HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Quality Assurance in Irish Universities Post-incorporation:with Particular Reference to Evaluating Teachers and Teaching
Author(s)	Tim, McMahon
Citation	高等教育ジャーナル, 14, 143-161
Issue Date	2006-07
DOI	https://doi.org/10.14943/J.HighEdu.14.143
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/28629
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	14_P143-161.pdf

Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers : HUSCAP

Quality Assurance in Irish Universities Post-incorporation: with Particular Reference to Evaluating Teachers and Teaching

Tim McMahon*

UCD, Dublin

Abstract—This paper describes the quality assurance procedures currently (August 2005) in place in Universities in the Republic of Ireland. The distinctive features that help make these procedures particularly effective and appropriate are identified. Potential issues arising from an external review conducted by the European Universities Association are discussed. Finally, the issue of the how to evaluate teaching and learning within the context of a quality assurance system is examined. The conclusion is reached that quality assurance processes in general and, in particular, those relating to the evaluation of teaching and teachers, are best achieved through internal processes subject to external moderation rather than through external inspection

(Received on March 1, 2006)

Introduction and Background

Ireland is one of the smaller member-states of the European Union. It has a **population** of just over 4 million people. The profile of the population, however, is atypical with 28% being under the age of 20 and 37% under 35.[1]

Gross Domestic Product was 148,000,000,000 euro in 2004 [2] (i.e. 148 billion euro or 36,737 euro per capita). Along with the US, Luxembourg, Norway and Switzerland, Ireland is categorized by the OECD as one of the five "high income" countries.[3]

Average annual economic growth rates have been as follows:

1990 - 1995 = 4.78%.
1995 - 2000 = 9.5%
2001 – 2003 = 4.8%
2004 – 2006 = 4.8% (OECD Forecast)
EU average for 2004:
1.0%, OECD average 1.6% [4]

There are seven universities in Ireland - all of them, in Japanese terms, national.[5] In 1997 these universities became self-governing corporations. (There are also 14 publicly-funded Institutes of Technology offering degree programmes up to Master level and one private college also offering degree programmes up to Master level. There are no private universities in the Republic of Ireland – there are, however, several private colleges offering degree programmes validated by European or

*) Correspondence: tim.mcmahon@ucd.ie

US universities.)

Funding for Irish Universities comes from the following sources:[6]

- 55.5% Government Block Grant
- 29.6% Additional Government Grant in lieu of student fees
  (i.e. 85.1% of funding is provided directly from government)
- 3.6% graduate student fees
- 2.8% student services charge
- 4.4% international student fees
- 4.1% other.

The Participation Rate in 2002 was 39% Type 'A' OECD classification and 57% Type 'A' plus Type 'B' (OECD averages 42% and 67% respectively). In 2002, 36,500 students entered higher education through the Central Application System, 90% of them in the 17 to 19 age group.[7] Ireland has a comparatively high proportion of graduates in Science, Technology and Engineering – 23% compared with a European Union average of 9.3%.[8]

UCD, Dublin is the largest university in Ireland. Founded in 1851, it has 16,500 undergraduate and 5,500 graduate students (giving a total full-time equivalent student population of 22,000).

The Legislation that made Irish Universities into corporations also made each university individually responsible for its own quality assurance.[9] The government agency that channels money to universities, the Higher Education Authority (HEA), is required to "assist" universities in achieving their quality assurance objectives: for the most part, this is an advisory role.

Prior to incorporation, Universities in Ireland used a variety of external quality assurance methods. These included:

- Involvement of external examiners in primary and higher degrees
- Peer-review of research publication
- Peer-review of applications for research grants
- Invitations to academic staff to teach and carry out research abroad
- Involvement of staff as peer reviewers and external examiners internationally
- Surveys of graduate progression
- External members of academic appointments panels.
- Professional body accreditation (where appropriate)

These methods have continued post-incorporation but have been supplemented by a nation-wide system developed by the universities themselves in a co-operative process that began in 1994[10] when Irish universities joined in a European Communities' (as the Union was then called) pilot project on quality assurance which ran from 1994 to 1996[11]. This led to a series of pilot quality assurance reviews in each university, ownership of which remained firmly with the home institution. These pilot projects revealed the importance of embedding quality assurance processes into the day-to-day organizational structure of the university and led directly to the methodology for the nation-wide system of quality assurance that is now in place.

In the following sections, the quality assurance procedures currently in place in Irish Universities (August 2005) will be described and the distinctive features that help make these procedures particularly effective and appropriate will be identified. Issues relating to the system identified by an external review conducted by the European Universities Association[12] will be discussed as will the implications of the proposed standards for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.[13] Finally the issue of the how to evaluate teaching and learning will be examined within this context.

Quality Assurance Procedures in Irish Universities Post Incorporation

The Universities Act established the 7 Irish Universities in their current forms. It also provided the first formal Quality Assurance framework for Irish Higher Education.

The key statutory requirements are[14]:

1. For "regular" quality reviews of each department or faculty. These reviews are to be conducted "in the first instance" by employees of the university but are to be subsequently reviewed by "persons other than employees who are competent to make national and international comparisons on the quality of teaching and research and the provision of other services". These reviews must not be more than 10 years apart.
2. Assessment of services provided by service users (including students).

3. Publication of reports arising from these reviews and assessments.
4. A review of the effectiveness of the above procedures at least once every 15 years. (The first of these took place in 2004 and was conducted by the European Universities Association[15]).
5. Publication of the review of the procedures.

From incorporation in 1997 until 2003, Irish Universities used an inter-institution committee (the Inter Universities Quality Steering Committee) to enable a common approach to quality assurance within the Republic.

In 2003, the Inter Universities Quality Steering Committee was replaced by the Irish Universities Quality Board (IUQB). This was established by agreement of the seven Universities and its role is to monitor and review the quality assurance processes adopted.

The IUQB is governed by a Board comprising a representative of each of the seven universities plus seven external members. These external members must include at least two members from outside Ireland with experience of the quality assurance procedures common in Europe and North America. Currently the seven external members are

1. A Senior Judge who acts as chair
2. The President of a North American University
3. A former President of the European Universities Association
4. A nominee of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions
5. A nominee of the Irish Business and Employers Confederation
6. A nominee of the Union of Students in Ireland
7. A representative of professional organizations accrediting universities degrees.

The IUQB also has an Executive Committee, consisting of 2 members from each university, one of whom is the Senior Officer in each university directly responsible to the President for Quality Assurance. The Executive Committee does the day-to-day work of the IUQB.

The IUQB does **not** conduct quality assurance reviews. Rather, it supports universities in developing and implementing appropriate policies and procedures[16]. Once these policies and procedures are in place, the IUQB's role is to identify good practice and to report on this directly to the Conference of Heads of Irish Universities (CHIU)[17] and also to the wider international academic community by way of promotion materials and academic papers. The IUQB also monitors and reports on the resource implications that arise from reviews and has a particular role in overseeing the review of the quality assurance system that is required by Irish law to take place at least once every 15 years. This role was delegated to IUQB by the Universities via their collective body (CHIU) and IUQB shares this responsibility with the statutory Higher Education Authority.

The Agreed Quality Assurance Process adopted by each university is that each unit that is reviewed (usually a department but sometimes a whole Faculty) has to

1. undertake a self-evaluation called a "self-assessment"
2. have this self-assessment peer-reviewed
3. from the results, produce a quality improvement plan
4. thereafter, produce an annual report on progress under the plan, suggesting appropriate modifications - until the next full-scale quality review.

