



11th European Quality Assurance Forum

17–19 November 2016

Quality in context – embedding improvement

Paper proposal form

Deadline 25 July 2016

Please note that all fields are obligatory. For a detailed description of the submission requirements and Frequently Asked Questions please consult the Call for Contributions.

Author(s)

Name: Orlanda Tavares

Position: Researcher

Organisation: A3ES

Country: Portugal

E-mail address: orlanda.tavares@a3es.pt

Short bio (150 words max): Orlanda Tavares holds a PhD in Educational Research from the University of Porto (Portugal) and is currently a researcher both at CIPES - Centre for Research on Higher Education Policies - and at A3ES, the Portuguese Assessment and Accreditation Agency for Higher Education.

Name: Cristina Sin

Position: Post-Doctoral Research Fellow

Organisation: CIPES

Country: Portugal

E-mail address: csin@cipes.up.pt

Short bio (150 words max): Cristina Sin is a postdoctoral research fellow at CIPES – Centre for Research in Higher Education Policies (CIPES). She holds a PhD in Educational Research from Lancaster University (UK). Previously, she worked at the Higher Education Academy (UK) with educational projects aimed at the improvement of higher education learning and teaching.

Name: Pedro Videira

Position: Researcher

Organisation: CIPES

Country: Portugal

E-mail address: pvideira1@gmail.com

Short bio (150 words max): Pedro Videira is a researcher at CIPES. He has a degree in Sociology from the ISCTE/IUL (Instituto Superior de Ciências do Trabalho e da Empresa/Instituto Universitário de Lisboa), a post-graduation in data analysis and a Master in sociology of economic and social development from the Sorbonne. He has been developing his PhD research concerning the impacts of scientific mobility in knowledge production and exchange at the ISCTE/IUL doctoral programme in sociology.



Name: Alberto Amaral
Position: President of the Administration Council
Organisation: A3ES
Country: Portugal

E-mail address: alberto.amaral@a3es.pt

Short bio (150 words max): Alberto Amaral holds a doctorate from Cambridge and is a professor at the University of Porto and a researcher at CIPES – Centre for Research on Higher Education Policies. He was the rector of Porto University from 1985 to 1998. At present he is the chair of the administration council of the Portuguese Assessment and Accreditation Agency for Higher Education.

After the Forum, the full text of all papers presented at the Forum will be published on the Forum website. If you do not wish your paper to be published, please indicate so here. This has no consequences on the selection of the papers.

Proposal

Title: The impact of internal quality assurance on teaching and learning in academics' perceptions

Abstract (150 words max): Internal quality assurance systems are expected to improve the institutions' core mission of teaching and learning. Resorting to data gathered through an online survey, distributed in 2014/2015, to the teaching staff of all Portuguese private and public higher education institutions, this paper examines the impact of internal quality assurance systems on teaching and learning from the perspective of academics. Findings suggest that Portuguese academics feel that despite the positive contribution of internal quality assurance towards an increased awareness of teaching quality issues at their institutions, the practical effects of these systems have been more related to increasing bureaucracy than to substantive improvements in teaching and learning. The use of information with a view to improvement and teaching staff involvement in the development of quality assurance were found to induce positive changes in teaching and learning, in academics' perceptions. Based on the findings, the paper makes recommendations for institutional practice.

The paper is based on: research

Has this paper previously been published/presented elsewhere? If yes, give details.

No



Text of paper (3000 words max):

Introduction

In Portugal, the recent overhaul of the quality assurance system (Law 38/2007) determined that institutions should develop an internal quality assurance policy, a culture of quality and quality assurance in their activities, and a strategy for continuous quality improvement.

Legally established in 2007, the Portuguese Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education took inspiration from the European Standards and Guidelines for quality assurance (ESG) to develop procedures and the criteria to be met by higher education institutions. Guided by these standards, each institution could define and implement a quality assurance system according to its specific mission, goals and institutional culture (Santos 2011).

