

## REPORT BASED ON QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSES

### -CASE OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA-

In total 70 questionnaires were filled in:

- 21 from University of Banja Luka
- 18 from University of Sarajevo
- 13 from University of Mostar
- 3 from Paneuropean University APEIRON
- 8 from Agency for Development of HE and QA
- 3 From Ministry of education and science
- 2 from Ministry of culture and sport
- 1 from Ministry of science and technology
- 1 from Agency for information society of Republika Srpska

Following groups were present in the sample, in percents:

- Representatives of teaching staff (40.0% of lecturers, 5.7% department heads)
- Faculty governing staff (7.1% of vice-deans and 5.7% of deans).
- Representatives of HEAs (21.5%)
- Representatives of administrative staff (15.7%) and
- Students representatives (4.3%).

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

| <i>Features</i>   | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Support (%)</i> * |
|---|----------|-----------|----------------------|
| <b>1. Comprehensiveness</b>                                 | 3.83     | 1.18      | 60.1                 |
| <b>2. Autonomy</b>  | 4.50     | 0.67      | 94.2                 |
| <b>3. Being integrated</b>                                  | 3.45     | 1.46      | 55.0                 |
| <b>4. Quality of research and teaching</b>                  | 4.84     | 0.37      | 100                  |
| <b>5. Right to award PhD degrees</b>                        | 4.46     | 1.06      | 85.5                 |
| <b>6. Being non-profit</b>                                  | 3.25     | 1.25      | 43.4                 |
| <b>7. Responsiveness to social needs</b>                    | 4.61     | 0.62      | 96.7                 |
| <b>8. Accessibility</b>                                     | 4.55     | 0.65      | 91.3                 |
| <b>9. Strong partnership with the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</b> | 4.19     | 1.17      | 72.1                 |

\*percent of rates 4 and 5 counted together

Most valued principles are:

- *Quality assurance and improvement, external evaluation and accreditation are all areas of Regional importance to higher education institutions (M = 4.84)*
- *The development of higher education should be informed by a strategic and long-term vision (M = 4.73)*

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 = 3.64)*
- *An adequate distance between higher education institutions and ministries has to be made through neutral expert intermediary bodies (M = 3.73).*

Majority of the participants believe that autonomy should be on both university and faculty level (63.8%), whereas 30.4% believe it should be on university level, and 5.8% - on faculty level. Regarding legal status, majority believe it should be associated to university (47.8%), while 40.6% believe it should be associated to both university and faculty, and 11.6% - to faculty.

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

| <b><i>Functions</i></b>                               | <b><i>Percentages</i></b> |                |             |
|---|---------------------------|----------------|-------------|
|   | <i>University</i>         | <i>Faculty</i> | <i>Both</i> |
| <b>1. Enrolling students</b>                          | 33.3                      | 43.5           | 23.2        |
| <b>2. Employing staff</b>                             | 37.7                      | 23.2           | 39.1        |
| <b>3. Deciding on the content of study programmes</b> | 38.2                      | 16.2           | 45.6        |
| <b>4. Issuing diplomas/degrees</b>                    | 61.4                      | 2.9            | 35.7        |
| <b>5. Negotiating with government for funding</b>     | 64.2                      | 2.9            | 32.9        |
| <b>6. Having development fund</b>                     | 46.4                      | 10.1           | 43.5        |
| <b>7. Having international relations office</b>       | 60.0                      | 4.0            | 36.0        |
| <b>8. Having quality assurance office</b>             | 50.0                      | 10.0           | 40.0        |
| <b>9. Having student support services</b>             | 8.6                       | 65.7           | 25.7        |
| <b>10. Having information system</b>                  | 44.3                      | 10.0           | 45.7        |
| <b>11. Having students organizations</b>              | 38.6                      | 10.0           | 51.4        |

From the following table it could be concluded that participants are dissatisfied with university administrative staff and especially with university information system in the country.

|   | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|---|------|----------------|
| <b>Importance that key members of university administrative staff have MA/PhD in relevant areas</b> | 4.01 | 1.06           |
| <b>Level of satisfaction with university administrative staff</b>                                   | 2.79 | 1.25           |
| <b>Importance that university has an efficient and comprehensive information system</b>             | 4.71 | 0.49           |
| <b>Level of satisfaction with university information system</b>                                     | 2.52 | 1.09           |

Regularly mentioned weak points of university administrative staff are: inefficiency, poor organization, lack of competence (especially for European projects administration), lack of English knowledge etc.

