



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

WP8
Quality and Management/Governance
National study – Poland
2012

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.

IBAR Project

Work-Package 8

Quality and Management/Governance
–Poland

Research Team, Warsaw School of Economics

Professor Ewa Chmielecka

Professor Stefan Doroszewicz

Dr Jakub Brdulak

dr Piotr Miller

Magdalena Kuna

1. Introduction

This report deals with the implementation of recommendations of the European Standards and Guidelines in Quality Assurance in Higher Education for university governance and management, and in particular, for the decision-making processes that are related to curricula design and management with a view of assuring their top quality.

The set of research questions prepared by the Portuguese team is focused on standards 1.1, 1.2 and 1.5 ESG, which state the following:

1.1 Policy and procedures for quality assurance

***Standard:** Institutions should have a policy and associated procedures for the assurance of the quality and standards of their programmes and awards. They should also commit themselves explicitly to the development of a culture which recognises the importance of quality, and quality assurance, in their work. To achieve this, institutions should develop and implement a strategy for the continuous enhancement of quality. The strategy, policy and procedures should have a formal status and be publicly available. They should also include a role for students and other stakeholders.*

1.2 Approval, monitoring and periodic review of programmes and awards

***Standard:** Institutions should have formal mechanisms for the approval, periodic review and monitoring of their programmes and awards.*

1.5 Learning resources and student support

***Standard:** Institutions should ensure that the resources available for the support of student learning are adequate and appropriate for each programme offered.*

The general intention is to finally introduce high culture of quality to all universities – and this is the aim of all ESGs.

This report describes extensively the national and institutional context related to quality management in Polish universities. It is important due to the fact that this academic year is the time when Polish universities are going through a phase of profound reforms related to the design and management of curricula. These reforms are a consequence of national and institutional implementation of National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education – NQF HE.

Research methodology in WP8 package does not differ from the methodology applied in the previous packages –national solutions data are obtained from publicly available documents and university data are gained from analyses of internal documents and interviews that were conducted in four Polish universities. We present these data in a semi-tabulated form to enable better comparisons. Summarizing these data and creating a clear picture of quality management and quality culture formation in Polish universities is not an easy task. Reform period does not create favourable conditions for drawing simple conclusions and thus the summary of this report will contain many question marks as well as poorly substantiated predictions.

2. National and institutional policy context

Governance structure in Polish universities is similar to university management structures in other European countries. At the higher education level, supervision and coordination are ensured by the Minister of Science and Higher Education. Apart from the minister, there is also a national collegial body (Central Council for Science and Higher Education), which has

advisory competences. In addition – there are rectors' conferences – the most important of which is Conference of Rectors of Academic Schools in Poland (CRASP), which is an association of rectors representing those schools that have so-called full academic rights. Beside this conference, there are also conferences of vocational and non-public universities.

A special role in assuring the quality of educational programmes belongs to Polish Accreditation Committee –PKA – a member of EQAR. It evaluates and grants accreditation to programmes and institutions. It is necessary to obtain a positive opinion from PKA to be able to launch and run a study programme. PKA's accreditation is obligatory and free of charge.

The fundamental structure of governing bodies at public universities is specified in the Higher Education Act and is as follows: rector is a one-person body and has executive competences, university senate is a collegial body which has referral and advisory and partially – decision-making competences (research, teaching). At the faculty level, the respective bodies are deans and faculty councils. In public universities, all these bodies are elected for certain terms by the academic community (employees and students). Faculty councils are responsible for designing and running of I, II and III cycle study programmes despite the fact that such programmes (sets of learning outcomes of such programmes) must be also approved by university senates.

Governance structure for non-public universities is not strictly specified by law, and so such schools may differ in terms of make-up and methods of appointment of the governing bodies and in terms of the methods of strategic decisions making.

External legal regulations on curricula design and delivery in Poland were significantly changed in 2011. The Higher Education Act from 29 July 2005, which was in force up to March 2011, and other related Orders (as well as previous legal acts) specified the following relevant rules:

- Universities were allowed to have one of 118 majors included in a national ministerial list. The list included the name of the study major as well as its teaching standards in the form of so-called „teaching content framework” [kind of the national curricula, content/input oriented]. They were complemented with study conditions (e.g. minimum requirements for the number and qualifications of the teaching staff assigned to the major). Thus, the primary teaching content was highly standardized (up to 50% of the curriculum) and PKA was responsible for ensuring that this content was realized. Numerous global institutions preparing reports on the status of higher education in Poland (such as, among others, World Bank, OECD, UNESCO agendas) indicated that this situation was a violation of the rules of academic autonomy.
- Unlisted majors (e.g. interdisciplinary macro-fields or unique fields) were allowed only after a university obtained an appropriate evaluation grade from RGSW and then, from PKA as well as an approval from the Ministry.

In 2011, when an amendment to „PSW” act was adopted (18 March 2011) and Order of the Minister of Science and Higher Education on curriculum design and delivery was issued, important changes were introduced. The orders (decrets) listed below had the biggest influence on university educational activity governance:

- National Qualification Framework for Higher Education – [NQF HE] (02.11.2011),
- Model (benchmark) learning outcomes, (04.11.2011),
- Study conditions at specific faculties and teaching cycles (05. 10. 2011),
- Conditions for curriculum and institution assessment (29. 09. 2011) supplemented with PKA resolution dated 24 November 2011, which specifies the standards and procedures of this assessment.

The new legislation has significantly expanded the autonomy of university curricula. The central list of study majors and the "teaching content framework" were abolished. Any university/department may run any teaching programme (major) it wishes to have. The only departments that enjoy somewhat constrained freedom in this respect are so called „non-autonomous" departments (which are not entitled to appoint the scientific degree of a habilitated doctor).