Internal quality assurance systems (IQAS) are expected to improve the institutions' core missions: teaching and learning, research and activities related to community engagement. However, little is known so far about whether or not IQAS have led to improvements in these areas. Most previous research has investigated the impact of quality assurance in general (Hoecht 2006; Horsburgh 1999; Huusko and Ursin 2010; Stensaker et al 2011), even so an under-researched area (Harvey and Williams 2010). The existing literature mostly reports either mixed positive and negative effects on teaching and learning (Baldwin 1997; Huusko and Ursin 2010; Stensaker et al. 2011), or little impact on teaching and learning improvement (Horsburgh 1999; Hoecht 2006; Newton 2000; Watty 2006). There are few studies that report mostly positive effects (see Kleijnen et al. 2011). As central role players in the improvement of teaching and learning, academics are probably the actors most qualified to evaluate the effects of quality assurance on this area. Given their position at the 'chalk face' level of teaching and their tendency to value educational improvement rather than accountability (Westerheijden et al. 2007), the study of these actors' perceptions acquires relevance. This paper examines the impact of internal quality assurance systems on teaching and learning from the perspective of Portuguese academics.

Quality assurance and teaching and learning

Academics have been regarded in the literature on quality as the 'real makers of policy' (Lipsky 1980). Recognised as important stakeholders who have legitimate authority to voice their views (Vroegenstijn 1990; Middlehurst 1992), their conceptions of quality are different from other actors' (Watty 2006; Anderson 2006). Academics tend to resist any quality procedures that are perceived as being disjointed from their academic work (Harvey and Williams 2010, Newton 2000, 2002). Resistance arises from the fact that academics associate quality assurance with administrative bureaucracy (Laughton 2003, Stensaker 2008; Stensaker et al. 2011), and with prescriptions which collide with academic freedom and with the core values of academic culture, such as collegial accountability and self-improvement (Laughton, 2003; Lomas, 2007; Cardoso et al. 2013).

Previous research has highlighted an unequivocal impact of quality assurance: the establishment of structural and organisational processes and procedures, leading to new monitoring systems and new routines for handling data on educational performance and quality (Stensaker et al. 2011; Westerheijden et al 2007). A positive consequence of this is the rationalisation of academic work and clarification of work practices, thereby increasing the 'intentionality, transparency and solidity of a department's activities' (Huusko and Ursin 2010, 866). However, this can also have potentially



damaging effects. Indeed, most researchers on this topic have criticised the burdensome bureaucracy associated with standardisation and collection of performance indicators, resulting in perceptions of monitoring and control on the part of academics and losses of academic freedom (Biggs 2001; Cartwright 2007; Harvey 2006; Hoecht 2006; Newton 2000, 2002; Watty 2006).

Several other studies claim that bureaucracy, standardisation and control can be detrimental for teaching and learning because these divert academics' time and energy from the issues that really matter, i.e. teaching and research (Baldwin 1997; Fourie and Alt 2000; Harvey 2006; Hoecht 2006; Newton 2002; Stensaker et al 2011). Notwithstanding such pessimistic views, the literature also reveals perceptions according to which quality assurance can improve teaching and learning and even initiate cultural change (Baldwin 1997; Brennan and Shah 2000; Carr, Hamilton and Meade 2005; Gift and Bell Hutchinson 2007; Huusko and Ursin 2010; Kleijnen et al. 2011; Westerheijden et al. 2007). Brennan and Shah (2000, 342) reported that the introduction of teaching quality assessment had led to more attention to 'the teaching function within the institution – to talking about teaching, monitoring teaching, and by implication the teaching act itself' and that quality assurance stimulated decision-making based on open and transparent information.

New approaches to quality assurance, which encourage reflection, have been proposed to help shift its focus from monitoring and accountability towards improvement of teaching and learning (Biggs 2001; Harvey and Newton 2007). One way to achieve transformation and improvement is by delegating responsibility for quality assurance to teaching teams (Horsburgh 1998) or communities of practice (Jordens and Zepke 2009). Measures resulting from such models are likely to enjoy better reception than current methods and thus lead to faster enhancement.