A review currently (August 2005) takes approximately 14 months to complete. The quality improvement process, however, will continue after the review has ended by way of a rolling quality improvement plan which is revised and updated annually between formal reviews.

The Stages of the Irish Quality Assurance Process in Greater Detail

Stage 1: Self-Assessment

In the first stage of the review the unit will prepare a self-assessment report the purpose of which is to provide a succinct but comprehensive statement of the unit's activities, together with an analysis of its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

> Self-assessment is considered to be the core component of the Irish universities' quality framework, with emphasis placed on the value to the unit of this analytical and self-critical process. The preparation of the self-assessment report acts as a stimulus and provides opportunities for

> reflection and consultation, enabling units to plan and manage strategically, and to align their development plans with those of the whole university. The main emphasis in all of the self-assessment processes is on qualitative analysis. Quantitative data are also provided to support the evaluation, providing a statistical overview of the size and level of activities of the unit under review.[18]

In effect, each department has to give detailed answers to the following four questions:

- What are we trying to do?
- How are we trying to do it.
- How do we know that it works?
- How do we change in order to improve?

Full details of the system, including detailed methodologies and recommended formats for self-assessment are available in A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities published by the Conference of Heads of Irish Universities and available at http://www.iuqb.ie/ Copies of the formats used for self-assessment at UCD, Dublin are also available on-line at http://www.ucd.ie/quality/

Stage 2: Peer-Review

Soon after the completion of the self-assessment report the unit is visited by a peer-review group that includes at least two external experts capable of making national and international comparisons with respect to the activities of the unit. The group may also include two or three senior staff members of the university. The visit will last two or (more usually) three days and the peer review group will use the self-assessment report to structure their investigations. They will meet with staff, students (undergraduate and postgraduate), employers, graduates and other service-users. They will also examine facilities and resources.

The fundamental issues dealt with by the peer review group are once again contained in the four basic questions namely:

- What are you trying to do?
- How are you trying to do it.
- How do you know that it works?
- How will you change in order to improve?

At this stage, however, the emphasis will be on the last question.

The peer review group's report should be given to the unit around six weeks after the visit.

Stage 3: The Improvement Plan

On the basis of their self-assessment and the report of the review group, the unit will prepare an improvement plan. In practice this is usually a three-stage process with the unit producing a "wish list" – sometimes called a "blue sky" document – which outlines what the unit would do if funding was not an issue. In the second stage developments are prioritized by the unit and, in the third stage, there is a negotiation with university fund-holders for access to additional funding to facilitate change. A key feature of the system is that, as well as leading to a review of how existing funds are spent, the review process also triggers access to additional funding set aside for the purpose of quality improvement. As a result of these negotiations, the department will produce a detailed one-year plan and an outline five-year plan.

Stage 4: Ongoing Implementation and Revision of the Improvement Plan

After one year, the unit will produce a report on the implementation of the one-year plan and a review of the overall five-year plan – including any appropriate revisions. This process is repeated until the next full-scale quality review and is an integral part of the strategic planning process for the unit.

Judging the Irish System against International Best Practice

Direct comparisons between national systems are problematic, not least because systems tend to be in a continuous state of change. A more appropriate approach is to identify the key aspects of the Irish system and suggest how they relate and compare to practices in other systems.

During the time the Irish system was developed, their nearest neighbor (the United Kingdom) had a quality assurance system that, on paper, looked similar but in practice was highly inspectorial. The system varied

by constituent nation within the UK and the description given here relates to that operated in (by far) the most populous, namely, England. The quality assurance system in England from April 1995 to December 2001 was based on external reviews of subject areas. An external review team graded six aspects of provision on a scale of 1 to 4, 4 being the highest and equating to excellence while 1 indicated that provision was unsatisfactory.

These six aspects that were rated were:

1. Curriculum Design, Content and Organization
2. Teaching, Learning and Assessment
3. Student Progression and Achievement
4. Student Support and Guidance
5. Learning Resources
6. Quality Management and Enhancement

The visit of the review team was preceded by what was called a self-assessment report but was, in reality, a highly directed and detailed auditors' questionnaire. As a result more attention was paid to ensuring that documentation of programmes was in accordance with the expectations of the "inspectors" than in ensuring actual quality of programmes.

Since 2001, the quality assurance systems in the constituent countries of the UK have diverged considerably. In England (and, also Northern Ireland – which is part of the UK and a separate entity to the Republic of Ireland) an institutional audit method has been adopted. This approach is meant to be distinguished by "lightness of touch"[19] but it can only be said to be light in comparison to the even more heavy-handed approach in place between 1995 and 2001.[20] The system still requires the provision of specified "data sets" of, largely, quantitative information to a review team who use this to structure their review. In essence, the English have reduced the size of the audit questionnaire. It is still large, burdensome and retains the meeting of externally determined criteria as the main methodology of evaluation. The English system can be categorized as centrally-directed, top-down and reductionist.[21]

In contrast, the Irish system is explicitly focused on self-assessment, self-regulation and self-improvement through the normal management infrastructure of the university. This represents a very different philosophical approach to the English system which is based on meeting externally set quality criteria. Such inspectorial systems generally aim at "achieving politically determined agendas by means of rationalisation, targeting of resources, and a formal external inspectorate".[22]

Thus, despite surface similarities, there is a clear difference of approach between the English and Irish systems. There is considerable evidence to suggest that while externally driven quality audits of the kind offered in England might enable comparative benchmarking between individual programmes of a similar (but not dissimilar) kind, they are not the most appropriate for enhancing the quality of higher education provision. In other words, the top-down external audit is not conducive to quality improvement.[23] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28]

In particular, the introduction of fixed external benchmarks may have a stultifying effect on innovation because once certain activities are identified as worthy of benchmarking there is a corresponding decrease in the perceived value of others[29]; further, imposed benchmarks are likely to promote responses to the letter rather than intent of the indicator, thus undermining the very purpose of the activity.[30]

Taken together, the research suggests that

> ...universities act more maturely in these matters if they are treated as trusted adults...and if they are wise enough to seize the responsibility for controlling the evaluation scheme and for self-regulation. In addition, the more institutions are expected to manage themselves, the more useful the results of self-regulatory evaluation. The less Government uses reductionist indicators...the more effective, useful and change-orientated the schemes become.[31]

Interestingly, as long ago as 1998, a report commissioned by the (then) European Communities found that while external evaluation, initiated by public authorities, is legitimate (because universities are a public service), models which are too "controlling" are inimical to university autonomy and do not succeed sufficiently in generating beneficial change.[32]

The methodology used in the Irish quality assurance system is consistent with the current European Union

sponsored Bologna Process as iterated, for example, in the Berlin Communiqué which stressed that

> ...consistent with the principle of institutional autonomy, the primary responsibility for quality assurance in higher education lies with each institution itself and this provides the basis for real accountability of the academic system within the national quality framework.[33]

The Irish model is also consistent with the principles of best practice developed under the aegis of the European University Association which also emphasize the need for quality assurance to be conducted in a way that will protect and enhance university autonomy.[34] It is possible, however, that issues might arise with regard to the standards and guidelines proposed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.[35] This aspect will be further discussed, along with the recommendations contained in the report of the review conducted by the European Universities Association, in the following section.

The Significant Features of the Irish System

In the above comparison with the UK system, certain things stand out as being distinctive in the Irish system. These are:

- The National Agency (IUQB) that is, effectively, driving the system is not independent of universities but was established by their collective action.
- The Peer-review Team (PRT) that conducts the external review comprises both experts external to the university and experts internal to the university but external to the unit under review.
- Quality Benchmarks are selected by the unit under review and the appropriateness and validity of these benchmarks is, itself, subject to review.

