

ORGANISATION
FOR ECONOMIC
CO-OPERATION
AND DEVELOPMENT



OECD PROJECT

**QUALITY AND RELEVANCE
OF TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

Date: 12th March 2008



Fabrice Hénard
Analyst - EDU/EMI/IMHE
Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education (IMHE)
OECD
Telephone: +33 1 45 24 93 23

www.oecd.org/edu/higher

QUALITY AND RELEVANCE OF TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION

FOREWORD

In the context of the sustained growth and diversification of higher education systems, the civil society's concerns about the quality of the programmes offered to the students are increasing. Public assessments and international comparisons of higher education institutions are receiving ever-higher levels of attention. However, the evaluation methods used by such indexes tend to over-emphasise research, and to use research performance as a yardstick of the institutions' value. If these assessment processes fail to appropriately address the quality of the teaching it is in part because measuring teaching quality is challenging.

Institutions may support and implement schemes, processes or evaluation mechanisms in order to identify, promote and / or reward good teaching practices. The institutional environment of higher education institutions or organisations can also lead to the enhancement of the quality of the teaching in higher education through various means.

This project's goal is to highlight effective quality initiatives. It hopes to push forward reflection or practice that may in turn help other institutions to improve the quality of their teaching.

The project is grounded on five main components: the online questionnaire, the review of the literature, video or telephone interviews, site visits, and a dedicated conference. Answers to the online questionnaire will constitute the vignette for each responding institution.

You will be given the possibility to decide whether or not you would like your answers to be quoted in the final report and / or published in the annex to the final report.

Please complete this questionnaire as soon as possible, and no later 21 April 2008. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Fabrice HENARD, Analyst, fabrice.henard@oecd.org, telephone +33 1 45 24 93 23 (Paris Time).

INSTRUCTIONS

Before commencing the questionnaire, it is important to understand that it must be completed in one sitting. At no time are you able to exit the questionnaire once you have begun. To help you prepare and complete the questions, please refer to the Pdf version of the on-line questionnaire (attached in the email) which will help you research for the most accurate response within your institution. To navigate between the pages, please use the BACK and NEXT buttons at the bottom of each page.

Your institution might have undertaken multiple initiatives to support the quality of teaching. You may wish to highlight all of them or only several of them, or, you may wish to focus on a specific action. This choice depends on you. We invite you to present no more than 3 different QT initiatives. The questionnaire proposes a branch that allows you to duplicate specific questions for each QT initiative.

Answers to the online questionnaire will constitute the vignette for each responding institution. You will be given the possibility to decide whether or not you would like your answers to be quoted in the final report and / or published in the annex of the final report. Please complete this questionnaire as soon as possible, and preferably by April 21st 2008. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Fabrice HENARD, Analyst, OECD - IMHE by email : fabrice.henard@oecd.org , or by telephone : +33 1 45 24 93 23 (Paris Time).

The questionnaire is composed of a number of drop-down lists and checkboxes. Additional space is provided for you to add your own comments. Please do so, especially if the proposed items do not fit your case. When responding to open questions, please use clear and concise language, or keywords. Try to avoid using terms such as “See above” or “See question no. X”. You might also want to attach extra documents for the comprehension of the case study. Please only send material if you think it will really help to clarify your responses. Thank you for explaining acronyms.

CONVENTIONS:

Your responses may be personal. They may also reflect the position of the institution as a whole. The institution organises itself to provide the answer.

By convention, the questionnaire will use such words or expressions:

- The expression “Quality Teaching initiative” (or QT initiative) addresses the mechanism, the scheme, the policy or the strategy that aims at improving teaching quality, which the institution would like to emphasise throughout this questionnaire.
- The word “teacher” comprises faculty, researchers who teach, professionals who teach, other non-academic staff who teach.
- The word “Administration” covers staff involved in non-academic affairs and who provide support to the academics and who regulate student life at the institution. It includes librarians and technical staff.
- The word “institutional” means the level where strategy is drawn up and the decisions are taken. Usually it refers to the high-level management and to the decision-making bodies. The word “department” means the part of the institution which supplies education in similar fields (e.g., a Faculty of law) or which is entitled with a certain level of autonomy within the institution (e.g., a School for management studies).
- The expression “accreditation and other assessment process” covers accreditation, quality audit, institutional evaluation, peer-review, accreditation or certification by professional

bodies, quality assessment and other processes which aims at either enhancing quality or at assuring that quality meets the standards.