In Portugal, previous research (Cardoso et al. 2013) has shown that academics seem to agree with the purposes and goals of quality assessment in general, as long as they feel that the assessment enables improvement rather than control. However, in the implementation of internal quality assurance systems, institutions were guided more by a logic of accountability rather than improvement, that is, they tended to be more concerned with formal procedures and regulations and less with values and beliefs (Tavares, Sin and Amaral 2015). Moreover, previous research has also revealed Portuguese academics' alienation in relation to quality assurance processes, their poor involvement in internal processes of quality assurance and their perceptions that follow-up to quality assessment is lacking (Veiga et al. 2013).

Data and methods

The empirical data used in this paper was gathered through an online survey, distributed in the academic year 2014/2015 to the teaching staff of all private and public higher education institutions, resulting in a sample of 1661 valid answers (of which around 1200 answered the questions on quality of teaching and learning). This is thus a census of the entire academic population. The response rate was slightly over 5%. Compared to some of the main known characteristics of this population (see Table 1), the sample follows roughly the same distribution regarding gender and higher education sector. However, there is a relative overrepresentation of respondents from the polytechnic subsystem (49.78% in our sample against 37.55% in the population).

Table 1. Sample characterization compared to the academic population in Portugal 2014/2015

		Sample		Academic population	
		N	%	N	%
Gender	Male	850	53,39%	17985	55,60%
	Female	742	46,61%	14361	44,40%
	Total	1592	100	32346	100,00%
	Missing	69			
Sector	Public	1246	77,54%	24493	75,72%
	Private	361	22,46%	7853	24,28%
	Total	1607	100,00%	32346	100,00%
	Missing	54			
Subsystem	University	807	50,22%	20201	62,45%
	Polytechnic	800	49,78%	12145	37,55%
	Total	1607	100,00%	32346	100,00%
	Missing	54			

Academics were asked to rate on a five-point 'Likert' scale their agreement with the extent to which the implementation of internal quality assurance practices at their institutions had produced:

1. Increased awareness of teaching quality issues
2. Greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning
3. Greater pedagogical training of teachers
4. Improvements in the quality of teaching / learning
5. Greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks.

In addition to a general descriptive analysis of perceptions, the paper also tests three hypotheses. Given the mixed findings about the effects of quality assurance practices on teaching and learning, the first hypothesis is that:

- (i) A formalised internal system has a more positive impact on teaching and learning than the existence of practices of quality assurance which are not incorporated into an integrated system.

Since individual lecturers are key actors in the improvement of educational quality (Westerheijden et al. 2007), their engagement with the IQAS could be expected to be beneficial for teaching and learning. Therefore, a second hypothesis is:

- (ii) The higher the involvement of teaching staff in the development of the IQAS, the more the system impacts positively on teaching and learning according to academics' perceptions.

An inherent part of the process of internal quality assurance systems is the collection, analysis and use of information for institutional improvement, as recommended by the ESG. A third hypothesis is:



- (iii) The higher the use of information to improve teaching and learning, in academics perceptions, the more the IQAS impacts positively on teaching and learning.

Descriptive statistics were computed to uncover academics' perceptions regarding the effects of quality assurance practices on teaching and learning at their institutions. Non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney and Spearman correlation coefficients) were run to investigate the influence of the selected factors on academics' perceptions.

Academics' perceptions of the impact of IQAS on teaching and learning

The highest perceived impact of the IQAS on teaching and learning, in Portuguese academics' perceptions (3.96 out of 5), is negative: the greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks (see Table 2). Indeed, bureaucracy has been consensually identified in the literature as an unintended side effect which diverts academics' time and energy from teaching and research (Cartwright 2007; Newton 2002; Harvey and Newton 2007). In a more positive note, academics largely recognize that IQAS have also contributed towards an increased awareness of teaching quality issues in their institutions (3.53). These are the only two items with which Portuguese academics show a clear agreement. The other effects of quality assurance systems and practices with which academics show a slightly above average agreement are the 'improvements in the quality of teaching and learning' and a 'greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning'. This confirms some previous studies which have found that quality assurance has raised awareness of and resulted in greater attention to teaching issues (Brennan and Shah 2000; Baldwin 1997).