Considering these three points in turn:

(1) The non-independence of the IUQB

The effectiveness of the IUQB in promoting effective quality assurance was confirmed by the EUA review.

> Based on a detailed examination at each university, the EUA teams can confirm that the Irish universities have established... quality assurance procedures and that these are functioning as part of the daily work of each university. The system is staffed and supported, is already yielding results and has promise for the future. The EUA teams are thus confident in confirming that the Irish universities have complied with their statutory obligations and indeed have taken considerable additional steps towards developing strong internal quality cultures, essential for the ongoing development of higher education in Ireland.
>
> This systematic organisation and promotion of quality assurance at the initiative of the universities themselves is, in the opinion of the EUA teams, unparalleled in any other country in Europe, or indeed in the United States and Canada. The system would appear to strike the right tone and combination of public interest, accountability, and university autonomy. It encourages a greater focus on quality and improvement than some systems worldwide, while at the same time being less intrusive than some other systems in Europe.
>
> It is important to note that all this activity has taken place without the existence of a governmental agency or of any direct links to the distribution of core governmental funding. These are, in the opinion of the EUA teams, extremely important and positive points, which have resulted in a general acceptance among academic and administrative staff of the usefulness and indeed necessity of quality assurance activities, and in a positive focus on improvement rather than the negative connotations associated with perceived "inspections" of quality. The role of the IUQB has been central in fostering this approach.[36]

Indeed the EUA goes as far as to describe the Irish university-led model as "healthy" "functioning" "well-organised" and "yielding results".

The only suggestion that there is any need to change the relationship between the IUQB and the Universities comes in the report of the "reflections" of a "high level reference panel" established by the HEA to "complement" the EUA review process. This panel consisted of "stakeholders external to the universities"

and its purpose was to "provide the EUA review teams with an Irish context to the review with particular regard to national social, economic and cultural needs and expectations, and to comment on the outcomes of the process at a sectoral level".[37]

> As part of the next stage of its development, the IUQB needs to set itself further apart from the universities and establish itself as an independent body.[38]

The panel only met four times and gives no rationale for this suggestion despite its seeming awareness of the dangers such a move would create.

> However, care must also be taken to ensure that these changes do not undermine the desirability of the Quality Assurance systems and processes being institutionally owned and driven.[39]

It is somewhat odd, therefore, that the IUQB, itself, both welcomed this suggestion and claimed that it "conforms to the observation of the OECD Report".[40] In fact this suggestion is directly counter to the recommendation of the OECD[41] which categorically opined that as

> ... the Inter-University Quality Board (sic) has not been in full operation for long(.) We believe it would be sensible to allow this to mature and settle down before imposing more changes. Moreover, there are moves in the European tertiary education area to establish new quality arrangements under the Bologna Declaration and it would be unwise to establish, no doubt after considerable argument, a new unified quality system in Ireland only for it to be overtaken by new Europe-wide cross-border systems of quality assurance that are emerging which might offer an attractive internationally based alternative.[42]

The oddness of the panels' suggestion and the welcoming of it by the IUQB is all the more apparent when considered in the light of the specific quote in the extract given above that:

> **The system would appear to strike the right tone and combination of public interest, accountability, and university autonomy.** It encourages a greater focus on quality and improvement than some systems worldwide, while at the same time being less intrusive than some other systems in Europe.[43]
> (emphasis added).

It might be the case that some would feel that the standards and guidelines proposed by the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education[44] require such independence and, indeed, the current draft proposals would seem, at first sight, so to do. The proposed standard for independence is that:

> Agencies should be independent to the extent that they have autonomous responsibility for their operations and that the conclusions and recommendations made in their reports cannot be influenced by third parties such as higher education institutions, ministries or other stakeholders.[45]

Further, the guidelines suggest that operational independence should be demonstrated by measures "such as"

- Its operational independence from higher education institutions and governments is guaranteed in official documentation (e.g. instruments of governance or legislative acts).
- The definition and operation of its procedures and methods, the nomination and appointment of external experts and the determination of the outcomes of its quality assurance processes are undertaken autonomously and independently from governments, higher education institutions, and organs of political influence.
- While relevant stakeholders in higher education, particularly students/learners, are consulted in the course of quality assurance processes, the final outcomes of the quality assurance processes remain the responsibility of the agency.

It is, however, clear from both of the above extracts, and the explanations of the purpose of external quality assurance in the text of the proposed standards document, that what is being described are standards and guidelines for agencies that **conduct** external evaluations. **This is not the role of the IUQB**, which is a supporting and coordinating agency for the internal quality reviews of its parent universities. That it is independent enough for this purpose has been adequately attested by the EUA review and, indeed,

by the OECD who saw no need for immediate change. The fact that Irish universities recognize the need for some fully independent external review is shown by their joint commissioning of the EUA report. In the Irish context, what is perceived as being necessary is that the internal quality assurance programmes are robust and lead to trustworthy public information. Periodic reviews of the kind conducted by EUA provide this and the report that is the consequence of the latest review testifies as to how an inspectorial system of the British type is not necessary. Further, the research literature suggests that such a move would probably be dysfunctional[46] [47] and ineffective. External pressure or exhortation cannot provide the level of benefits to be gained from local ownership and individual responsibility in a change process[48] because external models do not embed quality into the organizational culture[49] and tend to produce the kind of "gaming" identified by Bradach[50] where what is measured by the external evaluation gets done well, at least in the short term, in order to meet quality indicators while other, perhaps more important factors, are ignored.

The EUA review concentrated on evaluating systems and processes and this is precisely the kind of external evaluation appropriate to self-managed quality assurance aimed at continual improvement. A key feature that makes the EUA an appropriate body to conduct such a review is its international dimension. A single-nation agent of external quality review would not fit well with the Irish model. Given the success of this model, it would seem likely, however, that Irish Universities would support some form of formalized international agency (perhaps under the auspices of the EUA) which could provide process review services of the kind recently provided in Ireland by both the OECD and the EAU - provided there were safeguards to protect the autonomy that is an integral part of the culture and values of Irish universities. The establishment of some kind of international agency with the authority to license evaluation procedures, however, would not be acceptable.

> The current developments in the (Bologna) process involve European Ministers seeking to ensure that there is an alignment between policy developments at national level and the objectives of the Bologna Declaration. This will affect Ireland, making it important that the Irish Universities consolidate their existing arrangements for quality assurance and safeguard the autonomy and integrity of the process.[51]

Irish universities are unlikely to accept any set of standards or principles which involve some kind European meta-agency with the authority to draw up a register of ''acceptable" national systems and one which could damage the effectiveness of the Irish system. This has been clearly articulated by a past president of CHIU.

> The position of the Irish universities is clear and unambiguous in this matter. Through the Universities Act (1997) we are developing a system of quality assurance and improvement that is effective, and essentially conforms to recognised best practice in Europe. It preserves the autonomy of the universities, emphasises quality improvement in all activities, is self regulated, and requires the involvement of students, staff and experts from abroad. Review of the procedures by the HEA is a statutory requirement. It is a system that agrees with the principles set out by the European University Association, and more than conforms to Bologna. We are opposed to the creation of a European meta-agency with the authority to draw up a register of "acceptable" national systems and one which could damage the effectiveness of the Irish system enshrined in national legislation. We believe that mobility will be the result of creating networks of universities on the basis of proven track record and mutual acceptance of each others' quality procedures. History shows that this is the way universities do their business, and anyone with experience of higher education in the US will recognise these factors as an integral part of that highly successful system.[52]

(2) The mixed nature of Peer-review Teams

The use of peer-review teams that include experts both internal and external to the university (but always external to the unit under review) seems to be peculiar to the Irish system. Yet it seems to be effective and has impressed the external experts who served.