SCOPE OF THE QT INITIATIVES:

An illustrative QT initiative might cover one or more elements such as:

- Initial recruitment process of teaching staff
- Continuing education for teachers
- Policy design, monitoring and implementation
- Programme design, programme monitoring, programme evaluation
- Support to pedagogy (use of tools, organisation, leadership, behaviour, attitudes)
- Support to skills (disciplinary, inter-disciplinary)
- Support to teaching and learning environment (libraries, computing facilities, virtual learning environment...)
- Support to organisation, management of programmes at teachers level,
- Support to organisation, management of programmes at department or institutional level
- Support to students (e.g., counselling service, career advice, mentoring, students associations...)
- Student evaluation (i.e. evaluation, achieved by the students, of the programmes or of their learning experience or of the learning environment)
- Feedback loop of the QT initiatives on the teaching experience
- Support to student learning (initiatives helping the students to work efficiently)
- Others.

BREAKDOWN OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

- Introduction: profile and context of the institution
- Origin and initial steps of the QT initiative
- Functioning of the QT initiative
- Extension and sustainability of the QT initiative
- Progress monitoring and assessment of the QT initiative
- Synergy of the QT initiative
- Additional comments (optional)
- Confidentiality and further issues.

The **Introduction** of the questionnaire is meant to present the profile and the local and national quality assurance context of the entire institution. The questionnaire allows the respondent to feature up to 3 different QT initiatives.

Each QT initiative is presented through a specific **section** which addresses the origin, the functioning, the extension and sustainability, the progress monitoring and the synergy of each QT initiative within the institution.

- For the first QT initiative, go to page 3 of the questionnaire and complete Section 1.
- For the second QT initiative, go to page 4 of the questionnaire and complete Section 2.
- For the third QT initiative, go to page 5 of the questionnaire and complete Section 3.
- If you have a sole QT initiative to address, complete Section 1 only.
- The Additional comments (page 6) are optional whereas the confidentiality point (page 7) needs to be completed as to know whether you want your answers to be referenced and / or to be quoted.

INTRODUCTION: INSTITUTION'S PROFILE AND CONTEXT

1. Name of the HEI
2. Person completing the questionnaire, position and contact details
3. Number of students of the institution (full time equivalent students)
4. Proportion of Bachelor/ Masters/ Doctoral degrees/ Other degrees offered (use figures and %)
5. Full time equivalent number of teaching staff and number of teacher-to-student ratio
6. In major teaching fields, can you please show the breakdown using the list below, of the students bodies (figures or percentage of students enrolled).
 - a. Humanities (Philosophy, history, literature, linguistic, sociology...):
 - b. Science:.....
 - c. Health/Medicine:.....
 - d. Law:.....
 - e. Economics:.....
 - f. Business/management:.....
 - g. Art:.....
 - h. Engineering:.....
 - i. Education:.....
 - j. Other please specify
7. In case the list above is irrelevant to your institution, please use the comment box below to show specific breakdown of students using your own classification.
8. Does your institution select the students? (at which level?)
9. What are the main commitments of the institution aimed at enhancing the quality of its teaching? (*Respondents are asked to score from 1 (high) to 4 (low)*)
 - a. Initial recruitment process of teaching staff: 1 to 4
 - b. Continuing education for faculty: 1 to 4
 - c. Institutional policy design, monitoring and implementation: 1 to 4
 - d. Programme design, programme monitoring and implementation: 1 to 4