Table 2 – Academics' perceptions of the impact of IQAS on teaching and learning

	N	Mean	Median	Mode	Std. Deviation
Greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks	1210	3.96	4	4	.977
Increased awareness of teaching quality issues	1217	3.53	4	4	1.016
Greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning	1206	3.12	3	4	1.071
Greater pedagogical training of the teaching staff	1211	2.83	3	3	1.103
Improvements in the quality of teaching / learning	1207	3.20	3	4	1.060

The only item with which academics are in disagreement is the effect of IQAS on the pedagogical training of teaching staff at their institutions. This issue has been recently reinforced in the revised version of the ESG (ESG 2015), attributing a central responsibility for teaching staff development to higher education institutions. Confirming this finding, recent research found that pedagogic training is lacking in Portuguese higher education institutions (Cardoso et al. 2015).

The study has also explored the effects of higher education sector (public/ private) and subsystem (university/polytechnic) on academics' perceptions about the consequences of the implementation of IQAS on teaching and learning. Table 3 shows the statistically significant differences (results from Mann-Whitney tests for a 0.05 significance level) and indicates the group which agreed more with each proposition.

Table 3 – The influence of institution type on academics’ perceptions of the impact of IQAS on teaching and learning

	Sector	Subsystem
Greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks	p=0.141	p=0.662
Increased awareness of teaching quality issues	p=0.000 (Private)	p=0.230
Greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning	p=0.000 (Private)	p=0.629
Greater pedagogical training of the teaching staff	p=0.000 (Private)	p=0.378
Improvements in the quality of teaching / learning	p=0.000 (Private)	p=0.468

While the higher education subsystem does not account for any significant variation in academics’ responses, the sector of the institution for which they work (public or private) is clearly a variable worth noting. Private sector academics perceive a much higher impact of IQAS on all aspects related to teaching and learning improvement: increased awareness of teaching quality issues; greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning; greater pedagogical training of the teaching staff; and improvements in the quality of teaching and learning in general. The private sector in Portugal has traditionally resorted to some questionable institutional strategies to expand: provision of cheap or popular degrees; little investment in research; and the lower quality of the degrees provided due to poor academic qualifications of teaching staff (Teixeira and Amaral 2007). This situation has led to higher rates of non-accredited programmes in private institutions since the launch of the operations of the Portuguese accreditation agency in 2009 (Sin et al. 2016), and a major reason for denied accreditations was, in fact, related to teaching and learning quality. Therefore, private institutions, more than their public counterparts, have felt a greater urge to improve teaching and learning through the establishment of more stringent and demanding quality systems than in the past. This may also have affected more positively the perceptions of academics in private institutions about the impact of IQAS on teaching and learning.

Effects of the formalisation of the IQAS

The first hypothesis was that a formalised internal system has a more positive impact on teaching and learning than the existence of practices of quality assurance which are not incorporated into an integrated system. This hypothesis is not confirmed. The only significant difference between the perceptions of academics (Table 4) in institutions with formalised internal quality systems, when compared with those in institutions with only quality assurance practices is related to a greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks, experienced in a higher degree by the former. Although it is expected that a formalised system may impose more routines, processes, reporting and data collection procedures which divert academics from their traditional functions, what is more striking here is that a formalised system appears to have no beneficial effects on teaching and learning whatsoever.

