

## I. Theoretical underpinnings of IBAR project

- The IBAR project aims at identification of the implementation deficit of the ESG Part 1. The implementation deficit can be defined as the difference between the expected (the ESG Part 1 standards) and the achieved, i.e. empirical reality, real results (Hill, Hupe, 2002).
- The ESG Part 1 are addressed in workpackages 5-12 (WPs 5-12). The assumption is that every HEI has institutional policies<sup>1</sup> on the subject matter (“theme”) of WPs 5-12, starting with the internal QA system(s) (WP5) and ending with cooperation with institutions of secondary education (WP12). By such policies, HEI, *to some extent*, reflects upon the ESG Part 1. The reflection of the ESG Part 1 through WPs 5-12 can be more or less implicit/explicit, depending on the degree of implicitness/explicitness of the policies (policies are typically “fuzzy”).
- Despite fuzzy policy content, institutional policies contain *some* WPs 5-12 related goals (more or less fuzzy). HEI implements these goals through policy instruments<sup>2</sup>. By (systematic) application of policy instruments, the HEI achieves some relevant results *within a specific institutional context*. Achieving these results can be taken as (implicit) implementation of the ESG Part 1 standards.
- The way of reasoning that policy implementation can be studied through instruments used for putting the policy into action within a specific institutional context = **the instrument-context approach to policy implementation** (Howlett, Ramesch, 1995, 2002; Howlett, Ramesch, Perl, 2009).
- **The instrument-context approach to policy implementation** makes use of one typology of policy instruments (e.g. Salamon, 2002) or draws from several typologies. Policy instruments typically come in “mixes”, i.e. several different types of instruments are used at one time or within a certain period.
- Basic types of policy instruments are: regulation, funding, information (Vedung, 1998) but also capacity-building (Schneider, Ingram, 1990). Each type of instrument has several categories (e.g. funding: grants, loans, vouchers) and may have an affirmative and negative variant (e.g. funding: subsidies vs. taxes). For typology of instruments suggested for IBAR inquiry, see page 2.
- Usage of a typology including several instrument types (see page 2) makes it possible to study functioning and effects of individual instruments in combination, as it is assumed that implementation of the ESG Part 1 entails more than one instrument. Study of policy instruments in combination has been considered as often missing from literature on policy implementation (Peters, van Nispen, 1998; Eliadis, Hill, Howlett, 2005).
- **The instrument-context approach to policy implementation** enables to penetrate complexity of policy implementation, as it can be applied for various organisational settings and levels (micro (institutional level) – mezzo (national/system level) – macro (supranational level)) across individual countries.
- **The instrument-context approach to policy implementation** further makes it possible to identify and compare implementation barriers and examples of good

---

<sup>1</sup> Many different interpretations of the term “policy” exist, ranging from “a piece of legislation” to “a mental intent to do something”. Taken as a continuum, there are *explicit interpretations* “policy as legislation” on the one end and *implicit interpretations* “policy as a mental intent” on the other. For different interpretations and definitions of policy, see e.g. Hill, 2005: 6-10.

<sup>2</sup> Policy instrument defined as “an identifiable method through which collective action is structured to address a public problem” (Salamon, 2002). Terms *policy instruments* and *policy tools* considered mutually interchangeable.

practice. While the barriers help towards the implementation deficit, the examples of good practice can be expected to reduce it. However, to identify and compare barriers and examples of good practice, *the policy context-knowledge is essential* – must be included in each national case study.

## **II. Typology of instruments/tools for IBAR**

**Authority tools (regulation and law):** *prescriptions* (affirmative) and *proscriptions* (negative). *Prescriptions*: licensing/approval to operate. *Proscriptions*: absolute prohibitions, prohibitions with exemptions, prohibitions with permissions (enabling legislation), obligations to notify

**Economic tools:** *incentives* (affirmative) and *disincentives* (negative). *Incentives*: subsidies, grants, loans, vouchers, donations, insurance. *Disincentives*: taxes, charges, fees, tariffs, customs duties and others (fines)

**Information tools:** *mediated transmission* and *interpersonal transmission*. Both modes of transition (mediated, interpersonal) can be either affirmative (promotion) or negative (warnings, propaganda, indoctrination). *Mediated transmission*: mass media (television, radio, film, newspapers), printed matter (books, brochures, booklets, leaflets), labels, posters. *Interpersonal transmission*: direct, personal advice, conferences, workshops, exhibitions, and other less formal presentation activities involving face-to-face contact

**Capacity-building tools:** provision of education, training, as well as up-to-date technology devices to help in making decisions/caring out activities. Education, training, and technologies as basic capacity-building tools

**Learning tools:** tools to help understand the relevant aspects of policy problems. Research and development as basic learning tools

**Informal procedures:** procedures not specified in law or any other official documents. Personal correspondence (e-mails) as a basic informal procedure

Note: although efforts were made to account for all major categories and types of instruments with special regard for education, the list of instruments is not meant to be exhaustive. In constructing the typology, the balance between generalisability and specificity was aimed at, leading towards some overlaps between categories (e.g. between capacity-building and economic tools).

