

## REPORT BASED ON QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSES

### -CASE OF MACEDONIA-

In total 27 questionnaires were filled in:

- 20 from University Goce Delcev
- 7 from University Sv.Kliment Ohridski, Bitola

There were: representatives from Rectorate (6), Faculty of natural and technical sciences (5), Medical faculty (5), Student parliament (4), Faculty of computer science (3), Education faculty (2), Faculty of mechanical engineering (1) and Faculty of law (1).

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>	4.27	0.78	80.8
<b>2. Autonomy</b>	4.77	0.43	100
<b>3. Being integrated</b>	4.26	0.76	81.4
<b>4. Quality of research and teaching</b>	4.88	0.43	96.1
<b>5. Right to award PhD degrees</b>	4.63	0.49	100
<b>6. Being non-profit</b>	3.65	1.01	57.8
<b>7. Responsiveness to social needs</b>	4.07	0.73	77.7
<b>8. Accessibility</b>	4.00	1.10	80.8
<b>9. Strong partnership with the 3<sup>rd</sup> sector</b>	3.87	1.00	50.0

\*percent of rates 4 and 5 counted together

Most valued principles are:

- *Public management and governance of higher education has to be fully professional (M = 5.00)\**
- *The development of higher education should be informed by a strategic and long-term vision (M = 4.74)*
- *Higher education institutions must have freedom of action if they are to respond effectively to increasing domestic and international competition (M = 4.74)*
- *Academic freedom must be safeguarded (M = 4.70)*

\*This statement is a part of new version of questionnaire, and was considered by 4 persons, so this result is not reliable as others, based on the whole sample.

The least valued principles are:

- *Direct state supervision and external micro management has to be replaced by other steering instruments (for example agreed targets and output control) (M = 3.73)*
- *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 = 3.75)\**

\* This statement is a part of new version of questionnaire, and was considered by 8 persons, so this result is not reliable as others, based on the whole sample.

44.4% of participants believe that autonomy should be on university level, whereas 55.6% believe it should be on both university and faculty level. Regarding legal status, 3.7% believe it should be associated to faculty, 55.6% state it should be associated to university, while 40.7% - to both university and faculty.

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

<i><b>Functions</b></i>	<i><b>Percentages</b></i>		
	<i>University</i>	<i>Faculty</i>	<i>Both</i>
<b>1. Enrolling students</b>	29.6	44.5	25.9
<b>2. Employing staff</b>	37.0	7.4	55.6
<b>3. Deciding on the content of study programmes</b>	11.1	48.1	40.8
<b>4. Issuing diplomas/degrees</b>	33.3	7.4	69.3
<b>5. Negotiating with government for funding</b>	77.8	7.4	14.8
<b>6. Having development fund</b>	29.6	/	70.4
<b>7. Having international relations office</b>	40.7	/	59.3
<b>8. Having quality assurance office</b>	40.8	11.1	48.1
<b>9. Having student support services</b>	7.4	22.2	70.4
<b>10. Having information system</b>	18.5	3.7	77.8
<b>11. Having students organizations</b>	7.7	15.4	76.9

In the following table it could be observed that participants are satisfied with university administrative staff and university information system in the country – they almost completely fulfill their expectations and quality criteria.

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Importance that key members of university administrative staff have MA/PhD in relevant areas	4.37	0.93
Level of satisfaction with university administrative staff	4.19	1.04
Importance that university has an efficient and comprehensive information system	4.85	0.37
Level of satisfaction with university information system	4.79	0.42

63% of the participants think university information system should be central, whereas 14.8% - that it should be coupled network of faculty information systems.

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

- tuition fees – 66.7%
- administrative fees – 29.6%
- consultancy fees – 59.3%
- earnings from their own assets – 44.4%
- interest from financial investments – 22.2%
- donations – 66.7%
- publishing – 51.9%
- commissioned projects – 85.2%
- other party funding – 26.9%

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>	4.85	0.46	96.3
<b>2. To have central services</b>	4.52	0.64	92.6
<b>3. University being only legal entity</b>	4.41	0.84	77.8
<b>4. Rector being appointed by advert and having full power</b>	4.73	0.45	100.0

<b>5. Deans being appointed by rector</b>	4.31	1.00	73.7
<b>6. AS being well qualified and competent</b>	4.79	0.53	94.7
<b>7. AS playing important role in decision making</b>	3.85	0.77	70.4
<b>8. Students unions - single university legal entity</b>	4.42	0.69	89.4
<b>9. Students services - part of central university services</b>	4.52	0.51	100.0
<b>10. Central management with the recourses</b>	4.60	0.71	88.0
<b>11. Financial and ownership autonomy</b>	4.68	0.48	100.0
<b>12. Rector has effective decision power*</b>	4.57	0.53	100.0
<b>13. Centralized university decision making*</b>	4.00	0.58	85.7
<b>14. Central developmental fund*</b>	4.50	0.76	87.0

\* Last three items are part of the second, new version of the questionnaire, and they were considered by 7 participants, which make results less reliable than other results derived from the whole sample.