The provisions specified in the above-mentioned legal acts oblige universities to design learning outcomes-based / output oriented curricula, which are consistent with generic learning outcomes drawn up for eight fields of education (social studies, natural science, science, technical studies, agricultural studies, medical studies, the liberal arts and arts) contained in the resolution on NQF HE. These effects are defined for I and II cycle of education and for the one of two profiles: general/academic and practical. A university must make an interpretation of learning outcomes for every science discipline or area it offers. To this end, it creates a matrix of learning outcomes for each of its study programmes and an analogical matrix of learning outcomes validation. It may create one or multi-fields programmes. Both of these matrixes are prepared by departments and then approved by university senates. Departments have freedom of choice as to the methods of realization as well as to the adopted study programmes. So-called conditions of study conduct remain in force (although they have been slightly modified). Such requirements as the minimum number of personnel required to open and run a field of study as well as other national requirements remain in force.

The above-mentioned legal acts also oblige universities to implement an internal quality assurance system and to prepare appropriate documentation that would substantiate the functioning of such a system in accordance with ESG standards. Internal quality assurance system is necessary to be able to deliver study programmes.

The Polish Accreditation Committee evaluates the implementation of such legal regulations by accrediting both the programme and the institution. The accreditation concentrates on the functioning of the internal quality assurance system.

As far as the primary institutional context of decision making is concerned, e. i. quality management in the surveyed universities, it is as follows:

- AMU and TUL are typical, large, multi-department universities and their structures of decision making regarding teaching are fully compliant with the provisions of Higher Education Act. Administrational decisions related to curriculum designing and management as well as to the functioning of the internal quality assurance system and others are made jointly by the rector and the senate. As for the learning outcomes and contents, assessment methods of obtaining the outcomes and methods of delivering classes etc. are in the hands of departments councils - as it is provided for by law.

- WSE has a slightly different structure of decision making. Approximately 20 years ago, the school decided it was a one- department university and it introduced a highly flexible teaching system which is based on students' choice. It handed all the rights related to contents design and curricula structuring over to the senate and its committees. Curricula are provided for the whole university rather than for departments only. Rector makes administrative decisions related to teaching, internal quality assurance system, etc. The collegia that were created in place of dissolved departments do not have any voting right on teaching issues – they are engaged in research only and they prepare their teaching offer then governed centrally.
- BWS is a very small HE Institution. Its structure of teaching-related decision making is limited to one department and 5 majors. Unlike other universities, BWS is a private university and is strongly supervised by its owners, which makes it possible to explicitly assign responsibilities to individual people.

Research methodology

Our research, similarly to the previous packages, involved 4 schools of higher education. Their more detailed characteristics can be found in WP5. As all the participating schools gave their consent to publishing their contribution to the research, we present the empirical research data with reference to the abbreviated names of the schools. The four schools include:

- Uniwersytet Adama Mickiewicza/Adam Mickiewicz University In Poznań [UAM/AMU]
- Szkoła Główna Handlowa/Warsaw School of Economics in Warsaw [SGH/WSE]
- Politechnika Łódzka/Technical University of Lodz [PŁ/TUL]
- Bielska Szkoła Wyższa im. Józefa Tyszkiewicza/Bielsko College in Bielsko-Biala [BSW]

All these four micro-cases of the schools were prepared on the basis of:

- a desk study, using documents publicly available on the websites of the four institutions to uncover policies and information about national and institutional activities related to the quality in the context of school governance.
- the analysis of school documents gathered during visits to the schools,
- the interviews with the actors indicated in the WP8 form, including Members of the central administration (Rector, Pro-Rector), representatives of central office/structure for quality, senate or structure responsible for study programmes, student support services, faculty/school: middle level-management: deans, heads of pedagogic council representatives of office/structure in charge of quality, academics (different ranks), students– with respect to the decision making structure in the schools surveyed.

The total number of interviewees in all universities was 60 people. To some extent, the number of respondents reflected the size of the university. In AMU, apart from regular interviews, its deans organized a mini-seminar attended by academic teachers and students (3rd cycle), who jointly discussed survey questions. Some of the interviews were

complemented with telephone calls as well as responses to additional questions that were sent by e-mail.

A significant difficulty encountered during the interpretation of the data gathered in the interviews as well as during the analysis of university documents was the fact that the process of curriculum designing and delivering is undergoing rapid changes. All university bodies – one-person bodies and collegial bodies – are highly engaged in implementing new legal regulations related to National Qualification Framework (NQF) into the higher education system. The change in education management is very profound and difficult to cope with for universities. The most difficult task is to prepare all syllabi and curricula that would be focused on learning outcomes and to verify their references with the assigned areas. All surveyed universities initiated special training programmes to prepare their staff to this operation. Unfortunately, universities are implementing this change under the strong pressure of time: the regulations were issued in the autumn of 2011 and the legislation requires that the programmes designed within NQF methodology be fully implemented before 01 October 2012. These factors make managerial and teaching personnel impatient. Changes are perceived as bureaucratic and requiring a lot of inexplicable work on the part of schools. Out of the four surveyed universities, the only one that is already using the extended curriculum autonomy to create a new study major is TUL. Other universities are learning the new language of curriculum description and design, putting off the reforming tasks until the next year. Thus, the opinions expressed during interviews are mainly negative and are full of irritation and complaining. It may be expected that in the following years, once people get accustomed to the new methodology of curricula design, their opinions will change into more favourable.

Question 1

What is the institutional context of governance?

- a) What are the main changes for institutional governance and quality in the national framework and how they affect the governance structures and processes within the institution?
- b) What is in general characteristic in the decision-making culture in the institution: strongly bottom-up or strongly top-down?
- c) How strong or weak is, in general, the top administration in the higher education institution: e.g. does it regularly take initiatives for changing institutional policies?