(Based on: Birkland, T. 2005. *An Introduction to the Policy Process, Theories, Concepts and Models of Public Policy Making* [2nd ed.]<sup>3</sup>. New York: M.E. Sharpe. Vedung, E. 1998. Policy Instruments: Typologies and Theories. In: *Carrots, Sticks, and Sermons: Policy Instruments and Their Evaluation*. M. Bemelmans-Videc, R. Rist, and E. Vedung (Eds.). New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers. 21-58. Salamon, L. 2002. The New Governance and the Tools of Public Action: Introduction. In: Salamon, L. (ed.). *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: OUP. 1-47. Schneider, A., Ingram, H. 1990. Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools. *Journal of Politics*, vol. 52, no. 2. 510-529).

---

<sup>3</sup> Particularly Chapter 7 “Policy Design and Policy Tools”, Table 7.2 “Types of Policy Tools/Instruments as Categorized by Leading Policy Scholars”, pp. 174-176.

**Selected bibliography:**

- Bemelmans-Videc, M., Rist, R., Vedung, E. (Eds.). 1998. *Carrots, Sticks, and Sermons: Policy Instruments and Their Evaluation*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Birkland, T. 2005. *An Introduction to the Policy Process, Theories, Concepts and Models of Public Policy Making* [2nd ed.]. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Eliadis, P., Hill, M., Howlett, M. 2005. Introduction. In: *Designing Government: From Instruments to Governance*, edited by P. Eliadis, M. Hill, and M. Howlett. Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press. 3-18
- Hill, M., Hupe, P. 2002. *Implementing Public Policy: Governance in Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Hill, M. 2005. *The Public Policy Process*. 4th ed. Harlow: Pearson.
- Howlett, M., and M. Ramesch. 1995. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Toronto: OUP.
- Howlett, M., and M. Ramesch. 2003. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems* [2nd ed.]. Toronto: OUP.
- Howlett, M., Ramesch, M., and A. Perl. 2009. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems* [3rd ed.]. Toronto: OUP.
- Peters, G., Van Nispen, F. (Eds.). 1998. *Public Policy Instruments: Evaluating the Tools of Public Administration*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Salamon, L. (ed.). 2002. *The Tools of Government: A Guide to the New Governance*. New York: OUP.
- Schneider, A., Ingram, H. 1990. Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools. *Journal of Politics*, vol. 52, no. 2. 510-529.

### **III. List of subject-matter workpackages (incl. coordination and delivery time<sup>4</sup>)**

#### **Workpackage 5 (WP 5): Survey of internal quality assurance systems**

Coordinated by: Latvia

Delivery time: 7 March - 29 July 2011

#### **Workpackage 6 (WP 6): Quality and access**

Coordinated by: United Kingdom

Delivery time: 6 June - 28 October 2011

#### **Workpackage 7 (WP 7): Quality and students**

Coordinated by: Czech Republic

Delivery time: 3 October 2011 - 29 February 2012

#### **Workpackage 8 (WP 8): Quality and management/governance**

Coordinated by: Portugal

Delivery time: 6 February - 29 June 2012

#### **Workpackage 9 (WP 9): Quality and employers incl. private sector**

Coordinated by: Netherlands

Delivery time: 3 May - 28 September 2012

#### **Workpackage 10 (WP 10): Quality and teaching staff**

Coordinated by: Poland

Delivery time: 3 September 2012 - 31 January 2013

#### **Workpackage 11 (WP 11): Quality and information**

Coordinated by: Slovakia

Delivery time: 3 January - 31 May 2013

#### **Workpackage 12 (WP 12): Quality and secondary education**

Coordinated by: Czech Republic + United Kingdom

Delivery time: 4 March -31 July 2013

### **IV. Case Study Templates**

#### **A) Institutional “micro” case studies (mother tongue only)**

Always-concerning 4 HEIs selected in every participant country for analysis<sup>5</sup> on subject matter related to WPs 5 – 12. 4-5 pages for each HEI per WP = 16-20 pages per WP on average

