The Institutionalisation of Quality Assurance in European Higher Education

Jaakko Kauko

Department of Political Science, University of Helsinki.

Paper prepared for presentation in the Quality of Teaching Workshop at the EpsNet Plenary Conference in Budapest 16.–17. June 2006.

Please contact the author for finalised version for quoting.[1]

INTRODUCTION

Quality assurance (QA) has become everyday life of the academia in Europe. In some countries, QA has been in use for over a decade while other countries have adopted it only recently. Apart from footnotes made about university autonomy, QA has advanced on European level somewhat unquestioned. This is contradictory, because according to numerous studies QA is the most political goal set in the Bologna process. QA has a direct effect on the way in which power relations are arranged inside universities, in a country or on the continent. (See Saarinen 2005, 200; Rinne & Simola 2005, e.g. 16; Amaral & Magalhães 2004; Morley 2003, 164; Newton 2002, e.g. 46–47; Brennan & Shah 2000, 13–16.)

Even if QA is much older than the "Bologna process", the process is often used to legitimise it. The Bologna process seems to have consolidated, among other things, the QA inside the presupposed everyday practises in universities from Baku to Reykjavik.[2] Without taking a stand whether it would be good or bad, the dismantling of the QA system seems impossible at the moment. Assuring quality is today embedded inside the international, national and institutional systems of the universities. Thus it is reasonable to claim that QA has been institutionalised in the academia during the Bologna process.

---

[1] Contact information: jaakko-pekka.kauko@helsinki.fi or jaakkokauko@hotmail.com. Comments are very welcome.

[2] To emphasize the non-rhetorical aspect of this sentence: for instance, both Khazar university (2006) in Baku and the University of Iceland (2006) in Reykjavik are developing or using a quality assurance system.

The aims for this paper are to understand developments which have led to the institutionalisation of quality assurance and to examine the power dynamics of this development. The scrutiny is done by examining the core documents of European QA and of the Bologna process. The focus is limited temporally and actor-wise. Temporal centre of attention will be from the 1990s to the present. The actors in focus are EU, EUA[3], ENQA[4] and the European ministers' (of education) meetings; this excludes for instance the university students' associations (e.g. ESIB[5]) and the vocational or polytechnic institutes (e.g. EURASHE[6]).

TECHNOLOGIES OF INTEGRATION

The logic behind the introduction of QA can be assessed descriptively or with a more explanatory view. If one wants to settle with a description, the spread of QA can be seen as an innovation which is diffused among social systems through certain channels over time (Rogers 1989, 10). In the diffusion dynamics, the diffusion continues after takeoff almost inevitably and the only possible way to stop it is to start another overlapping diffusion of an innovation (cf. Brunsson & Olsen 1993, 44).

In a more explanatory view, the spread of QA can be seen to have happened through the Bologna process, in which the diffusion became more organised. The procedure of conduct in the Bologna process is similar to EU's open method of coordination. According to William Walters and Jens Henriks Haahr (2005, 1–2 and 123) the method is based on conceptualising Europe as an actor and defining the common goals for it. After agreeing on the goals, all critique presented is only developing the existing system further.

Andreas Fejes (2005, 13–16) marks how the Bologna process' documents are based on discourse of homogeneity and heterogeneity. The heterogeneity relates to the inclusive criteria of participation. The homogeneity refers to the standardisation aspect of the whole process. Once the actor is committed to the process, the standardisation, or

[3] *European University Association*, before 2001 known as CRE (*Association of European Universities*).
[4] *European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education*, before 2004 known as *European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education.*
[5] *The National Unions of Students in Europe*.
[6] *European Association of Institutions in Higher Education.*

homogenisation, starts to take effect. Homogenisation functions by excluding the ones who don't act according to the agreed norms. The freedom of choice is connected to the common truth of how one should act.

The lure in the Bologna process is the easy access but the catch is the tangled exit. This applies also to QA: all the criteria evolved during the Bologna process have been very inclusive. All and all, why exit something voluntary?