AMU	<p>Quality assurance issues have been the subject of interest of university authorities since approximately 1996, when the first elements of the current system were introduced. It was influenced by the creation of University Accreditation Committee. The Act from 2005, which obliges universities to implement the quality assurance system, changed those activities into systemic work. An amendment to the act from 18 March 2011 has been being prepared for one year now. This act introduced National Qualifications Framework to Polish universities and thus changed the methods of work on curricula. At present, this has the biggest influence on the mechanisms of quality assurance at Polish universities, particularly in the context of LO validation.</p> <p>For quality</p> <p>(b) This university has a distinct "mixed" model. At the whole university level, any quality – related initiatives are usually initiated by university authorities and depend on their „top-down” determination. However, before such initiatives are implemented, they are generally consulted with all internal stakeholders. They are later realized by the employees and by lower (departmental) levels of management. It is a „bottom-up” movement.</p> <p>(c) Leaders have a very strong impact on the pro-quality university policy. Changes occur mainly as a result of rector’s determination and efficiency. After many years of activity, environment resistance to quality assurance has been broken and although quality assurance is assuming new forms, it has become a routine and accepted element of university activities.</p>
WSE	<p>WSE was ahead of the legislation as far as the rules of creating study programmes are concerned (LO-based curricula and syllabi were introduced 4 years ago). Additionally, its internal quality assurance system, which was initiated in the 90's, has been developing consistently. The new legislation made the changes it stipulates easier to accept. The university adapted the already existent procedures and documents so that they explicitly comply with the legal regulations. Rector’s Committee for Didactic Offer Compliance with NQF HE was created. WSE has been also investigating student-reported learning outcomes for 3 years now. The investigation is done by the Team for Education Quality Management at WSE, which was created by the Rector and which is responsible for the development and implementation of systemic solutions as well as for the monitoring and supervision of the system, for reporting the results of system functioning and for analysing the quality of education.</p> <p>b. Initiatives related to university’s key issues are predominantly taken by the rector. Decision making is based on a „top-down” structure. On the other hand, for</p>

	<p>many years now, the choice of classes as well as their realization has been in the hands of the Programme and Education Councils and Senate Programme Committee as well as deans, which weakens the above-mentioned trend. This is more of a „bottom-up” movement, since these bodies mostly represent academic teachers and middle-level administration (deans). An example of a solution created at the level of the Senate Programme Committee may be the rules of learning outcomes validation. The final approval of the curricula is given by the Senate.</p> <p>c. Central university authorities are thought to be moderately effective at teaching issues, and in particular, at controlling the quality of education. The reason for it is mainly the fact that university’s methods of developing curricula are based on the academic community initiative. This is perceived as university’s weakness and that is why a return to the classic department structure is being discussed in order to change this situation.</p>
BWS	<p>The university has been developing LO-based curricula and has been running an active pro-quality policy for many years now. That is why the changes in legislation found it well prepared to NQF HE implementation. Last year, the owner of the university changed and the following two Pro-Rectors were appointed: Pro-Rector for Education Quality and Pro-Rector for Strategy and Development. Pro-Rector for Education Quality is responsible for all the issues related to the quality of the didactic process. The Pro-Rector supervises the work of Quality Collegium, which consists of the chairmen of programme committees as well as of the Quality Auditor.</p> <p>b. Due to the fact that the university’s environment is very volatile (because of the population decline - the number of students is decreasing and the university is struggling to survive on the market plus there were some changes in the legal regulations [NQF HE implementation]—the decision-making structure is predominantly "top-down". However, its employees have been informed about the changes and may influence them to some extent.</p> <p>c. The top management level is very powerful and the person who has a particularly strong impact on institution's activities is the Pro-rector for strategy and development (up to 20 March 2012 – she was the chancellor of the university and before that she was its rector – she has been working for the university ever since the beginning of its existence, i. e. since 1992). Major directions of change are initiated by the top management, however, since the university is small, the ideas that would facilitate its functioning may be proposed by all employees. Communication is direct and many of activities require oral agreement only.</p>
TUL	<p>The new regulations affect mainly university’s rector and deans whereas their impact on the environment is rather smaller. University’s authorities took the initiative to prepare documents on the methods of developing LO-based curricula. Learning outcomes for all study areas and subjects in all study majors provided in TUL have been formulated. Relations between course outcomes, area outcomes and region (country) outcomes have been specified by drafting appropriate matrixes to cover the outcomes of different categories. Work on the matrix of learning outcomes validation is in progress.</p> <p>External legal regulations have changed the previous understanding of the educational system: It used to be perceived rather as a process and now this perception has shifted toward the direction of a systemic approach aimed at</p>