#### **B) WP5: National case study template (mother tongue, English)**

1. Introduction: A short overview of the national system of HE quality assurance (1 page). 4 HEIs and reasons for their selection incl. brief description of institutional profile. Selection factors: size (big vs. small), location (centre vs. “grass root” region), profile (comprehensive vs. specialised), *type (public vs. private) where relevant*.  
**3-4 pages**
2. Description of institutional policy context: description of current state pertaining to the WP theme at 4 selected HEIs, including *a brief* history background; use empirical data and references to system policy (mezzo level) where available and appropriate;

---

<sup>4</sup> Period in which the WP content must be produced, starting with the coordination seminar and ending with the submission of the cross-country comparative study by the WP coordinator.

<sup>5</sup> See also WP 5: National case study template, 1. Introduction.

(implicit or even direct link between institutional policy and the corresponding ESG Part 1 content or it may go via the system policy level).

**6-10 pages**

3. Framing the enquiry (answering the research questions):

Q: .....? (see the WP content)

A: .....

Q: .....? (see the WP content)

A: .....

**2-3 pages**

4. Conclusions: identification of ESG Part 1 relevant barriers and examples of good practice

Barriers are:

- .....
- .....

Examples of good practice (if relevant) are:

- .....
- .....

+ concluding commentary

**3-5 pages**

**14-22 pages in total, i.e. 18 pages on average**

**Be clear, concise, specific**

**C) WPs 6-12: National case study template** (mother tongue, English)

*Without introduction (can run through few lines if relevant), otherwise identical in structure*

**11-18 pages in total, i.e. 14 pages on average**

**Be clear, concise, specific**

**D) WPs 5-12: Comparative case study template** (English only):

1. **Introduction:** Why the theme important, some evidence (quotes, paraphrases, quantitative data ...) in relation to the ESG Part 1 content + how framed, inclusion of research questions.

**2-4 pages**

2. **Analysing the ....** Context-informed/based description of situation in 7 countries (references to 21 HEIs in total), what works, what not, how and why (“whats, hows, whys”).

**10-15 pages**

3. **Identifying barriers and examples of good practice.** Review + synthesis of questions answers from individual countries, ended by specific identification.

Barriers are:

- .....
- .....

Examples of good practice are:

- .....

- .....
- 5-10 pages**
4. **Summary and conclusions + recommendations for policy practice as well as for further research**  
**Circa 5 pages**

**Overall, circa 20-25 pages in total**

**Note: Page limits: rough estimates only, may be modified per WP content**

## **V European Standards and Guidelines, Part 1**

### **European standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance within higher education institutions**

#### **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.

##### **Guidelines:**

Formal policies and procedures provide a framework within which higher education institutions can develop and monitor the effectiveness of their quality assurance systems. They also help to provide public confidence in institutional autonomy. Policies contain the statements of intentions and the principal means by which these will be achieved. Procedural guidance can give more detailed information about the ways in which the policy is implemented and provides a useful reference point for those who need to know about the practical aspects of carrying out the procedures.

The policy statement is expected to include:

- the relationship between teaching and research in the institution;
- the institution's strategy for quality and standards;
- the organisation of the quality assurance system;
- the responsibilities of departments, schools, faculties and other organisational units and individuals for the assurance of quality;
- the involvement of students in quality assurance;
- the ways in which the policy is implemented, monitored and revised.

The realisation of the EHEA depends crucially on a commitment at all levels of an institution to ensuring that its programmes have clear and explicit intended outcomes; that its staff are ready, willing and able to provide teaching and learner support that will help its students achieve those outcomes; and that there is full, timely and tangible recognition of the contribution to its work by those of its staff who demonstrate particular excellence, expertise and dedication. All higher education institutions should aspire to improve and enhance the education they offer their students.

#### **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.

##### **Guidelines:**

The confidence of students and other stakeholders in higher education is more likely to be established and maintained through effective quality assurance activities which ensure that programmes are well-designed, regularly monitored and periodically reviewed, thereby securing their continuing relevance and currency. The quality assurance of programmes and awards are expected to include:

- development and publication of explicit intended learning outcomes;
- careful attention to curriculum and programme design and content;
- specific needs of different modes of delivery (e.g. full time, part-time, distance-learning, e-learning) and types of higher education (e.g. academic, vocational, professional);
- availability of appropriate learning resources;

- formal programme approval procedures by a body other than that teaching the programme;
- monitoring of the progress and achievements of students;
- regular periodic reviews of programmes (including external panel members);
- regular feedback from employers, labour market representatives and other relevant organisations;
- participation of students in quality assurance activities.