> I have reviewed a dozen major universities in the

> United States in the past four years for the North Central Association of Universities and Colleges. I have also reviewed programmes at other universities as a consultant. Much of this university's process is the same as that used by major American universities. I rank the execution of the process at this university among the best of this group.
> Typical arrangement in the US involves an external committee and an internal committee. The external committee provides a report that becomes part of the internal committee's final report to the university.
> I like this university's structure of having a single committee of internal
> and external reviewers that must produce a report collaboratively.[53]

> The peer review process that I was involved with in this university was extremely well planned and carried out with superb efficiency. It was fully transparent and involved ALL staff members (senior scientists, lecturers, group secretary and laboratory technicians) rather than a selection of staff as in some university quality review exercises.[54]

> They certainly work you hard when you agree to take part in a QA effort at this university. Taking part as an outside member is a very intense experience. For all that, it's a satisfying one, since the process is well designed and carefully thought out. I have participated in a number of departmental reviews in the US and in Europe and **the system at this university strikes me as about the most rational that I've encountered. The balance of internal and external points of view is better judged than in other systems.**[55]
> (emphasis added)

The EUA Review did **not** recommend that the current mixed teams be replaced by ones composed entirely of external experts. They did, however, suggest that there were often too many internal reviewers and not enough external. They recommended a more "open and flexible"[56] approach to the selection of team members and suggested that more use be made of experts from outside Ireland. In this they are probably 'pushing at an open door'. Within the Irish system the benefits of using international peers is well recognized there is, however, considerable benefit to allowing these external experts the access to local knowledge that the mixed team approach provides. One possible approach would be for a majority of every peer review team to be from outside the institution. Also, it might well be advantageous to ensure that the chair of teams be one of the external members thus ensuring that there is no subtle internal guidance away from or towards particular issues.

The EUA report was, on the other hand, quite definite that the current practice of units presenting a short-list of peer reviewers be ended. They proposed that, instead, the unit name an external expert who would be asked to put forward a shortlist. This is probably not a contentious recommendation and is likely to be adopted.

(3) The selection of external benchmarks by the unit being evaluated

As the focus of the review is continual quality improvement rather than compliance to externally set criteria, any benchmarks that are used are not fixed either by internal or external mechanisms. Rather they are selected by the unit under review from appropriate current practice and are, themselves, subject to review by the PRT. In this model, benchmarks are treated not as fixed objective criteria but as evolving concepts rooted in current practice.

The EUA report did not mention the Irish approach to benchmarking and given the comment that:

> The EUA teams were unanimously impressed by the well organised systems in
> place, by the seriousness of the approach in each university to the quality assurance process, and by the amount of work undertaken by departments, faculties, service units and the university leadership and administration to ensure the success of these procedures. The agreed IUQB focus on quality improvement is particularly to be commended[57]

it is safe to assume that the practice does not diminish the comparative robustness and effectiveness of the Irish system.

It also seems reasonable to postulate that the Irish adopted this particular system, at least partly, because

they wanted to avoid the kind of distortions produced by the various attempts to establish fixed external benchmarks in the neighboring UK. The tendency of fixed external quality assurance criteria to lead to dysfunctional compliance has already been noted.[58] One of these[59], a recent comparison of different quality frameworks in the area of open and distance learning, illustrates the point with particular regard to universities. The study compares a system with externally decided benchmarks to one which requires organizations to derive their own quality checklists. It concludes that the latter model is more useful for making operational decisions about individual units within an organization because it is more adaptable to individual contexts. It was the belief that such adaptability leads to genuine quality improvement that led Irish universities to adopt their current model.

> In articulating a set of principles for reviewing the quality of their work the Irish universities have been guided by a commitment to focus on quality enhancement and strategic planning at the level of the unit being reviewed, and to foster innovation by evaluating units against their aims, objectives and strategic plans. Based on the experience of EU pilot projects and the guidelines subsequently adopted by the EUA it is a central principle that the institutions are being evaluated against their own targets in the context of appropriate international benchmarks.[60]

Again, this choice seems to have won the approval of those external experts involved in reviews

> The review was an excellent exercise. It really got the department to focus on the strategic issues in a thoughtful way. The exercise explicitly recognises the professionalism of academics, unlike similar structures for instance in the UK, where the initial assumption is that it is up to the academics to prove that they are professional in the first instance. The external reviewers engage substantively with the process, and do not merely get caught up in paper-chasing exercises, which is sometimes the case in more top-down quality control-oriented systems in other countries.[61]

Thus the three distinctive features identified, namely:

1. The non independence of the IUQB
2. The mixed nature of peer-review teams
3. Selection of external benchmarks by the unit being evaluated

can be seen to be significant contributing factors to the demonstrable success of the Irish system in gaining widespread acceptance within Irish universities to the point where it is perceived as useful and productive rather than a burdensome imposition.

This is not to say that the Irish system cannot be improved. The EUA review made several recommendations for change which are currently being seriously considered. The most important of which, significantly, focus on how to increase the impact of reviews on quality improvement: thus implicitly as well as explicitly endorsing the focus on quality improvement. The full list of recommendations can be found at

http://www.hea.ie/uploads/pdf/IE_Sectoral_Report_Final.pdf.

The recommendation that the choice of reviewers should be independent of the unit under review has already been mentioned. The most interesting of the other recommendations are:

1. Setting a time limit of three months for the self-assessment phase of the review. Currently a full year is allowed for this process and the amount of time taken can be dysfunctional to the ordinary functioning of the unit in question.

2. Setting a limit of 30 pages on the self-assessment report (excluding annexes). This was prompted by the tendency of units to provide "archive material" and is intended to prompt a closer focus on strategic analysis and reflection.

3. Setting a 6 month time limit on the production of the improvement plan. In some Irish universities, it can take a year or more to finalize the improvement plan, giving rise to the risk of events overtaking recommendations.

4. Ensuring regular and coherent student feedback on all courses and modules and for this feedback to be an explicit input into the quality assurance process. Gathering student feedback has not been a systematic feature of Irish universities hitherto. That this is a lack is universally acknowledged. There is, however, a

concern about the validity of some of the methodologies used in other countries. This is an issue that will be discussed below in the section on the evaluation of teaching.

5. Encouraging peer-review teams to focus on interdisciplinary and international issues. One of the problems of making academic departments the basic unit of review is that it can reinforce existing academic boundaries and "tribal" attitudes.[62] The EUA feels it is necessary for the terms of reference to peer-review teams to "encourage a broad view of quality, including sufficient emphasis on research, interdisciplinarity and internationalisation."[63] For the same reason, they recommend...

6. Reviewing groups of cognate units to achieve a better overview of how teaching, learning and research can develop across these units, and to break down current barriers to inter-disciplinary work.

7. Considering entire university budgets as quality improvement funds. The full and extensive discussion that this particular recommendation requires is beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that the EUA demonstrated a concern that the results of quality assurance reviews were sometimes marginal to the overall strategic management of the university and that fund allocation should be determined by development (rather than historic) need. This includes using quality review to inform decisions about teaching and other service portfolios. The same concern led to the recommendation that...

8. Linking quality review cycles to strategic planning cycles.

Overall the EUA found that:

> While the Irish universities are pioneers in developing and implementing a systematic quality review and quality improvement system by themselves, in the opinion of the EUA teams they are not yet leaders in using the outcomes of the system to stimulate strategic change inside the universities. This should be a priority during the next phase of developing the QA system.