	<p>supporting the university and its internal stakeholders in attaining LO.</p> <p>TUL's senate enacted a set of internal regulations related to the implementation of internal quality assurance system. A two-element organizational system structure was created. One of these elements is focused on developing standards of education quality and the other one is aimed at evaluating the quality of teaching by investigating the didactic process and the external environment, including employers' opinions and graduates' professional careers. The feedback received on the basis of these investigations constitutes the primary collection of evidence that is generated by the system with a view of improving the quality of education.</p> <p>(b) The structure of decision making in TUL is predominantly top-down, and before a decision is taken, it is consulted with the academic environment.</p> <p>(c) Management is perceived as strong and taking resolute actions related to education quality. Serious treatment of law, ESG standards and the issues related to the quality of teaching process is authenticated by creating the position of Pro-rector for Teaching Quality. His/her position at the university may be determined as strong.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Synthesis</p>	<p>All universities emphasize the very strong impact of the legal regulations from 2011, namely the introduction of NQF HE along with its quality elements: the necessity to specify LO validation methods and to adjust internal quality assurance systems to the new methods of curricula designing. The universities which had prepared for those changes are implementing the reform in a smoother way and they engage academic staff to a larger extent. All investigated universities are conducting intensive and advanced work, which results in changing the organisation of didactic offer development and the supervision of its realisation. If it had not been for this external inspiration, the pro-quality processes would have been much slower and not so radical.</p> <p>All these universities emphasize the strong „top-down” trend in change initiation and effective implementation. At the same time they acknowledge that academic environment is already engaged in implementing the changes and it provides feedback on the effects of such reforms and proposes adequate corrections.</p> <p>Three universities evaluated the position of their authorities as strong and inspiring and they considered their authorities' policy related to education quality as effective. One university claimed that its authorities do not have adequate control over the creation and realisation of its didactic offer.</p>

Barriers	<p>Two universities indicated that the haste, bureaucracy and discouragement of the environment resulted from the introduced quality-related changes, which constitutes the most significant reason for their failure. These universities feared that the pro-quality systemic reforms would be introduced on a very shallow level and their implementation would be ostensible only and that the core purposes of this change would be only moderately recognised by their employees. In the case of all these universities, a barrier that was difficult to overcome was the cooperation with the external stakeholders and follow-up on the further career of their graduates, which is required by law as an element of quality assurance system. Universities do not have any good practices and methodology to perform such activities whereas their stakeholders and graduates are not eager to cooperate.</p>
Good practices (?)	<p>All universities thought that the „top-down” trend was normal and inspiring in taking pro-quality initiatives (it made it possible to prevent any destructive opposition during the initial phase). They also thought it was normal and inspiring to have a „bottom-up” trend during the implementation phase and to achieve partner relations between university authorities and academic community that were made possible thanks to such a trend, which gives the base for the creation of quality culture.</p>

Question 2:

How does the institutional governance relate to quality assurance (ESG standard 1.1)?

- a) To what extent do governance structures and processes affect the quality culture of your institution? Give examples.
- b) To what extent have the mechanisms for the approval, periodic review and monitoring of study programmes increased the control of central/middle level administration over academic staff/director of study programmes?
- c) How regularly are curricula reviewed in this higher education institution, as a rule? How strongly is the quality function (quality office, senate committee, etc.) involved in vetting reviewed curricula? (ESG Standard 1.2) ()
- d) What are the authorities/responsibilities/freedoms on quality assurance, curriculum renewal, etc. of:
 - i) Senior managers/leaders and representative bodies of the higher education institution? (SSI)
 - ii) Middle level managers/leaders (faculty Deans, Heads of Departments) and representative bodies at these levels?
 - iii) "Street level" teaching staff?
 - iv) Students?

AMU	<p>All respondents said that their universities did not have any well - developed quality culture defined as joint responsibility for the education quality. Quality culture has been identified as a strategic goal at UAM and it has been developed consistently. It is supported by correctional activities that are implemented at the university and department levels. Its beginnings, which have already taken root in university's life, include a significant improvement in delivering classes and in assessing students' achievements as well as the culture of contacts between students and employees. The initial incomprehension of the sense of pro-quality activities is being weakened.</p> <p>b) and c) Curricula and syllabi are reviewed and updated mainly by departments. Senate's competences in this area are limited to approving sets of general learning outcomes for specific curricula. Once a year, UAM conducts a university survey, which covers all students of all types of studies as well as academic and administrative employees. Such surveys allow authorities to identify the main changes in education quality assessment. The second tool – self assessment questionnaires (created on the basis of „ESG”) is used in a two-year cycle. Self-assessment questionnaires are used for analysing (at department levels) such elements as curricula and informatics systems, as well as teaching staff, technical conditions of curricula realisation and class quality assessment. Responsibility for the quality of teaching lies in the hands of the unit realising university curricula. All respondents considered these mechanisms to be sufficient for quality control. The most important success: Quality has become the subject of public debate and of explicitly expressed opinions.</p> <p>d. Central authorities level – the university has a complete freedom in amending its curricula and subjects – the only external/legal condition includes regulation on the conditions of delivering study majors + sets of learning outcomes for 8 areas (see: introduction). Department level – autonomy with respect to curricula, methods,</p>
-----	---

	<p>teaching, LO evaluation and timetable of classes. They also have a possibility to create new curricula. Teacher level – all respondents unanimously said that they did not feel any constraints in the initiatives of curricula development. They understand the need for general university regulations but they do not perceive such regulations as restrictive. Students have some influence mainly through surveys and through participation in statutory bodies as well as through the activities of student self-government that has officially guaranteed voting right.</p>
WSE	<p>Since 2007, WSE has been consistently developing, implementing and expanding its internal education quality assurance system, which is based on the standards worked out in WSE and which complies with ESG guidelines. Some of its elements were introduced as early as in mid 90's. Initially, implementation of systemic solutions met with strong resistance and lack of acceptance from academic teachers. In particular, it concerned the implementation of standardized solutions for quality assessment of classes and for learning outcomes formulations. The above-mentioned changes have been gradually approved, which gives hopes that quality culture will eventually be established. It is supported by the following initiatives: Creation of Teaching Quality Management Team, delivering of public presentations of the concept of education quality assurance system, starting an intranet system of class quality assessment and others.</p> <p>b., c. WSE's didactic offer is continuously monitored, vetted and modified on an annual basis. Classes in basic subjects for study majors are delivered according to standard programs. Outline curricula for study majors, including a list of obligatory and optional classes (programme minima) are specified by the Senate Programme Committee. Any offer of a new subject proposed by an academic teacher must be drawn up in a form of a standardised syllabus, specifying the following: class objective, set of learning outcomes, literature, student qualification criteria, criteria for the final grade and learning outcomes validation methods. Such a syllabus must also contain information on academic teacher's scientific achievements entitling him/her to deliver the classes. Proposals of news classes are reviewed by the Programme and Teaching Council appropriate for a given study major. They are also reviewed by anonymous reviewers.</p> <p>d. University bodies have the following scope of competences:</p> <p>Rector and Rector's Proxy for Education Quality: Systemic solutions for quality assurance</p> <p>Senate: making resolutions on approving study curricula, programme minima for study faculties and majors, learning outcomes for study curricula and conditions for obtaining diplomas.</p> <p>Senate Programme Committee: It prepares opinions and applications for the Senate and the Rector related to study areas and to the rules of teaching policy at WSE as well as to the coordination of University's didactic activities. In particular, the Senate Programme Committee prepares curricula designs as well as study and</p>