### **1.3 Assessment of students**

#### **Standard:**

Students should be assessed using published criteria, regulations and procedures which are applied consistently.

#### **Guidelines:**

The assessment of students is one of the most important elements of higher education. The outcomes of assessment have a profound effect on students' future careers. It is therefore important that assessment is carried out professionally at all times and takes into account the extensive knowledge which exists about testing and examination processes. Assessment also provides valuable information for institutions about the effectiveness of teaching and learners' support.

Student assessment procedures are expected to:

- be designed to measure the achievement of the intended learning outcomes and other programme objectives;
- be appropriate for their purpose, whether diagnostic, formative or summative;
- have clear and published criteria for marking;
- be undertaken by people who understand the role of assessment in the progression of students towards the achievement of the knowledge and skills associated with their intended qualification;
- where possible, not rely on the judgements of single examiners;
- take account of all the possible consequences of examination regulations;
- have clear regulations covering student absence, illness and other mitigating circumstances;
- ensure that assessments are conducted securely in accordance with the institution's stated procedures;
- be subject to administrative verification checks to ensure the accuracy of the procedures.

In addition, students should be clearly informed about the assessment strategy being used for their programme, what examinations or other assessment methods they will be subject to, what will be expected of them, and the criteria that will be applied to the assessment of their performance.

### **1.4 Quality assurance of teaching staff**

#### **Standard:**

Institutions should have ways of satisfying themselves that staff involved with the teaching of students are qualified and competent to do so. They should be available to those undertaking external reviews, and commented upon in reports.

#### **Guidelines:**

Teachers are the single most important learning resource available to most students. It is important that those who teach have a full knowledge and understanding of the subject they are teaching, have the necessary skills and experience to transmit their knowledge and understanding effectively to students in a range of teaching contexts, and can access feedback on their own performance. Institutions should ensure that their staff recruitment and appointment procedures include a means of making certain that all new staff have at least the minimum necessary level of competence. Teaching staff should be given opportunities to develop and extend their teaching capacity and should be encouraged to value their skills. Institutions should provide poor teachers with opportunities to improve their skills to an

acceptable level and should have the means to remove them from their teaching duties if they continue to be demonstrably ineffective.

### **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.

#### **Guidelines:**

In addition to their teachers, students rely on a range of resources to assist their learning. These vary from physical resources such as libraries or computing facilities to human support in the form of tutors, counsellors, and other advisers. Learning resources and other support mechanisms should be readily accessible to students, designed with their needs in mind and responsive to feedback from those who use the services provided. Institutions should routinely monitor, review and improve the effectiveness of the support services available to their students.

### **1.6 Information systems**

#### **Standard:**

Institutions should ensure that they collect, analyse and use relevant information for the effective management of their programmes of study and other activities.

#### **Guidelines:**

Institutional self-knowledge is the starting point for effective quality assurance. It is important that institutions have the means of collecting and analysing information about their own activities. Without this they will not know what is working well and what needs attention, or the results of innovatory practices.

The quality-related information systems required by individual institutions will depend to some extent on local circumstances, but it is at least expected to cover:

- student progression and success rates;
- employability of graduates;
- students' satisfaction with their programmes;
- effectiveness of teachers;
- profile of the student population;
- learning resources available and their costs;
- the institution's own key performance indicators.

There is also value in institutions comparing themselves with other similar organisations within the EHEA and beyond. This allows them to extend the range of their self-knowledge and to access possible ways of improving their own performance.

### **1.7 Public information**

#### **Standard:**

Institutions should regularly publish up to date, impartial and objective information, both quantitative and qualitative, about the programmes and awards they are offering.

#### **Guidelines:**

In fulfilment of their public role, higher education institutions have a responsibility to provide information about the programmes they are offering, the intended learning outcomes of these, the qualifications they award, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, and the learning opportunities available to their students. Published information might also include the views and employment destinations of past students and the profile of the current student population. This

information should be accurate, impartial, objective and readily accessible and should not be used simply as a marketing opportunity. The institution should verify that it meets its own expectations in respect of impartiality and objectivity.