Table 4 – The influence of IQAS formalisation on academics’ perceptions of the impact of IQAS on teaching and learning

	Formalization of IQAS	N	\bar{X}	Sig. (Mann-Whitney)
Greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks	Yes	943	4,00	p=0.001
	Only practices	267	3,79	
Increased awareness of teaching quality issues	Yes	948	3,53	p=0.730
	Only practices	269	3,52	
Greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning	Yes	943	3,12	p=0.585
	Only practices	263	3,09	
Greater pedagogical training of the teaching staff	Yes	946	2,84	p=0.549
	Only practices	265	2,80	
Improvements in the quality of teaching / learning	Yes	940	3,21	p=0.334
	Only practices	267	3,16	

Therefore, either that greater concern with teaching and quality improvement is not perceived by the academics whose institutions have formal IQAS, or it simply does not exist. This would confirm previous research which has shown that, in the implementation of the quality assurance systems, Portuguese institutions have been more guided by a logic of accountability than with actual improvement (Tavares et al. 2015).

Effects of teaching staff involvement in the development of IQAS

The second hypothesis was that the higher the involvement of teaching staff in the development of the IQAS, the more the system impacts positively on teaching and learning according to academics’ perceptions. The results of Spearman correlation coefficients (Table 5) confirm the hypothesis. Academics who perceive that teaching staff are more involved in the development of the IQAS in their institutions also believe that there is ‘increased awareness of teaching quality issues’, ‘greater pedagogical training of the teaching staff’, ‘greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning’ and, particularly, that there are more ‘improvements in the quality of teaching and learning’ (Spearman correlations coefficients between each pair of variables are 0.310 0.330 0.340 and 0.384 respectively, with a significance level below 0.001). The only item without a significant correlation is the ‘greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks’ which remains a constantly high value, regardless of the degree of academics’ involvement in the development of IQAS.

Effects of the use of information for the improvement of teaching and learning

Previous research has found that, in Portugal, there is no systematic use of the collected institutional data, sometimes only performed because of the external pressure to do so (Sarrico and Machado 2013). In this context, the third hypothesis was that the higher the use of information to improve teaching and learning, in academics’ perceptions, the more the IQAS impacts positively on teaching

and learning. The findings confirm this hypothesis (see Table 5). Again resorting to Spearman correlation coefficients, there are positive and significant correlations between each pair of variables, even stronger than in the case of teaching staff involvement (ranging between 0.446 for the 'increased awareness of teaching quality issues' to 0.535 for 'improvements in the quality of teaching and learning'). The exception is again the 'greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks' where there is no discernible difference. This finding suggests that the use of information, encouraged by the existence of internal quality assurance, has beneficial effects for the improvement of teaching and learning, in academics' perceptions.

Table 5 – Results from the Spearman correlation tests between the selected variables showing the correlation coefficient between each pair of variables and the significance level (in bold if under 0.05)

	Involvement of the teaching staff in the development of the IQAS	Extent that performance information is used for teaching and learning
Greater demand and time investment in non-academic tasks	rho=0.016 (0.588)	rho=0.023 (p=0.445)
Increased awareness of teaching quality issues	rho=0.310 (p=0.000)	rho=0.446 (p=0.000)
Greater focus on innovation and experimentation in teaching and learning	rho=0.330 (p=0.000)	rho=0.482 (p=0.000)
Greater pedagogical training of the teaching staff	rho=0.340 (p=0.000)	rho=0.460 (p=0.000)
Improvements in the quality of teaching /learning	rho=0.384 (p=0.000)	rho=0.535 (p=0.000)

Conclusions

This paper has examined academics' perceptions of the impact of internal quality assurance on teaching and learning, drawing on data collected through a survey distributed to all Portuguese higher education institutions. The impact most widely recognised by academics as a consequence of the implementation of internal quality assurance is the greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks. However, academics also recognise that internal quality assurance has contributed to an increased awareness of teaching quality issues, but this seems to have only modest expression in actual improvements or innovations in teaching and learning. Missing pedagogic training, which academics did not identify as having improved after the implementation of internal quality assurance, may be part of the explanation. Given the recent emphasis on the development of teaching staff in European higher education policy (Sin 2015), and its importance for the quality of teaching and learning, pedagogic training is an area in which institutions could invest. According to academics' perceptions, the only significant consequence of a formal system was greater demand for and time investment in non-academic tasks. Apparently, in Portugal, internal quality assurance are still more associated with an increase in bureaucracy and less with substantive improvement in teaching and learning. However, private sector academics have experienced a stronger positive impact of the implementation of IQAS on teaching and learning. Additionally, the use of information with a view to



improvement and the involvement of teaching staff in the development of internal quality assurance were found to induce positive changes in teaching and learning, in academics' perceptions.