	<p>syllabus plans for obligatory courses. The Senate Programme Committee consists of the following: (among others) Pro-rector for teaching and students, collegia deans, study deans and chairmen of the programme and teaching councils appropriate for each of the study majors as well as representatives of students' self-government.</p> <p>Collegium Councils: Approving study curricula for doctorate and post-graduate studies,</p> <p>Heads of departments: approval of classes proposed by the subordinates.</p> <p>Academic teachers: realisation of courses in accordance with the syllabus.</p> <p>Students: they may influence the solutions for education quality and the shape of curricula - through voting or proposing initiatives, they are part of collegial university authorities and student self-government.</p>
BWS	<p>Although university management is highly focused on education quality assurance, it is yet impossible to determine whether it already has any quality culture. ESG guidelines are taken into account, however, it happens rather indirectly by ESG intentions and spirit pervading university's activities. Higher Education Act amendment and introduction of NQF HE give the university new possibilities, such as, for example, developing proprietary curricula. The university verifies its quality by increasing its impact on the environment and by its ability to attract new candidates.</p> <p>Control is wielded by the following three main organs: Quality Collegium, Teaching Process Supervisory Team and Quality Auditor. Teaching Process Supervisory Team performs on-going monitoring of the teaching process. If it finds any negligence, Team's members make an appropriate intervention so that any possible problems do not affect students. Quality Collegium is a collegial body that cooperates with Prorector for Education Quality. Its aim is to develop strategic solutions related to the implementation of proprietary curricula.</p> <p>Curricula in specific study majors are vetted by the Auditor once in 2 years. If there are any negative signals, a curriculum may be reviewed more frequently. At the same time, curricula are systematically assessed by students.</p> <p>BSW is a small university and it has a simple structure (1 faculty) and therefore its management system is relatively simple. Pro-rector for Education Quality is personally responsible for quality. Pro-rector is supported by the collegial body (Quality Collegium) and Quality Auditor. All employees – including academic teachers, have an influence on the management of quality assurance process and may consult their ideas with university top authorities.</p> <p>Students are members of the Senate and Faculty Council. Students are also members of the disciplinary boards, grant boards and programme councils. They have full voting right and are selected by students' self-government. This is specified by the University Statute. Students are moderately engaged in quality issues.</p>

TUL	<p>Large number and scope of activities enforced by TUL's management and related to university's adjustment to the new national regulations caused a negative reaction from the academic community. Training workshops were delivered and advisory services related to adjusting teaching activities to ESG and NQF standards were provided, however, those efforts did not manage to eradicate the conviction that the changes led mostly to an expansion of university's bureaucracy. As a results, there is an ambivalent attitude towards changes: On the one hand, university environment objectives set forward by law and the system are being implemented and people take notice of the fact that curricula have been better organized plus they also appreciate the superiority of learning outcomes. On the other hand, however, teachers and students do not recognise the sense of such objectives and formal rules of their implementation (ESG standards and orders of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education). The fact that the academic circles did not get genuinely engaged into the process makes one think that the process of shaping the quality culture at the university will be long and as for now, the "culture" of education quality is superficial.</p> <p>b. The mechanisms referred to in the question are dictated by the new legal regulations and were introduced practically in the same term. It will be possible to have a reliable opinion on their efficacy after they have been in use for three or four years.</p> <p>c. Curricula are reviewed by departmental Teaching Committees. The review covers the form of curricula and includes a verification of specific learning outcomes. TUL does not review its curricula. There is a systemic procedure of curriculum approval, including learning outcomes and study curricula. The bodies that are entitled to act within this field are Faculty Council and the Senate, respectively. No cyclical reviews of curricula are performed and no appropriate systemic procedure is in use. Curricula are modified when an academic teacher, the author of the curriculum, makes such a request.</p> <p>d. Pro-rector for Education Quality and Rector's Committee for Education Quality acting in the name of the Pro-rector have almost exclusive power and responsibility for the systemic assurance of education quality. As it was mentioned in point 2a, academic teachers show a passive attitude towards the system, and students have a negative opinion on the system.</p> <p>Amendments to curricula are formally initiated by university authorities and modifications concerning the merits are initiated by academic teachers. Individual curricula and study programmes for specific majors are approved by Faculty Council.</p>
-----	---