Regarding information system, 34.8% of the participants would opt for central university information system

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

- tuition fees – 95.7.%
- administrative fees – 52.2%
- consultancy fees – 88.4%
- earnings from their own assets – 62.3%
- interest from financial investments – 66.7%
- donations – 92.8%
- publishing – 94.2%
- commissioned projects – 97.1%
- other party funding – 33.3%

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> |
|---|----------|-----------|--------------------|
| <b>1. To have central information system</b>                      | 4.54     | 0.88      | 87.2               |
| <b>2. To have central services</b>                                | 4.13     | 0.92      | 81.4               |
| <b>3. University being only legal entity</b>                      | 2.97     | 1.53      | 40.0               |
| <b>4. Rector being appointed by advert and having full power</b>  | 3.52     | 1.33      | 52.0               |
| <b>5. Deans being appointed by rector</b>                         | 2.56     | 1.78      | 36.0               |
| <b>6. AS being well qualified and competent</b>                   | 4.41     | 0.94      | 90.5               |
| <b>7. AS playing important role in decision making</b>            | 3.68     | 1.60      | 64.0               |
| <b>8. Students unions - single university legal entity</b>        | 4.24     | 0.97      | 80.0               |
| <b>9. Students services - part of central university services</b> | 4.16     | 0.91      | 78.6               |
| <b>10. Central management with the recourses</b>                  | 3.81     | 1.25      | 70.0               |
| <b>11. Financial and ownership autonomy</b>                       | 4.36     | 1.44      | 88.0               |
| <b>12. Rector has effective decision power</b>                    | 3.64     | 1.07      | 62.2               |
| <b>13. Centralized university decision making</b>                 | 2.91     | 1.22      | 24.4               |
| <b>14. Central developmental fund</b>                             | 4.22     | 1.13      | 75.6               |

Concerning advantages/disadvantages of integrated university, 45.8% of participants see some disadvantages (like too high level of bureaucratization), while 37.5% don't care.

On the scale of 0 to 5, majority of participants rated the level of universities in their countries being integrated with 4 (34.8%), followed by 31.8% who rated it with 3, and 18.2% who rated it with 1.

Importance of listed FEATURES of university AUTONOMY:

| <i>Features</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Support (%)</i> |
|--|----------|-----------|--------------------|
| <b>1. Right to restructure themselves internally as they see fit</b> | 4.47     | 0.91      | 87.1               |

|  |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|
| <b>2. Right to negotiate common positions, projects and programmes with sister institutions, nationally and internationally.</b> | 4.43 | 0.85 | 91.4 |
| <b>3. Right to employ their own staff</b>  | 4.30 | 1.07 | 75.8 |
| <b>4. Right to vary salary scales and similar remuneration according to institutional needs</b>                                  | 4.13 | 1.09 | 77.2 |
| <b>5. Right to retain earnings from their own assets or from donations</b>   | 4.40 | 0.94 | 81.4 |
| <b>6. Right to have predictable long term funding framework with multi-year financial planning</b>                               | 4.41 | 0.96 | 84.3 |
| <b>7. Right to set up holding companies (alone or with external partners</b>   | 3.13 | 1.35 | 42.0 |
| <b>8. Right to have diversified funding and particularly access to private funding</b>   | 3.87 | 1.09 | 72.0 |
| <b>9. Right to have budgetary autonomy</b>   | 4.21 | 1.08 | 76.8 |
| <b>10. Right to have ownership autonomy</b>  | 3.59 | 1.41 | 66.1 |
| <b>11. Right to have access to private funding</b>   | 4.00 | 1.15 | 63.6 |
| <b>12. Right to withdraw from the state status if they want to</b>   | 2.64 | 1.55 | 33.8 |
| <b>13. Right to define their own strategic and long-term vision</b>  | 4.66 | 0.70 | 94.1 |
| <b>14. Right to respond effectively to increasing domestic and international competition</b>                                     | 4.40 | 0.83 | 80.9 |
| <b>15. Right to decide about curricula</b>   | 4.40 | 0.92 | 86.8 |
| <b>16. Right to decide about research subjects</b>   | 4.35 | 0.91 | 86.8 |
| <b>17. Right to determine tuition fees</b>   | 3.62 | 1.53 | 62.8 |
| <b>18. Right to have its own developmental fund</b>  | 3.97 | 0.94 | 72.1 |
| <b>19. Right to have classified internal information</b>   | 3.23 | 1.17 | 44.2 |

