752	1667	1469

Table 22 **Institution D: student numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Bachelor	331	754	1208	1925	2328	2649	2935	3200	3582	3603	3356
2-year Master	0	0	0	0	385	780	1149	1525	1692	2007	2179
PhD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Total	331	754	1208	1925	2713	3428	4084	4725	5274	5609	5547

Table 23 **Institution D: student ratios by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Bachelor	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.858	0.773	0.719	0.677	0.679	0.642	0.605
2-year Master	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.142	0.228	0.281	0.323	0.321	0.358	0.393
PhD	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002
Total	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 24 **Institution D: graduate numbers by programme**

Year/progr.	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Bachelor	0	0	0	351	384	760	750	715	887	840
Long Master	0	0	0	0	0	339	346	617	668	667
PhD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	0	351	384	1099	1096	1332	1555	1507

Table 25 **Institution D: rate of admission to 2-year Masters**

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
BAgraduates	0	0	0	351	384	760	750	715	887	840
MA enrolled	0	0	0	396	420	739	775	844	1072	964
%				112.8	109.4	97.2	103.3	118.0	120.9	114.8

Table 26 **Institution D: success rate by programme (%)**

Year/progr.	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Bachelor	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.604	0.614	0.765	0.788	0.713	0.734	0.656
2-year Master				0.000	0.000	0.942	0.856	0.922	0.897	0.853
PhD										
Total	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.600	0.605	0.813	0.810	0.798	0.797	0.731