As the impact of internal quality assurance on the quality of teaching and learning is an under-researched area (Harvey and Williams 2010), which has generated mixed findings, this paper provides empirical evidence on academics' perceptions of this impact in Portugal. The evidence warrants attention to some issues that deserve the attention of higher education institutions to embed improvement: streamlining of administrative processes and procedures to avoid overburdening academics; investment in pedagogic training; involvement of teaching staff in quality assurance to increase ownership and the use of collected information in order to improve teaching and learning. Institutions need not only collect data, but also to effectively use it in order to overcome identified shortcomings. The effectiveness of such use depends on some possible measures: sharing data on teaching performance with academics, so that they are aware what needs improving; encourage academics to act on the data by including them in a broad reflection, not only driven by the collected data but also about what data should be collected; avoid the multiplication of data collection exercises to relieve the administrative burden (Amaral et al. 2013); establish a stable reward system (e.g. promotions, recognition, awards, etc.) so that academics make use of the information and improve their teaching.

This study has aimed at gathering perceptions from as many academics as possible, hence the choice of a quantitative method which would allow large-scale data collection. However, this does not allow a thorough understanding of the experiences, reasons and motivations of academics. Therefore, the next step will be the implementation of a more qualitative approach in order to provide more depth to the analysis.

References:

- Anderson. G. (2006). Assuring quality/resisting quality assurance: Academics' responses to 'quality' in some Australian universities. *Quality in higher education*. 12(2). 161-173.
- Baldwin. G. (1997). Quality assurance in Australian higher education: The case of Monash University. *Quality in Higher Education*. 3(1). 51-61.
- Biggs. J. (2001). The reflective institution: Assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. *Higher education*. 41(3). 221-238.
- Brennan. J. and Shah. T. (2000). Quality assessment and institutional change: experiences from 14 countries". *Higher Education*. 40(3). 331-49.
- Cardoso. S., Rosa. M. J. & Santos. C. S. (2013). Different academics' characteristics, different perceptions on quality assessment? *Quality Assurance in Education*. 21(1). 96-117.



Cardoso, S., Tavares, O., & Sin, C. (2015). The quality of teaching staff: higher education institutions' compliance with the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance—the case of Portugal. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 27(3), 205-222.

Carr, S. Hamilton, E., & Meade, P. (2005). Is it possible? Investigating the influence of external quality audit on university performance. *Quality in Higher Education*. 11(3). 195–211.

Cartwright, M.J. (2007). The rhetoric and reality of 'quality' in higher education: an investigation into staff perceptions of quality in post 1992 universities. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 15(3). 287-301.

Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). (2015). Brussels, Belgium.

Fourie, M. & Alt, H. (2000). Challenges to sustaining and enhancing quality of teaching and learning in South African universities'. *Quality in Higher Education*. 6(2). 115–124.

Gift, S. I. & Bell-Hutchinson, C. (2007). Quality assurance and the imperatives for improved student experiences in higher education: The case of the University of the West Indies. *Quality in Higher Education*. 13(2). 145–157.

Harvey, L. (2006). Impact of quality assurance: overview of a discussion between representatives of external quality assurance agencies. *Quality in Higher Education*. 12(3). 287-90.

Harvey, L. and Newton, J. (2007). Transforming quality evaluation: moving on. In Westerheijden, D.F., Stensaker, B. and Rosa, M.J. (Eds). *Quality Assurance in Higher Education. Trends in Regulation. Translation and Transformation* (pp. 225-45). Dordrecht: Springer.