What is interesting here is the clear implication that the Irish system produces useful results (the need for improvement notwithstanding) but that they do not always feed into the strategic decision making of the universities. Indeed many of the recommendations are to do with strategic management rather than quality assurance per se. In this the EUA echo the earlier OECD report.[64] The real achievements of the Irish quality assurance system, therefore, are that:

1. It has gained acceptance among academics in a way not found in externally imposed models

2. It produces data that a prestigious international review team considered of such quality that it ought to have more influence on strategic management decisions.

This is more than enough to commend the Irish model as an exemplar.

> Most importantly, the concept of quality is being built into discussions at many levels across each university campus. No major change can occur in open public systems without these discussions taking place. The Irish universities are currently benefiting from such discussions and debate on quality assurance which, coupled with concrete assessment and evaluation activities, are leading to increasing levels of quality awareness and culture across the universities.[65]

Evaluating Teaching and Learning within the context of a quality assurance system.

Neither formal evaluation of teaching nor gathering of student feedback on programmes is yet systemic in Ireland and while there is a general acceptance of the necessity for both, there is a general concern at the over-simplistic application of techniques evident in some other countries. There is also awareness that research does not fully validate any instrument or method.[66] [67]

Particular problems have been documented with:

- eacher competency / performance tests [68] [69]
- extrapolation from student achievement [70] [71]
- various forms of observation of teaching [72] [73] [74] [75] [76]
- self-appraisal [77] [78] [79] [80] [81]
- student evaluation of teachers and teaching; these are discussed immediately below.

Despite considerable philosophical and methodological problems,[82] [83] [84] [85] [86] [87] [88] and some

evidence that it can stifle innovation [89] while not prompting any other improvements,[90] [91] student evaluation of teaching appears to be the most common way of gathering evaluation data about teachers and teaching – probably because:

- it is politically expedient [92]
- modern societies have a cultural need for measurement [93] that makes it difficult to abandon practices where counting takes place – even if what is counted is problematic [94] or, even, meaningless [95]
- despite the problems, it is still a rich and useful source of data.[96] [97] [98] [99] [100]

This latter point provides a justification for the practice, but the methodological and philosophical issues make it essential that data gathered from student evaluations is mediated, triangulated and placed in an appropriate context. As Cashin[101] suggests, regarding student feedback as data rather than as compete evaluations helps to distinguish between data sources and evaluators – the latter being responsible for interpretation. Cashin further advises:

> Viewing student ratings as data rather than evaluations may also help to put them in proper perspective. Writers about faculty evaluation are almost universal in recommending multiple sources of data. No single source of data, including student rating data, provides sufficient information to make a valid judgment about teaching effectiveness."[102]

This advice holds true for all of the data gathering methods identified above.[103] [104] [105] It is not the means to draw-out useful data from (inevitably) flawed instruments that is lacking; rather, it is often, the political or administrative will.

In effect, there are three types of problem with data concerning the quality of teaching:

1. how this data is collected
2. how this data is processed
3. what happens to the results

With regard to data collection, despite assertions to the contrary,[106] [107] [108] [109] [110] existing claims of instrument validity are often exaggerated and not fully supported by the literature. The widely used Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ), for example, might be reasonably valid for ranking courses in the same subject area but it is not valid for measuring quality improvement in one course over time, it takes no account of higher order learning nor of the social dimensions of university experience. Further, the language of the CEQ is imprecise and difficult to transfer from one context to another. The statement "the course helped me to develop my skills as a team member" (to which student have to respond using a Likart scale) does not allow for variations with regard to existing skills of students or contextual or cultural definitions of good team skills.

With regard to data processing issues, Sproule[111] produced or quoted enough examples of dubious practices to raise major concerns about common data processing practices. The recent report into Australian higher education performance indicators also provides examples of how processing practices can make evaluations less robust.[112]

Both data collection and data processing problems are, however, essentially technical and can, in principle, be solved though triangulation and by refining instruments and methodologies. In this way, the problems are really no different from any other investigations into human systems – researchers have to do the best with the tools to hand and seek to improve these tools as they work.[113]

Rather, it is the third type of problem, those concerning the destination and use of the data and the associated backwash, that present the most difficulty from a quality assurance point of view.

Essentially, the issue with regard to the destination and use of data regarding the evaluation of teaching is a microcosm of those relating to quality assurance in universities as a whole and which is discussed above; namely, people behave differently when they are being judged and the backwash this creates tends to be dysfunctional. Thus the same research is relevant, especially as it is supported by specific research into the evaluation of teaching,[114] [115] [116] [117] [118] [119] and the same conclusions apply: namely, when subject to externally controlled evaluation teachers will seek to demonstrate their strengths and conceal any areas that need development. This might demonstrate existing quality but it is not likely to lead to improvement. Further, the threat inherent in external evaluation is likely to inhibit innovation and lead to "gaming"[120]

and other compliance behavior.

For these reasons, many commentators argue that external, summative evaluation must be kept operationally separate from developmental, formative evaluation.[121] [122] [123] [124] Summative evaluation, however, is essential for public accountability and it would be a great loss if the information generated by formative, self- or peer-managed evaluation was lost. Berman,[125] for example, argues that an effective evaluation system should connect the formative and summative data on several levels and presents some evidence of how this can work in practice. There is, however, a danger of dysfunctional backwash this mixing – i.e. teacher reaction to the summative element leading to gaming and other compliance behavior - and a consequential need to ensure that the tendency to such behavior is minimized.

As with the macrocosm of overall quality assurance procedures, however, the answer to effective teacher evaluation lies in vesting control in the entity being evaluated – in this case the individual teacher.

It has been demonstrated that self-evaluation, especially when conducted within a peer support system, is an essential component of self-improvement though reflective practice.[126] It has also been demonstrated that there is less anxiety and teacher resistance when professional development is the focus.[127]

One approach that would seem to do this is to put the onus on teachers to demonstrate both existing quality and continuing professional development through presentation of a portfolio of evidence but to ensure that the choice of whether the data from any particular evaluation exercise is revealed remains firmly with the teacher. Current research at UCD, Dublin, on the use of third-party observation, suggests that such data control protocols can reduce the effects of dysfunctional backwash when formative evaluation data is fed into the summative system.[128] [129] [130] This, effectively, creates the same conditions on an individual level that Irish universities enjoy at institutional level.

Suggesting the use of portfolios for evaluation purposes is not new, there is a vast literature on the use of portfolios to improve practice[131] [132] and to provide evidence of proficiency and quality[133] or both.[134] [135] [136] [137]

Of course, the use of portfolios brings "its own set of problems"[138] including those of validity and reliability. There is, however, enough evidence, collectively, in the literature referenced above to indicate that application of triangulation and standardization techniques can produce acceptable levels of both. The most crucial need, when using portfolios, is to ensure that when teachers choose to put forward evidence of quality in teaching and recent professional development, those who make judgments do so with an understanding that "there is no single definition of excellence in teaching in terms of what the teacher does"[139] and that if one focuses on the positive effects that teachers' actions have on student learning then "excellence can result from many diverse activities".[140] Excellence in teaching is heavily contingent on a number of variables including:

- subject and discipline
- the personality of the teacher
- the particular skills and experiences of the teacher
- the profile of the students
- any number of environmental factors.