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Synthesis</p>	<p>All universities unanimously state that they do not have any quality culture yet. They anticipate that it will not be created any time soon. For them, the systemic reforms that are being implemented in Polish higher education institutions bring both some opportunities (legal requirements to implement pro-quality solutions) and some risks such as facade nature of the reforms and bureaucracy and no deeper involvement of the community in their sense.</p> <p>As far as the scope of competences and responsibilities of bodies are concerned, all universities share the same pattern: Institutional organizational quality-related solutions are introduced by university authorities whereas the academic community is responsible for the contents and methods of teaching. Nobody has made any complaints about any restrictions in the autonomy of introducing changes and innovations to study curricula.</p>
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Barriers</p>	<p>Barriers to the introduction of quality culture:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employees' self-righteousness and conviction that their work is perfect as well as minimal effort on the part of students (which is a result of making education widely available) • Often, deans have very low scientific degrees and poor standing in the academic environment (great scientists are reluctant to engage in administrative work) so they have a moderate impact and it is them who bear the main burden of realising the pro-quality tasks. • In general, university personnel, and sometimes also its authorities, have no insight into the higher education system – lack of understanding of study flexibility, three-cycle studies, student centred learning, LLL etc.
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Good practices</p>	<p>In WSE, students' self-government has a students' association which deals with the issues of education quality. This is a bottom-up students' initiative that supports formation of opinions and solutions affecting the quality of education.</p>

Question 3

To what extent does institutional governance take into account quality assurance of study programmes in particular with respect to:

- a) Development and publication of learning outcomes (ESG standard 1.2)? (Data/SSI)
- b) Curriculum and programme design content; modes of delivery and institutional profile (ESG standard 1.2)? (Data/SSI)
- c) Availability of appropriate learning resources and student support (ESG standards 1.2 and 1.5)? (Data/SSI)
- d) Periodic reviews of programmes including feedback from employers and alumni (ESG standard 1.2)? (Data/SSI)

AMU	<p>According to the new legislation, in the academic year 2011/12, the university is obliged to present all of its programmes as LO-based curricula and syllabi. The work on such programmes is in progress. It was described in points 1 and 2. The methods of work were specified in the new (January/February 2011) resolutions of the senate and in rector's order. One of the rules is to relate programmes to university's mission. Legislation also requires profile specification (academic - or practical). Like previously, all these programmes, once the work is finished, will be made publicly available, especially in AMU internet service. Teaching resources are provided by departments. At the central level, they are offered by the university library (considered to be very good) and e-learning system which is thought to be insufficiently developed. Efficiency of departmental activities is monitored through surveys referred to in question 2. Feedback from employers and graduates is included in routine annual reviews and in creating new programmes. The efficiency is thought to be insufficient.</p>
WSE	<p>This university has been writing its curricula in the learning outcomes language for 4 years now. It makes the curricula public. Currently, the curricula are being exactly adjusted to the new legislation. Learning outcomes are published in WSE Prospectus (presenting WSE didactic offer) and in course syllabi. Both of these documents are available in electronic and printed versions. Students may access them through the virtual dean's office.</p> <p>WSE is an economic university and all of its curricula are related either to the economics or to the social aspects of economics, which is explicitly included in the university's mission. Descriptions of monitoring, periodic reviews and approvals of curricula were presented in points 2b and 2c. Programme realisation and outcome verification lie in the hands of academic teachers. Proper execution of these activities is ensured by monitoring the competences of academic teachers, i. e. by reviewing their scientific achievements, performing class inspections, conducting student surveys and others.</p> <p>WSE boasts one of the biggest local, multi-system computer networks in Poland. There are over 1400 Internet-connected computer stations that are available to employees and students, and over 330 of these computers are public.</p> <p>Most of the lecture rooms are equipped with multi-media equipment. There is</p>

	<p>Multimedia Techniques' Team at the Informatics Centre as well as other forms of teaching support methods e.g. WSE case study clearing house. In students' opinion, using modern teaching aids that support the teaching process is not enough, especially when it comes to the possibility of team work and problem-based learning and to utilizing the latest technical developments by WSE employees in classes.</p>
BWS	<p>Teaching programmes are described in the learning outcomes language and are published in syllabi and curricula that are available (chiefly in an electronic form) to students.</p> <p>In its strategy, BWS chose to develop as a practical profile university. Therefore, BWS feels responsible for adjusting its programmes to the expectations of the labour market in the areas in which it educates students. Currently, it creates study curricula on the basis of identified needs of the labour market.</p> <p>To create curricula, it utilizes employers' questionnaires asking what type of higher education shapes the competences that are required in labour market and specifically, what communications competences are sought by employers. Moreover, information on employers' expectations is collected in direct and telephone interviews. Job offers from the local market are analyzed. Results of such research provide a good recognition of the learning outcomes that are desired both by students and by employers. They are also used for curricula preparation.</p> <p>The base of teaching resources is intensively developed, particularly thanks to the European Union funds that were acquired by the university and thanks to the cooperation with the local self-government. Students have an opportunity to realise projects related to self-governments' needs in the area of scientific resources.</p> <p>Complex marketing research involving 350 employers and 150 graduates is being conducted to collect opinions on the teaching activity of the university. Starting any new teaching activity (e.g. postgraduate studies, training, courses) is preceded by brief studies aimed at identifying the demand for such a study area. The Pro-rector for Education Quality has been given a task to create a system that would allow an on-going assessment of teaching programme quality and that would take into account the opinions of employers and graduates. The system is to be created in the nearest future. .</p>
TUL	<p>Pending legislative changes, two-level training was organized to prepare the university environment for the formulation of curricula in learning outcomes language. First, training was delivered to trainers who then trained academic teachers. Internal rules for constructing teaching programmes on the basis of Bloom's taxonomy were formulated and the number of course outcomes as well as the rules of determining the value of a course in ECTS points were specified. Categorization of course learning outcomes was abandoned. Training brought results in the form of syllabi. Academic teachers were given access to the terminal called „teacher” where each lecturer could find practical instructions on how to construct or correct a syllabus. The university was granted ECTS Label certificate. Trainers verified course learning outcomes. Curricula and syllabi are publicly available. Academic teachers are fully autonomous in choosing the content and methods of teaching.</p>