Majority of the participants are familiar with the concept of buffer bodies (80.6%) stated that they are familiar with the concept of buffer bodies. In the table evaluated functions of buffer bodies are presented:

| <i>Buffer bodies could</i>  | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>Support (%)</i> |
|---|----------|-----------|--------------------|
| <b>Provide detailed steering of HE system, broad policy framework</b> | 3.78     | 1.21      | 72.9               |

|  |      |      |      |
|--|------|------|------|
| <b>Facilitate strategic development of the HE sector</b>       | 4.02 | 1.28 | 76.3 |
| <b>Encourage long term strategic planning of the HE system</b> | 4.31 | 1.30 | 87.5 |
| <b>Safeguard and promote university autonomy</b>               | 3.85 | 1.41 | 69.3 |
| <b>Provide for a separation of functions</b>                   | 3.61 | 1.35 | 50.9 |
| <b>Safeguard, help promote and improve academic standards</b>  | 4.15 | 1.31 | 58.0 |
| <b>Limit bureaucratic control and micro management</b>         | 3.65 | 1.52 | 70.5 |
| <b>Limit direct political involvement in HEIs</b>              | 4.12 | 1.35 | 78.9 |
| <b>Prevent inappropriate use of power</b>                      | 4.32 | 0.73 | 90.0 |

When participants were asked to rate professional potential of HEA with no permanent staff on a scale from 0 to 5, mean value was  $M = 2.62$ . On the question “Whether there exists conflict of interest if all members of HEA are academics being employed at HEIs”, mean value was,  $M = 3.20$ .

All the participants believe that regional cooperation offers possibilities for further professionalization and could enhance internal structural reform.

Majority of the participants believes that private HEIs are typical for Western European countries (24.3%), while on the second place are Western Balkan countries (21.4%). There are 15.7% of the participants who stated that private HEIs are typical for countries with long lasting experience in market economy, and the same percent of those who think they are common in all countries.

Majority of the participants believe that the title/name of university should be legally protected (89.8%). Regarding interior organization of private university, it should be decided by the law (47.6%) or governing body (39.7%).

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, because the country doesn't have enough money and because state apparatus is slow and rigid.

The highest level of trust participants have toward state universities ( $M = 4.13$ ), then toward not-for-profit universities ( $M = 3.95$ ) and for-profit universities ( $M = 2.04$ ). Similarly,

majority expressed preference toward university for excellence (48.4%) and state university (40.6%), while on the third place is not-for-profit university (10.9%).

Regarding the concept Foundation-owned universities, 64.6% of participants have heard for it before.

69.7% of participants believe it would be advisable to introduce non-state agencies/bodies with advisory powers throughout the higher education sector, and 65.6% 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 ( $M = 4.05$ ), comparing to professional for-profit ( $M = 2.38$ ) and non-professional state agencies/bodies ( $M = 2.33$ ).

Regarding certificates that could provide more confidence concerning the quality of HEI, majority of participants would opt for international accreditation certificate (78.1%).