- e. Student evaluation (i.e. evaluation, achieved by the students, of the programmes or of their learning experience or of the learning environment): 1 to 4
- f. Professional development to pedagogy (pedagogical tools, teachers behaviour and attitudes): 1 to 4
- g. Funds to promote motivative teaching: 1 to 4
- h. Prize endowment for “good” teachers or remarkable QT initiated by teachers: 1 to 4
- i. Support to organisation, management of programmes at teachers level: 1 to 4
- j. Support to organisation, management of programmes at institutional level (departmental or institutional level): 1 to 4
- k. Support to teaching and learning environment (libraries, computing facilities, virtual learning environment...): 1 to 4
- l. Support to students (e.g., counselling service, career advice, mentoring, students associations...): 1 to 4
- m. Feedback loop of the QT initiatives on the teaching experience: 1 to 4
- n. Support to student learning (initiatives helping students to work efficiently): 1 to 4

10. **IMPORTANT:** What is (are) the specific QT initiative(s) your institution would like to address particularly through this questionnaire (1 to 3 QT initiatives).

Quality assurance context:

This part aims at achieving a better understanding of the legal environment in which the institution operates. It addresses the issues of accreditation/ evaluation and of the level of autonomy on teaching matters (i.e. excluding research).

11. Is your institution accredited or externally adjudged in relation to quality assurance or enhancement at institutional level? Yes/No

Additional comments?.....

12. When has the most recent accreditation or evaluation occurred at institutional level and at programme level?

13. What body carries out the accreditation or the external quality assurance or enhancement process at institutional level?

- a. Ministry
- b. External agency
- c. Professional bodies
- d. Other additional bodies?

14. What are the main methods used to accreditate or to adjudge the institution in relation to quality assurance or enagement?

- a. Self-evaluation + peer review
- b. Other additional main methods used?.....

15. What body carries out the accreditation or the external quality assurance or enhancement process at programme level?
 - a. Ministry
 - b. External agency
 - c. Professional bodies
 - d. Other additional bodies?

16. What are the main methods used to accreditate programmes:
 - a. Self-evaluation + peer review
 - b. Other additional main methods used?

17. What is the scope covered by the accreditation or the process in relation to quality assurance or enhancement (on teaching aspect only)? (*Respondents are asked to score from 1 (high) to 4 (low)*)
 - a. Academic content of programmes: 1 to 4
 - b. Recruitment process of teaching staff: 1 to 4
 - c. Human resources policy: 1 to 4
 - d. Pedagogy: 1 to 4
 - e. Facilities for teaching and learning: 1 to 4
 - f. Quality assurance set up by the institution to support quality teaching: 1 to 4
 - g. Impact of student experience: 1 to 4

Additional scopes covered?

18. If case the institution is not accredited in your country or in your region, what can be the consequences? (*Respondents are asked to score from 1 (high) to 4 (low)*)
 - a. No funding or less funding received: 1 to 4
 - b. The institution cannot operate: 1 to 4
 - c. The institution is obliged to undertake corrective actions: 1 to 4
 - d. No consequences: 1 to 4

Additional consequences?

19. What reforms has your institution engaged in after the evaluation, in order to obtain full accreditation and/or to take into account the recommendations of the evaluators?
20. If the programme is not accredited or if the evaluation reveals poor or bad results, what are the consequences for the programme? (*Respondents are asked to score from 1 (high) to 4 (low)*)
 - a. No funding or less funding received: 1 to 4
 - b. The programme cannot operate: 1 to 4
 - c. The institution is obliged to undertake corrective actions to make the programme operate: 1 to 4
 - d. No consequences: 1 to 4

Additional consequences?

21. Has your institution recently required a private accreditation or evaluation (labelisation, etc) at any level?

Autonomy of the institution

22. In your country (in your region or in your city), to what extent your institution has the freedom or the autonomy to:*(Respondents are asked to score from 1 (high) to 4 (low))*
 - a. Design the programmes: 1 to 4.....
 - b. Implement the programmes: 1 to 4.....
 - c. Assess the outcomes of the programme: 1 to 4.....
 - d. Recruit the teachers: 1 to 4:.....
 - e. Discretion to reward the teachers: 1 to 4.....
 - f. Assess the teachers: 1 to 4.....

Any additional comments to add?