Harvey, L., & Williams, J. (2010) Fifteen Years of Quality in Higher Education: (Part Two). *Quality in Higher Education*. 16(2). 81-113.

Hoecht, A. (2006). Quality assurance in UK higher education: Issues of trust. control. professional autonomy and accountability. *Higher education*. 51(4). 541-563.

Horsburgh, M. (1998). Quality monitoring in two institutions: A comparison. *Quality in Higher Education*. 4(2). 115–135.

Horsburgh, M. (1999). Quality monitoring in higher education: the impact on student learning. *Quality in higher education*. 5(1). 9-25.

Huusko, M., & Ursin, J. (2010). Why (not) assess? Views from the academic departments of Finnish universities. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. 35(7). 859-869.

Jordens, J. Z. & Zepke, N. (2009). A network approach to curriculum quality assessment. *Quality in Higher Education*. 15(3). 279–289.



- Kleijnen, J., Dolmans, D., Willems, J., & van Hout, H. (2011). Does internal quality management contribute to more control or to improvement of higher education? A survey on faculty's perceptions. *Quality Assurance in Education*. 19(2). 141-155.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Lomas, L. (2007). Zen, motorcycle maintenance and quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*. Vol. 15 No. 4. pp. 402-12.
- Laughton, D. (2003). Why was the QAA approach to teaching quality assessment rejected by academics in UK HE?. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*. Vol. 28 No. 3. pp. 309-21.
- Middlehurst, R. (1992). Quality: an organising principle for higher education?. *Higher Education Quarterly*. 46(1). 20-38.
- Newton, J. (2000). Feeding the Beast or Improving Quality? academics' perceptions of quality assurance and quality monitoring. *Quality in higher education*. 6(2). 153-163.
- Newton, J. (2002). Views from below: academics coping with quality. *Quality in higher education*. 8(1). 39-61.
- Sarrico, C.S., Machado, I. (2013). Information for quality management in Portuguese higher education institutions. Paper presented at EAIR 35th Annual Forum, Rotterdam, the Netherlands, 28-31 August 2013.
- Sin, C. (2015). Teaching and learning: a journey from the margins to the core in European higher education policy. In A. Curaj, L. Matei, R. Pricopie, J. Salmi and P. Scott (eds.) *The European Higher Education Area: Between Critical Reflections and Future Policies*, pp. 333-350. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Sin, C. Tavares, O., Amaral, A., (2016). The impact of programme accreditation on Portuguese higher education provision, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2016.1203860
- Stensaker, B. (2008). Outcomes of quality assurance: a discussion of knowledge, methodology and validity. *Quality in Higher Education*. Vol. 4 No. 1. pp. 3-13.
- Stensaker, B., Langfeldt, L., Harvey, L., Huisman, J., & Westerheijden, D. (2011). An in-depth study on the impact of external quality assurance. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. 36(4). 465-478.
- Teixeira, P. N., and Amaral, A. 2007. "Waiting for the tide to change? Strategies for survival of Portuguese private HEIs." *Higher Education Quarterly* 61(2): 208-222.
- Veiga, A., Rosa, M. J., Dias, D., & Amaral, A. (2013). Why is it difficult to grasp the impacts of the Portuguese quality assurance system?. *European Journal of Education*. 48(3). 454-470.
- Vroejenstijn, T., (1990). Autonomy and assurance of quality: two sides of one coin. *Higher Education Research and Development*. 9(1). pp. 21-38.



Watty, K. (2006). Want to know about quality in higher education? Ask an academic. *Quality in Higher Education*. 12(3). 291-301.

Westerheijden, D. F., Hulpiau, V., & Waeytens, K. (2007). From design and implementation to impact of quality assurance: an overview of some studies into what impacts improvement. *Tertiary Education and Management*. 13(4). 295-312.

Discussion questions:

Is quality assurance the best way to approach the enhancement of teaching and learning?

What have other countries/institutions done which has resulted in better teaching and learning?

Any examples of internal quality assurance with low levels of bureaucracy?

How to increase teaching staff involvement in quality assurance?