	<p>The university has very rich resources to support the teaching process and it makes them available both to students and to academic teachers. It ensures a complete freedom of choice. It provides access to international networks of scientific information. TUL's library is one of the most modern facilities of this type in the country.</p> <p>The mechanism of curricula review that would incorporate feedback from employers and graduates is not in use. The university is aware of employers' most important requirements related to knowledge, and in particular, of the skills that TUL's graduates acquire by informal but very strong relations formed with such employers.</p>
Synthesis	<p>Legislation forced all Polish universities to develop their curricula in learning outcomes language only. It is obvious that such curricula should be publicly available.</p> <p>Universities are acting under the pressure of a shrinking education market (population decline). There is an increased understanding of the fact that they need to adjust to the needs of the social environment, especially to the needs of the labour market. Universities, especially the ones that have a practical profile, are creating and using more and more powerful instruments to recognize such needs. Poor recognition of the possibilities created by LLL.</p> <p>European funds are extensively used to enhance many quality aspects: including curricula construction and teaching base expansion.</p> <p>Occasionally, an internal conflict, especially among university academic teachers may be seen: there is a need not only for commonly available studies that would satisfy the labour market but also for preparing personnel for a great science that is isolated from the environment and its needs.</p>
Barriers	<p>Employees' preparation for the utilization of the latest technological developments and methods of class teaching – it is too poor and employees are reluctant to enhance it. Slowly acquired understanding of „student centred learning“.</p>
Good practices	<p>??</p>

Question 4

The views of students, academics and decision-makers on ESG (SSI):

- a) How well are students, academics and decision-makers familiar with the ESG?
- b) How do students, academics and decision-makers see the ESG impacting on curricula and quality assurance? (Give examples)
- c) How do students, academics and decision-makers assess the level of implementation of Part 1 ESG standards?
- d) What barriers do students, academics and decision-makers see when implementing Part 1 ESG guidelines?

AMU	<p>Relevant knowledge is possessed only by those who have been trained as "trainers", i. e. university authorities and some department authorities, but still, this group is rather small. Some departmental Teams for Teaching Quality may also have such knowledge, because they have been trained, too. In practice, the knowledge exists at the „subconscious” level and is manifested in activities.</p> <p>If it had not been for ESG, it would have been difficult to draw up the structures of education quality management in AMU two years ago. Students are not familiar with ESG. They are aware of the standards which force the university to take action.</p> <p>Respondents believe that they are implementing ESG at the university in a very good way and that their work is well advanced.</p> <p>Barriers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No understanding and engagement of large academic community masses • Problems with obtaining feedback from all stakeholders • Rejecting QA as a „technological” whim that has no evident and important purposes • The pace of implementing NQF HE and obtaining knowledge on LO contributes to superficiality and makes the concepts look like a beaurocratic whim. <p>But, in general – barriers are getting lower. The personnel „rebellion is being suppressed”. The prospects seem to be good as the academic environment begins to see the sense of pro-quality activities.</p>
WSE	<p>University management is familiarized with ESG guidelines. However, academic teachers have little (or no) knowledge on the nature and requirements of ESG guidelines although these guidelines have been delivered to them in presentations.</p> <p>Most of the University Management sees ESG’s positive influence on quality assurance although not all of them are aware of the nature of changes that occur in university functioning along with ESG implementation. University employees point to the additional and incomprehensible work that accompanies ESG</p>

	<p>implementation and they do not recognise the concept and the context of the proposed solutions. One of the positive phenomena is a favourable attitude to pro-quality activities, which is known to the economic environment from other areas of their work.</p> <p>According to students' self-government, ESG requirements are necessary and show good practices with respect to higher education quality assurance. Students' knowledge of such practices is very poor. In general, students' community has a very low awareness of how the quality assurance system functions at WSE. For them it seems to be an obvious and routine element of university activities. .</p> <p>It should be said that ESG implementation in WSE has been at the middle level. Many solutions work according to ESG, however there are no formal regulations and too few documented systemic procedures that would explicitly describe all utilized practices.</p> <p>Primary barriers: similar to the ones found in AMU plus the following ones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities are too procedurised and standardised (in the opinion of the employees), which has a negative effect of work quality • Students' involvement in the process of class quality assessment is low.
BWS	<p>ESG does not directly initiate changes in BWS in the areas of education quality. The changes that take place at the university result from the changes that occur in its surroundings (both legal and social). However, the document is known to university top authorities and it is certain that they act in accordance with its spirit. The rest of the community is unlikely to know it. Therefore, there is no basis for evaluating ESG implementation or for indicating any barriers to ESG implementation.</p>
TUL	<p>The only personnel who has the knowledge of ESG standards and their significance for education quality is the managerial staff, including the employees who are related to education quality assurance system –department of Pro-rector for Teaching Quality.</p> <p>Compare to point 2a. In general, increased bureaucracy; and costs are pointed out. Students express negative opinions.</p> <p>Students and academic teachers have no grounds to formulate such opinions. The personnel believe that most of the requirements specified in ESG standards and related to internal education quality assurance have been met (but they are not aware of such requirements).</p> <p>In the opinion of the management, the barriers to ESG standard implementation are related to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - academic environment's mentality is not compatible with the idea of complex,