In the same way that fixed external benchmarks tend to be dysfunctional to institutional quality review, so will fixed criteria for the evaluation of teaching tend to be dysfunctional. On the other hand, there needs to be some guide to the making of judgments and it is probably not possible to derive, on the individual level, a manageable analogue to the institutional method used in Ireland where units under review select their own benchmarks. An alternative to fixed criteria is provided by Mohanan[141] who reminds us that even while acknowledging diversity, characterizing teaching excellence in terms of the quality of learning it is likely to trigger, makes it possible to:

> ... identify a collection of ingredients that contribute towards better learning, though there is no need to prescribe any given subset from this collection.[142]

These "ingredients" are not a checklist but a means to interrogate evidence. For example, there is probably general agreement that, in most cases at least, helping students to become self-directed, lifelong learners is an indicator of good teaching. Thus, it is possible to ask, what evidence is there in this portfolio that the

teacher has encouraged the development of lifelong learning skills? Using such ingredients and the obvious resultant questions as guides, peers can make informed judgments on the quality of teaching from the evidence presented to them. Thus, it is possible, through the vehicle of portfolios, for teachers to present examples of their work that demonstrate either of both excellence in teaching and continuing professional development without the need for mechanistic, atomistic narrow evaluation criteria.

Summary

The Irish system of quality assurance is predicated on the assumption (extensively supported in the literature) that continuous improvement is best achieved when quality processes become integral to an institution's culture and are embedded in the management infrastructure. This is much more likely to happen if there is a genuine sense of ownership and control of the processes via, self-regulation, self-assessment and self-improvement. The needs of public accountability are best met through transparency of both process (by the inclusion of external experts) and results (again, by the inclusion of external experts and also by publication). Key principles of the Irish system are ownership, inclusiveness, collegiality, continuous improvement, transparency and, above all, institutional autonomy and responsibility. However, while each individual university in the Republic of Ireland retains its autonomy, collectively they have recognized the value of a common national system wherein peer support and the exchange of information help ensure rigor and transparency.

Enough evidence had been generated by the observations and investigations of international experts to warrant the system as effective and, indeed, exemplary.

When it comes to the evaluation of teachers and teaching, similar arguments about autonomy and self-regulation apply. The effective evaluation of teaching in a way that prompts continual improvement is best achieved through individually managed self-directed professional development within a collegial framework of peer support.

Within the context of quality assurance, teaching needs to be seen a complex, multi-faceted activity – a "meta-profession"[143] based on developmental scholarship.[144] In this model, the mechanistic behaviors and skills tested by much traditional evaluation methods are best seen as "surface teaching"[145] concerned with the important, but limited, issues of coverage, depth and presentation. Effective teaching requires competence in these areas but excellence in teaching requires much more. The literature supports the contention that confidential formative evaluation where there is little risk of adverse career consequences, leads to more effective quality improvement than external inspections. It is, however, possible to feed data from formative evaluation into summative systems provided the control of individual data sets remains with the individual teachers. Consequently, the evaluation of teaching is best conducted within a framework of individual responsibility and control analogous to the institutional situation of Irish universities.

There is, therefore, considerable evidence to support the contention that both institutional quality assurance and the evaluation of individual teachers is best achieved through self-managed internal processes rather than externally imposed inspectorial systems.

Remarks

1. Central Statistics Office Ireland. Data relates to April 2004 retrieved on 19th July 2005 from http://www.cso.ie/statistics/imfsummaryire.htm#popanchor) Dublin.

2. Central Statistics Office Ireland. http://www.cso.ie/statistics/nationalingp.htm retrieved 22nd August 2005 Dublin

3. http://www.finfacts.com/cgi-bin/irelandbusinessnews/exec/view.cgi?archive=2&num=121

4. OECD 2004Economic Outlook No.1. Paris.

5. Strictly speaking, there are 8 Universities – NUI Maynooth consists of two universities NUI Maynooth itself and the Roman Catholic Pontifical University. This latter is, for all practical purposes, a part of NUI Maynooth but in theory and in law remains an independent institution.

6. OECD 2004 Review of Higher Education in Ireland. Paris.

7. Ibid

8. EU Commission 2004 Progress Towards the Common Objectives in Education and Training, Indicators and Benchmarks. Brussels.

9. The Universities Act 1997, Oireachtas, Dublin, http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/ZZA24Y1997.html

10. However, this co-operation was, at least partly, prompted the Irish Government's Green paper *Education for a Changing World* Department of Education, Dublin, 1992.

11. Commission of the European Communities 1996 Pilot project for Evaluating Quality in Higher Education Report. Brussels.

12. European Universities Association 2005 Review of Quality Assurance in Irish Universities available at http://www.hea.ie/uploads/pdf/IE_Sectoral_Report_Final.pdf. Brussels

13. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education 2005 *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* Helsinki.

14. Universities Act Section 35.

15. European Universities Association 2005 Review of Quality Assurance in Irish Universities available at http://www.hea.ie/uploads/pdf/IE_Sectoral_Report_Final.pdf. Brussels.

16. IUQB Terms of Reference available at http://www.iuqb.ie/

17. http://www.iuqb.ie/

18. Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin (pages 33 - 34)

19. Higher Education Funding Council for England 2002 *Information on Quality and Standards in Higher Education.* London (Page 5).

20. Between 1993 and 1995 an equally heavy-handed system was operated by the Higher Education Funding Council for England.

21. Reductionist because it seeks to reduce definitions of quality to fixed objective criteria.

22. Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin (page 15)

23. Becket N & Brookes M 2005 Analyzing Quality Audits in Higher Education *Brookes eJournal of Learning and Teaching* Oxford available at http://www.brookes.ac.uk/publications/bejlt/volume1issue2/academic/becket_brookes.html!

24. Inglis 2005 Quality Improvement, Quality Assurance, and Benchmarking: Comparing Two Frameworks for Managing Quality Processes in Open and Distance Learning *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning 6.1 (March - 2005)* Athabasca University, Athabasca, Alberta, Canada.

25. Garlick, S., and Pryor, G. 2004 *Benchmarking the university: Learning about improvement.* Canberra, ACT: Department of Education, Science, and Training.

26. Davies J 2002 Cultural Change in Universities in the Context of Strategic and Quality Initiatives", in Tabatoni P, Davies J & Barblan A, *Strategic Management and Universities' Institutional Development.* Available at http://www.eua.be:8080/eua/jsp/en/client/item_list.jsp

27. Roffe, I. M. 1998 Conceptual Problems of Continuous Quality Improvement and Innovation in Higher Education, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 6 (2), pp. 74-82

28. Kells, H.R. 1995 *Self-Study Processes, A Guide to Self-Evaluation in Higher Education.* Phoenix, Arizona: Oryx Press.

29. Inglis 2005 sup cit

30.Garlick and Pryor 2004 sup cit

31. Kells 1995 quoted in Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin page 16

32. Dubois P 1998 *Evalue – Evaluation and Self-Evaluation of Universities in Europe* Commission of the European Communities. Luxembourg page 20

33. Berlin Communiqué, September, 2003 available at http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/en/communique_minister/ retrieved 2nd August 2005.

34. EUA Graz Convention, May, 2003 (Theme 3) Available at http://eua.uni-graz.at/documents.html retrieved 2nd August 2005.

35. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education 2005 *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* Helsinki.

36. Ibid pages 11-12

37. HEA 2005 Reflections Document Prepared by the High Level Reference Panel Government Publications, Dublin page 8.

38. Ibid page 12

39. Ibid page 12

40. IUQB 2005 Response to the EUA Quality Review of Universities in Ireland available at http://www.iuqb.ie/ Dublin.

41. OECD 2005 Review of National Policies in Education: Review of Higher Education in Ireland Examiners Report. Paris.

42. Ibid page 21

43. European Universities Association 2005 Review of Quality Assurance in Irish Universities available at http://www.hea.ie/uploads/pdf/IE_Sectoral_Report_Final.pdf. Brussels page 12.

