

REPORT BASED ON QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSES

-CASE OF ALBANIA-

In total 44 questionnaires were filled in:

- 23 from University of Tirana
- 20 from University of Durrës
- 1 from Ministry of education and science

There were 2 representatives of HEA in the sample, 3 representatives of administrative staff, and 39 representatives of HEIs.

On a scale from 0 to 5, participants rated following features of university in following way:

<i>Features</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Support (%)</i> *
Comprehensiveness	4.25	1.08	77.3
Autonomy	4.25	0.91	90.9
Being integrated	4.26	0.82	81.4
Quality of research and teaching	4.50	0.70	88.7
Right to award PhD degrees	4.67	0.60	93.0
Being non-profit	3.14	1.71	47.7
Responsiveness to social needs	4.07	0.97	72.2
Accessibility	3.86	1.25	63.7
Strong partnership with the 3rd sector	3.69	1.43	60.0

*percent of rates 4 and 5 counted together

Most valued principles are:

- *The development of higher education should be informed by a strategic and long-term vision (M = 4.84)*
- *Higher education institutions must be fully accountable for the very substantial public and private funds devoted to support their mission (M =4.62)*
- *Governments need to place much more faith in the capacity of universities to determine their own development and to respond to the challenges of innovation and creativity (M =4.62)*

The least valued principles are:

- *New models for financially autonomous, professionally governed and managed non-state higher education institutions and bodies have to be introduced, e.g. foundation owned HEIs and bodies (M = 3.66)*
- *An adequate distance between higher education institutions and ministries has to be made through neutral expert intermediary bodies (M = 3.73)*

12.2% of participants believe that autonomy should be on a faculty level, 14.6% participants believe it should be on a university level, whereas 73.2% believe it should be on both university and faculty level. Regarding legal status, 2.4% believe it should be associated to faculty, 34.2% state it should be associated to university, while 63.4% - to both university and faculty.

Regarding the functions that should be assigned to University, Faculty or both, participants responded in following way:

Functions	Percentages		
	<i>University</i>	<i>Faculty</i>	<i>Both</i>
1. Enrolling students	27.3	34.1	38.6
2. Employing staff	11.4	40.9	47.7
3. Deciding on the content of study programmes	2.3	68.2	29.5
4. Issuing diplomas/degrees	36.4	15.9	47.7
5. Negotiating with government for funding	36.4	11.4	52.3
6. Having development fund	13.6	15.9	70.5
7. Having international relations office	34.1	15.9	50.0
8. Having quality assurance office	36.4	9.1	54.5
9. Having student support services	15.9	50.0	34.1
10. Having information system	13.6	15.9	70.5
11. Having students organizations	18.2	20.5	61.4
12. Creating the proposal of the content of study programmes*	9.4	84.4	6.3
13. Approving the content of study programmes*	18.8	43.8	37.5

- Last two items are from the new version of the questionnaire (N=32)

In the following table it could be observed that participants believe that there is an evident difference between ideal level of development of university administrative staff and current level, and that there is even bigger discrepancy between ideal university information system efficiency and current efficiency.

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Importance that key members of university administrative staff have MA/PhD in relevant areas*	4.39	0.88
Level of satisfaction with university administrative staff	3.07	0.99
Importance that university has an efficient and comprehensive information system	4.77	0.52
Level of satisfaction with university information system	2.93	1.19

- In a new version of questionnaire (N=32), question was about importance that university has competent and well trained administrative staff

40.9% of the participants think university information system should be coupled network of faculty information systems and 25% - it should be central.

Regarding non-state own income that should be allowed to university, participants answered affirmatively for:

- tuition fees – 84.1.%
- administrative fees – 70.5%
- consultancy fees – 75%
- earnings from their own assets – 81.8%
- interest from financial investments – 41.9%
- donations – 97.7%
- publishing – 79.5%
- commissioned projects – 72.7%
- other party funding – 46.5%

In the following table results regarding importance of FEATURES of an INTEGRATED university are presented:

<i>Features</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Support (%)</i>
1. To have central information system	4.47	0.76	95.4
2. To have central services	4.13	1.00	77.3

3. University being only legal entity	3.57	1.45	52.2
4.Rector being appointed by advert and having full power	2.72	1.10	18.2
5. Deans being appointed by rector	2.00	1.26	0.0
6. AS being well qualified and competent	4.52	0.70	88.6
7. AS playing important role in decision making	3.27	0.90	45.5
8. Students unions - single university legal entity	4.27	0.65	90.9
9. Students services - part of central university services	3.97	0.87	70.4
10. Central management with the recourses	4.26	1.00	81.4
11. Financial and ownership autonomy	4.42	0.67	91.7

Concerning advantages/disadvantages of integrated university, 25% of participants see some disadvantages.

On the scale of 0 to 5, the most of participants rated the level of universities in their countries being integrated with 4 (46.5%), followed by 41.9% who rated it with 3, then 7% - with 5, and 4.7% with 2.