23. Does your institution (or part thereof) assign certain teachers to specific classes or specific level (e.g.; at introductory level)?
24. Do external regulations / guidelines oblige or expect new recruited teachers to be trained initially or on continuing education?
25. If you have external regulations or guidelines, how are they organised and impact on your institution?
26. If you have internal regulation or guidelines, how are they organized?

QT INITIATIVE

As stated in the beginning in the foreword, the questionnaire addresses the following items:

- Introduction: profile and context of the institution
- Origin and initial steps of the QT initiative
- Functioning of the QT initiative
- Extension and sustainability of the QT initiative
- Progress monitoring and assessment of the QT initiative
- Synergy of the QT initiative
- Additional comments (optional)
- Confidentiality and further issues

PLEASE REMEMBER :

- Complete SECTION 1 for QT initiative 1 (page 3), SECTION 2 for QT initiative 2 (page 4) and SECTION 3 for QT initiative 3 (page 5).
- If you have only one QT initiative, please complete Section 1 only (page 3) and then go directly to Page 6.
- Page 6 and 7 are Additional Comments and Confidentiality and Further Issues.

ORIGIN AND INITIAL STEPS OF THE QT INITIATIVE

This part of the questionnaire is meant to provide an overview of the reasons why quality teaching has become an issue of importance. This section, and those following, deals primarily with the QT initiative(s) your institution would like to underpin.

27. What is the initiative? Describe the QT initiative and give examples:.....
28. What was the origin of the QT initiative?
 - a. Internal (strategy, new types of teaching...):
 - b. External (law, regulation, quality assurance process, accountability...):
 - c. Contextual (environment, demography, types of students...)

Comments:

29. Who prompted the QT initiative with the institution?

- a. Teachers individually:
- b. Teachers as a team:
- c. Leadership at school or faculty level:
- d. Students:
- e. Decision-making bodies:

Additional Comments?.....

30. Has the QT initiative:

- a. Now just started
- b. Been being implemented for less than 3 years
- c. Been being implemented for more than 3 years

Additional Comments?.....

FUNCTIONNING

This part deals with the content and ways of operation of the QT initiative. It aims the reader at capturing the gist of the concrete tools, process or systems that come into play. This part also intends to feature the people involved in the implementation of, and those who might gain from, the QT initiative.

31. How would you describe the QT initiative:

- a. Experimental: Yes/ No
- b. Established: Yes/ No

Comments:.....

32. Does the QT initiative aim at:

- a. Enhancing the quality of the teaching:
 - b. Assessing the quality of the teaching
 - c. Helping teachers to teach efficiently
 - d. Rewarding teachers that commit themselves to QT
 - e. Rewarding excellence of teaching
 - f. Affecting teachers' career progression
 - g. Promoting scholarship and research on teachers:
- Other aims?

What is the level of concern regarding the objectives of the QT initiative?

- a. For the institution: 1 to 4
- b. For teachers: 1 to 4
- c. For the students: 1 to 4

33. Is the QT initiative locally implemented (within a faculty or a department or at lower level)?
34. Is the QT initiative disseminated (over several departments, faculties or concerns the whole institution)?
35. What is the exact timeline if the the QT initiative?
36. Who and how is dedicated to the project (position, type, number of staff concerned) and how is it done?
37. Does your institution have a specific body / committee / postholder that centralises or monitors or coordinates the support to QT initiative?
38. What is the target audience (beneficiaries, i.e. those who are directly concerned and involved) of the QT initiative? *Respondents are asked to score from 1 (high) to 4 (low)*
 - a. New teachers: 1 to 4
 - b. Current teachers: 1 to 4
 - c. Bachelor Students: 1 to 4
 - d. Master students: 1 to 4
 - e. Doctoral students: 1 to 4
 - f. Administrative Staff: 1 to 4
 - g. Leaders of the institution: 1 to 4
 - h. Employers: 1 to 4

Other target audiences?

39. How many people have attended/which departments have been participating (as beneficiaries) in the QT initiative so far?
40. If *individual teachers* have been launching their own QT initiatives, to what extent does the institution support, monitor and / or reward these initiatives?
41. If your your *institution* or a *department* has launched the QT initiatives, what are the tools and procedures used to make such initiatives attractive to potential audience?
42. To what extent the QT initiative has enhanced or clarified the linkage between research activities and teaching activities in the institution?