44. European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education 2005 *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* Helsinki.

45. Ibid page 25

46. Jackson, N. (1997), Internal Academic Quality Audit in UK Higher Education: part II implications for a national quality assurance framework, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 5 (1), pp. 46-54.

47. Roffe, I. M. (1998), Conceptual Problems of Continuous Quality Improvement and Innovation in Higher Education, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 6 (2), pp. 74-82.

48. ONeil, C. (1997), Student Ratings at Dalahousie, Focus, 6 (5), quoted in Becket & Brookes 45.

49. Becket N & Brookes M 2005 Analyzing Quality Audits in Higher Education Brookes eJournal of Learning and Teaching Oxford available at http://www.brookes.ac.uk/publications/bejlt/volume1issue2/academic/becket_brookes.html!

50. Bradach, S. 1998, *Franchise Organisations* Harvard Business School Press, Boston.

51. Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin. Sup. cit. page 18.

52. Smyth W J 2003 Paper Pesented to National Conference on the Bologna Process 23 July 2003 - Dublin Castle

53. Professor Morteza Amir Rahimi, Northwestern University. Quoted in Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin. Sup. cit. Page 26.

54. Professor John Robinson, Scottish Agriculture College. Quoted in Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin. Sup. cit. Page 42.

55. Professor James McCloskey, University of California, Santa Cruz. Quoted in Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin. Sup. cit. Page 45.

56. Page 17

57. European Universities Association 2005 Review of Quality Assurance in Irish Universities available at http://www.hea.ie/uploads/pdf/IE_Sectoral_Report_Final.pdf. Brussels. Page 11.

58. References 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 above.

59. Inglis 2005 Quality Improvement, Quality Assurance, and Benchmarking: Comparing Two Frameworks for Managing Quality Processes in Open and Distance Learning *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning 6.1 (March - 2005)* Athabasca University, Athabasca, Alberta, Canada.

60. Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin. Sup. cit. page 27.

61. Dr. Seán Ennis, Strathclyde University quoted in Conference of Heads of Irish Universities 2003 *A Framework for Quality in Irish Universities* Dublin. Sup. cit. Page 32.

62. Becher T & Trowler P 2001 *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines* 2nd Edition SRHE / Open University Press Buckingham.

63. EUA Report sup cit page 27.

64. Sup cit.

65. EUA Report sup cit page 12.

66. Goldhaber D & Anthony 2004 A *Can Teacher Quality Be Effectively Assessed?* The Urban Institute, Washington DC. Available at www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=410958

67. Johnson, T. D. & Ryan, K. E. 2000 *A Comprehensive Approach to the Evaluation of College Teaching* in Ryan K. E (Ed.), New Directions for Teaching and Learning Evaluating Teaching in Higher Education: a vision for the future (pp. 109-123). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

68. Medley D M & Shannon D M 1994 Teacher Evaluation in Husen T & Postlethwaite T N (eds) *The International Encyclopedia of Education* 2nd edition Vol 10 6015 – 6020 Pergamon, Oxford.

69. Scriven M 1996 Assessment in Teacher Education: Getting Clear on the Concept *Teaching and Teacher Education* 12, 443 - 450

70. Medley D M & Shannon D M 1994 sup cit

71. Glass G V 1990 Using Student Test Scores to Evaluate Teachers. In Millman J and Darling-Hammond L (eds) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* 229 – 240 Sage, Newbury Park.

72. Marshall K 2005 It's Time to Rethink Teacher Supervision and Evaluation *Phi Delta Kappan* 86, 10 727 – 735.

73. Darling-Hammond L 1995 *A License to Teach:*

building a profession for 21st century schools Westview Press, Bolder, Co.

74. Medley D M & Shannon D M 1994 sup cit

75. Haertel E H 1991 New Forms of Teacher Assessment. In Grant G *Review of Research in Education* 17,
3 – 29 AERA Washington DC.

76. Good T L & Mulryan C 1990 Teacher Ratings: a call for teacher control and self-evaluation. In Millman J and Darling-Hammond L (eds) *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: assessing elementary and secondary school teachers* 191 - 215 Sage, Newbury Park.

77. Campbell D J & Lee C 1988 Self-appraisal in Performance Evaluation: developmental versus evaluation. *Academy of Management Review* 13, 302 - 314

78. Moses I 1986. Self and student evaluation of academic staff. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 11, 76-86.

79. Howard G S, Conway C G & Maxwell S E 1985 Construct validity of measures of college teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 77,187-196

80. Meyer H 1980 Self-appraisal of job performance *Personnel Psychology* 33, 291-295.

81. Thornton, G. (1980) Psychometric properties of self-appraisal and job performance *Personnel Psychology* 33. 63-271

82. Access Economics Pty 2005 *Review of Higher Education Performance Indicators* Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra.

83. Sproule R 2000 *Student Evaluation of Teaching: A Methodological Critique of Conventional Practices* Education Policy Analysis Archives 8, 50 available at http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v8n50.html

84. Leamnson R 1999 *Thinking about Teaching and Learning: Developing Habits of Learning with First Year College and University Students* Stylus,.Sterling, Va

85. Cosser M 1998. Towards the design of a system of peer review of teaching for the advancement of the individual within the university. Higher Education, 35, 143-162.

86. Adams J V 1997 Student Evaluations: the ratings game *Inquiry* 1, 2 10 – 16.

87. Haertel, Geneva D.; & Wheeler, Patricia H. (1994). *Rater Effects when Judging Performance* EREAPA Publication Series 94-5. Livermore, CA: EREAPA Associates

88. Platt M 1993 What Student Evaluations Teach *Perspectives in Political Science* 22, 1 29 - 40

89. Lynch J 2003 *Promoting Innovation in UniversityTteaching Against the Tide of Centralised Control and Institutionalised Risk Avoidance* NZARE / AARE available at www.aare.edu.au/03pap/lyn03383.pdf retrieved 9th August 2005

90. Turhan K, Yaris F & Nural E 2005 Does Instructor Evaluation by Students Using a Web-based Questionnaire Impact Instructor Performance? *Advances in Health Sciences Education* 10, 1. 5 – 13.

91. Peterson, K.D. 2000 *Teacher Evaluation: a comprehensive guide to new directions and practices.* Corwin Press Inc., Thousand Oaks, Ca.

92. Sproule 2000 sup cit page 13

93. Katzner 1991 Our Mad Rush to Measure: How Did We Get There? Methodus 3, 2 18 – 26 (quoted in Sproule 2000)

94. Wolfer, T. A., & Johnson, M. M. (2003). Re-evaluating Student Evaluation of Teaching: The Teaching Evaluation Form *Journal of Social Work Education* 39(1), 111-121.

95. Lakotos 1978 *The Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. (quoted in Sproule 2000)

96. Cashin W E 1998 Student Ratings of Teaching: *A Summary of the Research* Idea Paper 20 Kansas State University, Manhattan Ks.

97. d' Apollonia, S., & Abrami, P. 1997 Navigating student ratings of instruction *American Psychologist* 52(11), 1198-1208.

98. Cohen P 1981 Student Ratings of Instruction and Student Achievement: A Meta-analysis of Multisection Validity Studies *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 3: 305

99. Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76 (5), 707-754.