	<p>unified, systemic education quality assurance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the public imposes some mechanisms of education quality assurance but it does not provide any financial support for their implementation, - when implementing ESG, it is necessary to utilize voluntary work and altruistic attitudes, - communication between the parties which should take active part in ESG promotion and implementation is insufficient.
Synthesis	<p>In all universities, their authorities and services responsible for the implementation of QA systems have explicit knowledge of ESG. Sometimes, it is also known to students' self-government. This does not mean, however, that the knowledge of AQ mechanisms does not exist – it is present (to various degrees) in the consciousness of the personnel and students but is not clearly and consciously associated with ESG.</p> <p>In the opinion of university authorities and QA personnel, ESG implementation (as far as its letter or at least its spirit is concerned) is rather good. Most of the university communities are growing testy because of the unnecessary (in their opinion) bureaucratic efforts. Students perceive ESG elements (e. g. class assessment surveys, publicly available syllabi and curricula, and other) as an obvious element of university operations. Sometimes they are quite reluctant to take part in such elements – often they do not see any results of their interventions or do not understand that such results may not be direct.</p>
Barriers	<p>Mentioned in the responses of each of the universities.</p>
Good practices	<p>Assistance for the academic staff in preparing obligatory LO-based curriculum descriptions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • „cascade” training method (TUL and AMU): training provided first to trainers who then provide training to teachers; • starting internet-based forms of teacher assistance in preparing new syllabi.

Conclusion

These conclusions will not consist of formal „findings and recommendations" and a list of „barriers and good practices” of ESG implementation at institutional, national and supranational levels. They will rather be a free reflection on the methods of creating a pro-quality culture in the context of methods of institution governance and management and the role that ESG guidelines may play in this process.

The primary objective of ESG standards, in the context of management, is to build quality culture in institutions. The main problem that arises in the context of research into the impact of governance and management on the creation of quality culture in higher education institutions is related to the factors that allow such a culture to emerge. Quality culture comes into existence only when academic community (and external stakeholders) – at the national and institutional levels, respectively – take joint responsibility for quality: identify themselves with the processes that support and creatively develop culture standards and implement pro-quality solutions. There are various reasons for taking pro-quality activities: it may be an apparent threat to quality and community's engagement in preventing such a threat, or it may be a threat to the vital interests of this community etc. Pro-quality culture is built relatively easily if it is initiated by the „bottom-up” movement. Obviously, it may also be initiated by an administrative decision of responsible authorities who would request an academic community to take appropriate measures to assure quality according to the imposed standards and procedures. In such a situation, we deal (at least in the beginning) with a „top-down” movement, which may but does not have to transform into quality culture. In particular, it happens when academic community does not understand the sense and necessity of and does not identify with such actions, treating them as a bureaucratic and superficial operation. We believe that this issue constitutes an axis for our deliberations on „governance” and quality assurance (at least in Polish reality).

Building of the quality culture in Polish higher education system is a vivid illustration of the above-mentioned problem. In the 90's, Polish academic society undertook spontaneous activities aimed at organizing the dynamically developing market of educational services (an increase in the number of HEIs from approximately 100 to 400, mainly private ones, an almost 5-fold increase in the number of students), which posed a serious threat to the quality of education. Since national authorities did not react to the problem, universities took initiative in their own hands and in the years of 1994-2000 they created several environmental (academic) accreditation committees that offered voluntary quality assessment performed according to the standards worked out by the environment. This gave rise to a pro-quality movement at the institutional level (at universities) and propagated the use of internal systems of quality assurance and other good practices. In 2001, National Accreditation Committee was created in accordance with the Polish law. It offered obligatory accreditation which used minimal quality standards. This body controls and supervises quality. It also has a potential to bring administrative results and to grant a teaching licence or a ban. Good universities have no difficulties obtaining such an accreditation. Since no method of cooperation between these two types of accreditations could be found, the „national” accreditation practically annihilated the environmental movement within the following few years. Universities abandoned environmental accreditations and settled for NAC accreditation, meeting the minimal level of requirements set forward by NAC. So far, its reconstruction has been unsuccessful. This shows how national „top-down” movement was not only unfavourable but in fact was detrimental to the developing quality culture by weakening the motivation for its development. It must be said, though, that this movement established minimal quality standards.

Currently, when the new legislation obligates Polish universities to implement NQG HE and learning outcomes orientation as well as internal systems of quality assurance, the situation is quite similar. The movement toward a better quality of curricula was initiated “top - down” and so far it has been perceived as a bureaucratic requirement that needs to be tackled as effortlessly as possible. Universities take minimal advantage of their autonomy in creating new, better curricula and in using effective methods of learning outcomes validation as well as other innovations. It is possible that the situation will change in the future once the new language of curriculum design has been mastered.

The situation at the level of Higher Education Institutions looks similar. Understanding of the sense of reforms (including ESG utilization) is moderate even among university authorities, although such authorities are required by law to put reforms into practice. Fortunately, all respondents state that university authorities have powerful standing and that universities are trying to „suppress the rebellion” of the academic community. This process is more effective at the universities where pro-quality procedures were initiated a long time ago and became an element of university routine operations. In general, however, administrative decisions were made before academic community became aware of and approved the changes although informational campaigns which promoted new solutions and showed their benefits to universities had been delivered for a long time.

Such a situation does not support development of the pro-quality culture propagated by ESG. Obviously, good university management may accelerate, facilitate and support its development. However, the question about the deeper roots of this divergence should be answered. We strongly recommend discussing the roots of divergence and publishing the final version of IBAR project, as almost all research packages state that the main barrier to ESG implementation is the fact that academic communities do not understand the reforms that are being introduced to the contemporary higher education. R. Merton’s old thesis says that the untrammelled and successful development of science is possible if the value of academic ethos is similar to the dominant values of the external public ethos. It is clearly emphasized that the academic ethos should serve as the point of reference. Given the fact that these days external values are invading the internal life of university, one may wonder what the situation looks like today. Which values should dominate? May it be possible that academic community’s resistance to approving these values is somehow substantiated?