Importance of listed FEATURES of university AUTONOMY:

<i>Features</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Support (%)</i>
1. Right to restructure themselves internally as they see fit	4.48	0.68	95.1
2. Right to negotiate common positions, projects and programmes with sister institutions, nationally and internationally.	4.41	0.67	91.2
3. Right to employ their own staff	4.44	0.70	88.4
4. Right to vary salary scales and similar remuneration according to institutional needs	3.60	1.34	59.6
5. Right to retain earnings from their own assets or from donations	4.54	0.55	97.6
6. Right to have predictable long term funding framework with multi-year financial planning	4.19	0.83	73.8
7. Right to set up holding companies (alone or with external partners	3.54	1.13	50.0

8. Right to have diversified funding and particularly access to private funding	3.88	0.94	69.1
9. Right to have budgetary autonomy	4.60	0.69	92.0
10. Right to have ownership autonomy	3.83	1.32	66.7
11. Right to have access to private funding	4.18	0.75	81.9
12. Right to withdraw from the state status if they want to	2.92	1.63	32.3
13. Right to define their own strategic and long-term vision	4.28	1.12	86.0
14. Right to respond effectively to increasing domestic and international competition	4.35	1.04	83.8
15. Right to decide about curricula	4.83	0.37	100
16. Right to decide about research subjects	4.69	0.74	95.4
17. Right to determine tuition fees	4.06	1.05	76.6
18. Right to have its own developmental fund	4.43	0.73	86.7
19. Right to have classified internal information	3.87	1.17	62.0

34.9% of the participants answered they are familiar with the concept of buffer bodies, whereas 51.2% stated they have not heard before for this concept. In the table are presented evaluated functions of buffer bodies:

<i>Buffer bodies could</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Support (%)</i>
1. Provide detailed steering of HE system, broad policy framework	3.61	1.16	56.1
2. Facilitate strategic development of the HE sector	3.95	1.07	72.1
3. Encourage long term strategic planning of the HE system	4.27	0.78	81.9
4. Allow long term considerations to inform decisions	4.50	1.51	100
5. Safeguard and promote university autonomy	3.90	1.25	67.5
6. Provide for a separation of functions	3.95	1.10	73.8
7. Safeguard, help promote and improve academic standards	3.88	1.29	55.9
8. Limit bureaucratic control and micro management	4.07	1.20	73.8
9. Limit direct political involvement in HEIs	3.97	1.25	75.6

10. Prevent inappropriate use of power	4.13	1.24	71.9
---	------	------	------

When asked to about professional potential of HEA with no permanent staff, on a scale from 0 to 5, participants assessed it as relatively low ($M = 2.64$). On the question whether there is conflict of interest if all members of HEA are academics being employed at HEIs, average rate, $M = 2.81$.

Participants expressed the highest level of trust in not-for-profit buffer bodies ($M = 4.18$), followed by state buffer bodies ($M = 3.36$) and, at the end, for-profit buffer bodies ($M = 3.27$).

Majority believes that regional cooperation could enhance internal structural reform (82% agreed) and that „creation of various and simultaneous cross-border institutionalized frameworks for regional cooperation could help in further convergence to EHEA“ (93.8% answered affirmatively)

Majority of participants believes that private HEIs are typical for Western Balkan countries (43.2%), whereas 18.2% believe they are typical for Western European countries 13.6% for SEE countries and 11.4% - for countries with long lasting experience in market economy.

Half of the participants believe that it will be possible to maintain and further develop HE without increasingly involved private financing, and half of them believe it will not be possible (mainly because *“State does not have enough money for HE development”*, or because *“Private financing will enhance cooperation with other sectors and groups of the society.”*, or because *“Higher education needs periodic finances to meet the changes of the new technology and new standards in the field of education.”*). There is slightly more commentaries that reveal negative attitudes toward private HEI (e.g. *“destroying our system”* or *“undermining the education quality”*) than those that reveal positive attitudes (e.g. *“aims at promoting, improving and increasing the degree of the scientific research in a state”*)

Regarding the concept Foundation-owned universities, 54.5% of participants have heard before for that concept, whereas 45.5% have not.

Majority expressed preference for state university (54.5%), whereas on the second place is university of excellence (20.5%) and on the third – not-for-profit university (18.2%). Accordingly, most of them expressed trust in state universities ($M = 4.16$) then in not-for-profit universities ($M = 3.50$), whereas they are mostly suspicious regarding for-profit

universities ($M = 2.25$). Almost all participants (97.6%) think that the title “university” should be legally protected.

62.2% of participants believe it would be advisable to introduce non-state agencies/bodies with advisory powers throughout the higher education sector, and 94.7% would support introducing non-state professional accreditation/QA agencies/bodies in the higher education system. They would have most trust in professional non-state and non-profit agencies ($M = 4.15$), comparing to professional for-profit ($M = 3.46$) agencies/bodies and non-professional state ($M = 2.62$).

Regarding certificates that could provide more confidence concerning the quality of HEI, majority of participants would opt for international accreditation certificate and appearance in international global ranking of HEIs (compared to national). Majority (76.7%) would support usage of rankings of HEIs for helping to decide how to allocate financial resources.