100. McKeachie, W. J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A Reprise *Academe* 65, 384-397.

101. Cashin W E 1998 Student Ratings of Teaching: *A Summary of the Research* Idea Paper 20 Kansas State University, Manhattan Ks.

102. Ibid page 6.

103. Theall M, Abrami P. A. & Mets L. (eds) 2001 The student ratings debate. Are they valid? How can we best use them? New Directions for Institutional Research
No. 109. Jossey Bass, San Francisco.

104. Arreola, R.A., 2000 *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: a handbook for college faculty administrators on designing and operating a comprehensive faculty evaluation system.* 2nd Ed. Anker Publishing, Bolton, MA.

105. Stodolsky S S 1990 Classroom observation. In Millman J. & Darling-Hammond L. (eds.), *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers*, (pp.175-190). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

106. Berman E 2000 *A Short Guide to Evaluating Teaching* University of Arizona Retrieved 15th July 1005 from http://aer.arizona.edu/AER/Teaching/docs/ShortGuide.pdf

107. Leamnson R 1999 Thinking about Teaching and Learning: Developing Habits of Learning with First Year College and University Students Stylus,.Sterling, Va

108. Cashin W E 1998 Student Ratings of Teaching: *A Summary of the Research* Idea Paper 20 Kansas State University, Manhattan Ks.

109. McKeachie, W. J. (1979). Student ratings of faculty: A reprise. Academe, 65, 384-397.

110. Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, potential biases, and utility. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76 (5), 707-754.

111. Sproule 2000 sup cit

112. Access Economics Pty 2005 *Review of Higher Education Performance Indicators* Department of Education, Science and Training, Canberra.

113. Stodolsky S S 1990 Classroom observation. In Millman J. & Darling-Hammond L. (eds.), *The New Handbook ofTteacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers*, (pp.175-190). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

114. Davis D R, Ellett C D & Annunziata J 2003 Teacher Evaluation, Leadership and Learning Organisations *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 16, 4. 287 – 301.

115. Mohanan K P 1999 – 2003 *Assessing Quality Teaching in Higher Education* National University of Singapore available at http://www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/publications/assess/default.htm retrieved 12th July 2005.

116. Kleinhenz E, Ingvarson L & Chadbourne R 2002 *Evaluating the Work of Teachers in Australian Schools: Vision and Reality* Paper presented at the AARE annual conference Brisbane.

117. Stiggins, R.J., & Duke, D.L. 1990. The Case for Commitment to Teacher Growth: Research on Teacher Evaluation. State University of New York Press, New York.

118. Annunziata J R 1988 Perceptions of the Use of the Teacher Development and Assessment System (TADS) to Instructional Improvement Unpublished Doctoral Thesis University of Miami Fa. Quoted in Davis D R, Ellett C D & Annunziata J 2003 Teacher Evaluation, Leadership and Learning Organisations *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education* 16, 4. 287 – 301.

119. Darling-Hammond L, Wise A & Pease J R 1983 Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: a review of the literature *Review of Educational Research* 53 285 – 328.

120. Bradach, S. 1998, *Franchise Organisations*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

121. Mills, M., & Hyle, A. 1999 Faculty Evaluation: A Prickly Pear. *Higher Education* 38, 351-371.

122. Stiggins, R.J., & Duke, D.L. 1990. The Case for Commitment to Teacher Growth: Research on Teacher Evaluation. State University of New York Press, New York.

123. Darling-Hammond L, Wise A & Pease J R 1983 Teacher Evaluation in the Organizational Context: a review of the literature *Review of Educational Research* 53 285 – 328.

124. Seldin P 1988 Teaching and Learning: lessons learned in evaluating teaching. Fourteenth International Conference on Improving University Teaching. Umea, Sweden: The University of Umea and The University of Maryland / University College, 38-48 Quoted in *The Compleat Learner* Feb 2001 available at http://web.bsu.edu/tlat/compleat_learner/feb_01/feb01_teachingeval.html retrieved 9th August 2005.

125. Berman E 2000 *A Short Guide to Evaluating Teaching* University of Arizona Retrieved 15th July 1005 from http://aer.arizona.edu/AER/Teaching/docs/ShortGuide.pdf

126. Ashcroft, K. and Palacio, D. 1996 *Researching into Assessment and Evaluation in Colleges and Unviersities* Kogan Page, London.

127. Seldin P 1988 Teaching and Learning: lessons learned in evaluating teaching. Fourteenth International Conference on Improving University Teaching. Umea, Sweden: The University of Umea and The University of Maryland / University College,

38-48 Quoted in *The Compleat Learner* Feb 2001 available at http://web.bsu.edu/tlat/compleat_learner/feb_01/feb01_teachingeval.html retrieved 9th August 2005.

128. McMahon, Barrett & O'Neil *forthcoming*

129. McMahon T & O'Neil G 2005 *Genuine Peer-Observation of Teaching – promoting excellence through self-managed professional development.* Irish Universities Quality Board Third International Conference "Engaging a Diverse Student Population". Maynooth, Ireland, 28th & 29th January 2005.

130. McMahon T & Thakore H *Peer Observation of Teaching – The Importance of Equalising Power Relationships through Data Control Protocols.* ECER Conference. Dublin, Ireland, 7th – 10th September 2005

131. Hutchings, P. 1998 Defining Features and the Significance Functions of the Course Portfolio. In, *How Faculty can Examine their Teaching to Advance Practise and Improve Student Learning.* American Association for Higher Education, Washington:

132. Hurst B, Wilson C & Cramer G 1998 *Professional Teaching Portfolios: Tools for Reflection, Growth, and Advancement.*

133. Seldin P 1991 *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Promotion/Tenure Decisions.* Anker Publishing, Bolton, Ma:

134. Baume D & Yorke M 2002 The Reliability of Assessment by Portfolio on a Course to Develop and Accredit Teachers in Higher Education. *Studies in Higher Education.* 27 (1), pp7-25.

135. Lyons, N. 2002 Guidelines for Creating a Teaching Portfolio. In Lyons, N, Hyland, A., & Ryan, N. Eds. *Advancing the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning through the Reflective Process: The University College Cork Experience.* Cork: University College Cork Publication. Pp113-115.

136. Lyons, N. 2001. *Interrogating, Documenting and Representing the Scholarship of Teaching: Portfolio Options.* May, 2001. Course Handout: University College Cork

137. Kulski M M & Radloff A 1998 Adding Value to Teaching: A Framework for Institutional Use of the Teaching Portfolio. *SAJHE/SATHO*, 12(3), pp179-185.

138. Way D 2002 *Evaluating Teaching Portfolios: Moving from a Competitive to a Collaborative Culture* 4th World Conference of the International Consortium for Educational Development in Higher Education, Perth, Australia

139. Mohanan K P 1999 – 2003 Assessing Quality Teaching in Higher Education National University of Singapore available at http://www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/publications/assess/default.htm retrieved 12th July 2005 page 1.

140. Ibid. page 1.

141. Mohanan K P 1999 – 2003 *Assessing Quality Teaching in Higher Education* National University of Singapore available at http://www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/publications/assess/default.htm retrieved 12th July 2005

142. Ibid page 2

143. Arreola R A, Theall M. & Aleamoni L *Beyond Scholarship: Recognizing the Multiple Roles of the Professoriate* Paper presented at the 2003 AERA Convention, Chicago, Il

144. Boyer, E L. (1990) *Scholarship reconsidered.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

145. Mohanan K P 1999 – 2003 *Assessing Quality Teaching in Higher Education* National University of Singapore available at http://www.cdtl.nus.edu.sg/publications/assess/default.htm retrieved 12th July 2005