Concerning advantages/disadvantages of integrated university, 26.3% of participants see some disadvantages, like: difficulties with strategies planning and poor efficiency; however, some advantages are also mentioned, such as: greater mobility, faster exchange of information and more opportunities for better scientific cooperation.

On the scale of 0 to 5, majority of participants rated the level of universities in their countries being integrated with 3 (33.3%), followed by 29.6% who rated it with 5, then 22.3% - with 4, and 14.8% with 2.

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>	4.29	0.77	81.4
<b>2. Right to negotiate common positions, projects and programmes with sister institutions, nationally and internationally.</b>	4.71	1.00	96.3
<b>3. Right to employ their own staff</b>	4.52	0.85	84.6
<b>4. Right to vary salary scales and similar remuneration according to institutional needs</b>	4.15	0.78	84.6

<b>5. Right to retain earnings from their own assets or from donations</b>	4.85	0.36	100.0
<b>6. Right to have predictable long term funding framework with multi-year financial planning</b>	4.89	0.32	100.0
<b>7. Right to set up holding companies (alone or with external partners)</b>	3.96	0.85	62.9
<b>8. Right to have diversified funding and particularly access to private funding</b>	4.41	0.84	77.8
<b>9. Right to have budgetary autonomy</b>	4.78	0.50	96.3
<b>10. Right to have ownership autonomy</b>	4.41	1.15	81.5
<b>11. Right to have access to private funding</b>	4.65	0.67	90.0
<b>12. Right to withdraw from the state status if they want to</b>	3.07	1.17	35.3
<b>13. Right to define their own strategic and long-term vision</b>	4.81	0.48	96.3
<b>14. Right to respond effectively to increasing domestic and international competition</b>	4.85	0.36	100.0
<b>15. Right to decide about curricula</b>	4.81	0.48	96.3
<b>16. Right to decide about research subjects</b>	4.92	0.27	92.3
<b>17. Right to determine tuition fees*</b>	3.67	0.52	66.7
<b>18. Right to have its own developmental fund*</b>	4.57	0.53	100.0
<b>19. Right to have classified internal information*</b>	4.33	0.82	83.3

\* Last three items are part of the second, new version of the questionnaire, and they were considered by 7 participants, which make results less reliable than other results derived from the whole sample.

Concerning the appointment of university leadership, members of university boards and staff, the participants' preferences are:

- rector should be elected from and within local staff (59.3%)
- deans/heads of departments should be appointed by board of directors for a fixed term (55.6%)
- university personnel should be hired by a body appointed by rector/dean (48.1%)
- posts and tenures in the university should come under legislation on labor contracts (68.4%)
- the board of trustee/governors should be chaired by rector (85.2%)

Out of 27, only 3 participants (11.1%) stated that they are familiar with the concept of buffer bodies, whereas 88.9% stated they have not heard before for this concept. In the table

evaluated functions of buffer bodies are presented; however, results are not of high reliability since they are based on analyses of 6 cases:

<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>	4.67	0.82	83.3
<b>Facilitate strategic development of the HE sector</b>	3.00	0.00	/
<b>Encourage long term strategic planning of the HE system</b>	4.00	0.00	100.0
<b>Safeguard and promote university autonomy</b>	3.83	0.41	83.3
<b>Provide for a separation of functions</b>	4.67	0.81	83.3
<b>Safeguard, help promote and improve academic standards</b>	3.83	0.41	83.3
<b>Limit bureaucratic control and micro management</b>	4.50	0.84	83.3
<b>Limit direct political involvement in HEIs</b>	4.83	0.41	83.3
<b>Prevent inappropriate use of power</b>	3.83	0.41	83.3

All the participants believe that regional cooperation offers possibilities for further professionalization and could enhance internal structural reform, and more than a half believe that „creation of various and simultaneous cross-border institutionalized frameworks for regional cooperation could help in further convergence to EHEA“.

Majority of the participants believes that private HEIs are typical for Western European and countries with long lasting experience in market economy (per 29.6%), whereas 22.2% think they are typical for Western Balkan countries or all mentioned countries (18.5%).

All the participants believe that the title/name of university should be legally protected. Regarding interior organization of private university, it should be decided by the owner (53.8%) or the law (46.2%).

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. The highest level of trust participants have toward state universities ( $M = 4.79$ ), then toward not-for-profit universities ( $M = 3.84$ ) and for-profit universities ( $M = 2.63$ ). Accordingly, majority expressed preference for state university (40.7%) and university of excellence (40.7%)

Regarding the concept Foundation-owned universities, only one participant stated that he/she knew what that concept stand for.

81.5% of participants believe it would be advisable to introduce non-state agencies/bodies with advisory powers throughout the higher education sector, and 63.0% 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 = 4.48), comparing to non-professional state (M = 3.56) agencies/bodies and professional for-profit (M = 2.67).

Regarding certificates that could provide more confidence concerning the quality of HEI, majority of participants would opt for international accreditation certificate (96.3%). Majority (70.1%) would support usage of rankings oh HEIs for helping to decide how to allocate financial resources.