EXTENSION AND SUSTAINABILITY

This part aims at highlighting the institutional commitment to sustain the QT initiative and to help the impacts of QT initiative(s) to permeate to all levels and to maintain teachers' commitment to / engagement with the QT initiative (s).

43. Is there a willingness of the institution to extend the QT initiative?
44. How has the institution extended or disseminated or permeated the QT initiative in-house?
45. What are the major challenges the QT initiative promoters will have to anticipate or had to anticipate in order to succeed?
46. In what ways your institution encourages discussion of the impacts and of the appraisal of the efficiency of the QT initiative?
47. How is the QT initiative funded (special external money, internal resource, amount)?
48. How does your institution foresee the next steps for the future of the QT initiative?
49. Additionally, what could be done to lead the QT initiative to greater success?

PROGRESS MONITORING AND ASSESSMENT OF QT INITIATIVE

50. What are the mechanisms / indicators implemented by the institution to follow-up on the progress of the QT initiative?
51. What is measured when assessing or monitoring the QT initiative?
52. The people who are in charge of the implementation of the QT initiative, who are they accountable to?
53. Who are responsible for taking stock of the QT initiative's progression and of the outputs?
 - a. The people in charge of QT implementation:
 - b. The beneficiaries themselves:
 - c. The Administration support:
 - d. A specific body:
 - e. Others:.....
54. What criteria did your institution chose to evaluate the success of the QT initiative?
 - a. Please give examples of criteria
 - b. Please give examples of yardsticks or standards to be reached:.....

55. To date, what are the main consequences for the teachers and the students of the QT initiative? ?

SYNERGY

This part is meant to underline how multiple initiatives are likely to entwine and hence to improve the quality of teaching within the institution.

56. Has the QT initiative been designed and implemented to be linked to other policies of the institution? If so, could you specify by giving examples, what are these links with:
- IT strategy:.....
 - Student services:.....
 - Staff development policies:.....
 - Estate and space and building strategies:.....
 - Others? :.....
57. Could you give examples of tools or practices that ensure the coherence amongst the various QT initiatives that may occur simultaneously?
58. Could you give examples of impact of the QT initiative that concern other domains than solely teaching (e.g.; on teachers mobility, on research activities...)?
59. Within the institution, how is the QT initiative articulated with other initiatives undertaken by other departments, by senior decision-making bodies, by committees and by other individuals?
60. Outside the institution, how is the QT initiative articulated with other initiatives undertaken by other departments, by senior decision-making bodies, by committees and by other individuals?
61. Could you give examples of how your institution makes sure that the QT initiative is articulated with the strategy or the key objectives of the institution?
62. Is the QT initiative part of or an incentive to build a “quality culture” in your institution?
63. To some extent is the QT initiative bound to a specific identity of your institution?
64. Is the QT initiative part of the promotion of the institution?

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS (OPTIONNAL)

Comments to be added by the respondent on matters that affect QT (practicalities, philosophy or values that underpin the QT initiative, specific conception of “teaching” or of “quality” embedded in the institution, other issues of importance to better understand the commitment of the institution as regard the quality of teaching).

This part allows the respondent to complement or even reshape the online questionnaire. This part will also help IMHE to find out relevant items for further discussions (by telephone interviews and/or site visits). Please add your comments?

CONFIDENTIALITY AND FURTHER ISSUES:

We remind you that the purpose of the project is to provide examples and neither to compare nor to appraise the individual responses to the questionnaire.

- 65. Would you permit reference to your institutional illustrations in the report? Yes/no
- 66. Would you allow the institutional illustrations to be quoted in the report or an annex? Yes/no
- 67. Would you like the institutional illustrations to be part of the annex of the report on the IMHE-OECD website? Yes/no
- 68. Would you like to be contacted to have further discussions on the topic? Yes/no
- 69. Would you like to participate in in-depth analysis for the second phase of this project? Yes/no

Thank you for taking part in this survey and contributing your experience of quality and relevance of teaching in higher education.