

EUROPEAN ACCREDITATION OF PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

*An Analysis Based on Global Patterns
Of Private Higher Education (PHE)*

Daniel C. Levy

SUNY Distinguished Professor,
University at Albany & Director of the Program
for Research on Private Higher Education
(PROPHE)

*Presentation at the OAR-NVAO Conference
“Business as unusual--Private Higher Education in
Europe: Fact-Finding, Experiences, Pathways”
Vienna, May 7, 2009*

I. INTRODUCTION

- Honor for me, invited by professionals doing the hard work of Accreditation
- Importance:
 - Accreditation itself
 - Crucial to PHE (QA, legitimacy)
 - And PHE = 30% of global H Ed (> US); key to access
 - PHE growth = one of HE's main developments
 - Crucial to H Ed privatization (with partial privatization of public H Ed)

I. INTRODUCTION 2

◎ Purpose:

- Analyze European Accredited concerns & results in context of global PHE realities & concepts

◎ Theme:

- *Lots overlap in concerns & policy Qs, except W. Europe's small PHE leads to different realities (8/9)*
- But (a) mixes; (b) dangers of over-genz; (c) I had only survey of QA agencies/ PHE institutions (tho now seen)

I. INTRODUCTION 3

◎ Outline:

- By topics of QA survey (size, types, p vs p; regs, QA)
- Assess similarities and fit to global
- Assess differences in mixes (even CEE)
- Time for Open Discussion & welcome your help!

II. SIZE

- ◎ Q of size of sectors as key in pol-econ, soc.
- ◎ OAR Fit Global:
 - PHE recent & growth
 - Smaller in developed /Japan, Korea, US
 - (US first in PHE enrollment, India next)
 - Rare no PHE: small Asian countries, Cuba, "Greece"
 - PHE = one side of H Ed (& beyond)
privatization
 - PHEi smaller than public HEi (PHE % i > enrolment)

II. SIZE 2

○ OAR Contrast, as Global:

- W Europe OAR max 14% (tho NL & full BE & Portugal); sole PHE “peripheral” region (privz of pub = main)
- Even CEE small to 34% (PL, Estonia); spurt 1990-5; stagnation; threat but resilience
- Asia largest & variable (0 to 80%); many > 70%; some 20-5-; few small, & rapidly grow)
- Latin America 47%; many majority
- US 25% but > in 4 year, grad, research (fp!)
- Africa usually < 20%; Anglophone
- Middle East: just now but most countries

III. PHE TYPES & OWNERSHIP

○ OAR W Europe Fit Global:

- Heterogeneity of PHE
- Higher % of non-u/u; little PhD
- Business & market orientation: schools & fields
- Non-Profit dominance
- Church notable but declined share
- [lack "elite" /US]

III. PHE TYPES & OWNERSHIP 2

- ◎ OAR W Europe Contrast, as Global:
 - Growth of for-profit (tho fuzzy, CEE)
 - "Demand-absorbing" #'s dominance (CEE some)
 - Related to mass-based PHE access
 - More diversity of phe

IV. P vs P: DISTINCTION, \$

◎ OAR W Europe Fit Global:

- P-P Distinctiveness Dominant
- Tho similarities, overlap, and blurring
- (And depends heavily on if include WE "govt-subsidized")
- \$: PHE almost all by private; public still mostly public
- \$: PHE hybrid thru competitive grants and student loans/annual grants

IV. P vs P: DISTINCTION, \$ 2

- OAR W Europe Contrast, as Global:
 - Has much larger, wide-ranging PHE
 - Many very far from public norms (e.g., vs. WE similar status for PHE & public students)
 - “Continental Model” of H Ed vs. US Model (standardization vs. decentralized & plural, national system & legislation vs. state & private)
 - (See Regs & QA on more leeway & demand-absorbing)

V. LEGAL REGULATIONS

○ OAR W Europe Fit Global:

- Ambiguity de jure vs. de facto (e.g., DE prohibit)
- Gradations of license, degree, graduate
- 'Babylon' on "accred," "license" (esp. inter-region)
- Mix of institutional, program, professional

V. LEGAL REGULATIONS 2

- ◎ OAR W Europe Contrast, as Global:
 - PHE often pre-reg (& “delayed reg” e.g., CEE)
 - Wide variation in heavy vs. light regulations
 - Though usually less in rules/ public sector
 - But program & professional accred globally pertinent (institutional accred natural fit to US/ Continental Model—but Bologna)

VI. QA

◎ OAR W Europe Fit Global:

- One national agency at least for institutional
- (US unusual in 6 regional accred agencies & many national ones, all private & “voluntary” tho used by governments)
- Main challenges, including lack of core staff, issues of institutional autonomy, etc. esp. as systems internally differentiated, inc PHE
- How to deal with franchise models (int'l)
- And how to be “fair” & “consistent” with the two sectors
- Quality & legitimacy of PHE widely doubted (tho esp. d-absorbers & for-profits)

VI. QA 2

- ◎ OAR W Europe Contrast, as Global:
 - More problematic often in org., transparency, corruption, etc.
 - Mix of more & less lenient for PHE than for public
 - Requirement for only PHE found in only some places (but LA etc. idea that public is autonomous & trustworthy)
 - [NVAO support based on skewed, confident, good, success (job)-& seek legit, market, & diff from d-a]

VII. CONCLUSIONS

- ◉ W Europe unusually small PHE sectors
- ◉ & cultural tradition of “Continental Model” including discomfort with private sector
- ◉ & thus with p-p distinctiveness (regs., QA)
- ◉ But PHEi show much similarity to global PHEi (institutional size, non-u levels, market-orientation, finance, even growth)
- ◉ Which, in turn, contributes, to common challenges & policy issues (\$, regs., QA)

Europe's Private and Public Country Enrollments and Shares (2003-2009)

