Independence of QA vis-à-vis different stakeholders

Accreditation of courses of studies: quality standards and their effect on university autonomy

Rodolfo De Vincenzi. Universidad Abierta Interamericana, Universidad de San Andrés. Argentina

rdevincenzi@vaneduc.edu.ar
Guarantee Quality in Higher Education

Definition of Standards

Professional Colleges
Universities
State
Scientific Academies
Process of Evaluation and Accreditation

Increase of Regulatory power of State

Argentine Universities

Increase of Power of Academic Elites
Autonomy vs. Regulation

1918

Córdoba Reform
(Argentina)

Concept of Autonomy

1995

Higher Education Law

Definition of Standards
in courses of studies of risk
Process of Definition of Standards

Standards for the accreditation of courses of studies of risk contemplated in section 43 of Higher Education Law
Evolution

1999  2001  2006  2007

Medicine  Engineering  Architecture  Medicine

Res. 535/99  Res. 1232/01  Res. 498/06  Res. 1314/07
Queries in the Research

What was the level of participation of the State, the universities, the professional colleges and the scientific academies in the definition of quality standards?

How did relations among these actors evolve along the different processes?

In which way was the autonomy of universities affected by these processes?
About the level of participation of the involved actors

**In favor of Autonomy:** Those appealing to the suppression of concepts, sentences or reports suggesting control or interference in tasks and functions unaware to the need of regulation. Furthermore, it includes the ones that imply a fixed position of the institution which is supported by the autonomy itself.

- **In favor of Regulation:** Those which semantically propose changes suggesting a major control, regulation or order.
# Definition of Standards for Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum course hours</th>
<th>Basic Contents</th>
<th>Intensity of Practice Formation</th>
<th>Scope of the Title of Doctor of Medicine</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total observations carried out</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of Autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In favor of Regulation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total observations considered at Resol. 535/99.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary Chart of the decision-making process for the case of the regulation of courses of studies in medicine
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Analysis of the level of autonomy admitted by standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scoring Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAY - SHOULD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT DEFINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCEPTUAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course of studies</th>
<th>Total Scoring</th>
<th>Quantity of Standards</th>
<th>Relation Scoring - Standards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE - Res. 535/99</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING - Res. 1232/01</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARQUITECTURE - Res. 498/06</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICINE - Res. 1314/07</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

Which was the level of participation of the State, the universities, the professional colleges and science academies in the definition of quality standards?
1) We found that the success key for the consensus was that most universities and actors consulted show their analysis and points of view according to their possibilities or decisions.
2) The State could adopt a new attitude developing a policy that guarded over the quality by means of evaluation and accreditation with the purpose of harmonizing expansion and quality, without interrupting the process of development of the institutions of higher education; but carrying out instruments for their control.

How did the relations between these actors evolve along the different processes?
We cannot yet see the evolution, because we have just analyzed the case of the regulation of medicine. There remains the analysis of the case of engineering and architecture to be able to conclude how the relations evolved.

How was university autonomy affected by these processes?
1) We found that the quantity of standards does not define the degree of autonomy.
2) We found that the key of the regulation is in the writing of each of the standards.
Elements of a Standard that determine its position towards university autonomy

- **Object of Regulation**
  - Conceptual or Operational
  - Product, Process or Input

- **Subject of Regulation**
  - Defined or not defined

- **Regulatory Action**
  - “Can” “Should” “Must”