

What Did We Learn From a Cycle of Institutional Reviews?

Andrée Sursock

Chair, Quality Board for Icelandic Higher Education

www.qef.is

Overview

- Comparing the context
- Comparing the findings
- Lessons learned from Finland

National and Institutional Contexts: What do IS and FI have in common?

- Enhancement oriented: cursor at about the same place on the enhancement-accountability continuum
- Trust based: working in partnership with the higher education institutions
- Giving priority to IQA and very respectful of institutional autonomy => quality audits

National and Institutional Contexts: How do they differ?

- **Iceland:**

- A microstate with one medium size university; the rest are small to very small.
- Evaluation started in 2010

- **Finland:**

- Much larger and more diverse system
- Better funded
- Ministry has funding indicators
- Evaluation started in 2005

⇒ HEIs have been supported for a much longer time in developing their IQA

⇒ The FI quality audits are more comprehensive: include all three missions

Comparing the findings

What do IS and FI have in common? How do they differ?

- **Commonalities:**

- Education and research management are good in both places
- Strategic management is developing

- **Differences :**

- Size, an advantage in Iceland:
 - Less variations across faculties than in Finland, more fluid communication within and across institutions
 - Stakeholder consultation seems more systematic
- QA history, an advantage in FI:
 - more formal IQA, better resourced and embedded

Two policy lessons learned from Finland

- Wide ownership of QC => If everyone is in charge, no one is in charge!
- Articulation between Ministry's funding indicators, institutional strategies and FINEEC's enhancement approach?