The approaches described above are explicitly based on Foucauldian conception of power. In this respect, three issues arise. The first issue is the triangle of power, truth and right. According to Michel Foucault (2003, 24–25), these three concepts function in constant interaction. Power has on the one hand normative effects and on the other hand effects on truth. The power cannot function without creating truth, which affects perceptions of everyday life. According to Foucault, the core question is to find the ways of power to create or the rules of right which create the discourse of truth. The second issue relates to the aspect of voluntary nature of the Bologna process. According to Foucault (1975/2005), the new techniques of power are not founded on coercive but normative ways of conduct. This again, requires autonomy from different actors, which makes the overall situation an endless strategic game between free autonomous subjects (Burchell, Gordon & Miller 1991, 5; Hindess 1996, 101–103). Hence, there is an interconnection between privatisation (autonomy) and totalisation (norms) (Foucault 1991, 2–8). Third issue is the techniques of government through conceptualisation and measurement (Miller & Rose 1989, 146–147). Creating common concepts and means to measure common goals are vital also in creating a situation where the open method of coordination is possible, as Walters and Haahr described.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF QUALITY ASSURANCE IN EUROPE

To understand the power dynamics of QA, it is worthwhile to reflect the current situation in its historical context. The introduction of QA in higher education in Europe can be divided into three time periods: early beginning, takeoff and institutionalisation.

The early beginning

Quality assurance has its roots in manufacturing industry's management model called Total Quality Management or TQM. TQM was first developed in Japan after the Second World War with the help of American professors. Around 1980, the idea of TQM was imported back to the United States. (Lumijärvi & Jylhäsaari 1999, 20–23; Morley 2003, 13.) The arrival of TQM first in North-America and then in Europe was eased by an earlier idea of evaluation of the public sector. Hence, evaluation can be seen as a predecessor of TQM.[7] During the first *evaluation* wave, the innovation spread in to pioneering countries, such as, Canada, Germany, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United States during the 1960s, 1970s and also to some extent in the 1980s (Furubo, Rist, Sandahl 2002, 11).

Eventually, after an extensive breakthrough of TQM in the private sector during the 1980s, the US higher education institutions adopted the model from the business world in the beginning of the 1990s (Rhoades & Sporn 2002, 366; Lumijärvi & Jylhäsaari 1999, 24; cf. Birnbaum 2000). In the higher education sector the TQM was introduced under the concept of quality assurance. The American QA model was spread to Europe during the 1990s through conferences of higher education researchers (Rhoades & Sporn 2002, 363–364).[8] This was assisted by intergovernmental organisations. For instance, OECD's general tendency shifted towards quality in the 1990s (Rinne, Kallo & Hokka 2004, 40). This tendency materialised when the OECD launched an US-influenced higher education QA programme IMHE[9] in the early 1990s (Henry, Lingard, Rizvi, Taylor 2001, 76). In addition, the EU started a pilot project in 1994–1995 on evaluating quality in higher education. The pilot project's goal was to "increase the awareness for the need of evaluating higher education" (European Commission 1995, I). The promotion of the American QA model by the intergovernmental organisations coincided with the European

[7] The most distinguishing feature which separates evaluation in general from TQM is the *ex post facto* nature of evaluation. In TQM evaluation is ubiquitous.
[8] The researchers' organisations meetings which Gary Rhoades and Barbara Sporn (2002, 363–364) scrutinize are EAIR (*European Association for Institutional Research*) and CHER (*Consortium of Higher Education Researchers*).
[9] *Institutional Management in Higher Education.*

scale QA takeoff in the late 1990s and the QA model adopted during the takeoff can be seen to have assimilated influences from this promotion.[10]

As the pioneering countries had implemented the first generation QA in the 1980s and as it seemed to produce only loss of legitimacy, the need for the next generation models was imminent already before the Bologna declaration in 1999 (Jeliazkova & Westerheijden 2002, 433). At the same time, other European countries, such as Belgium, Denmark, Finland and Norway, started to move towards QA systems for the first time (Rhoades & Sporn 2002, 363). This second QA wave was parallel with a more extensive introduction of evaluation in a global scale and was fuelled, as seen concretely above, by the external pressure of international organisations: OECD, EU and the World Bank (Furubo et. al. 2002, 11–17).

The takeoff

The European QA takeoff in the late 1990s can be observed both inside the EU and on the whole continent. In 1997, the pan-European Lisbon convention agreed, that the signatory states' universities should indicate their quality.[11] The modest mean to reach this objective was to obligate the signatory states to publish the results of the formal assessment or giving out other information that would indicate their higher education institutions' qualifications. (ETS 165 1997, art. VIII.1.) Any formal assessment, meaning QA, wasn't necessarily required. The same tendency can be seen in the Sorbonne declaration (1998) which didn't mention the word *quality*, but referred to the Lisbon convention's idea of recognising qualifications.

The means to promote QA grew, as the EU member states passed the Commissions proposal in the Council recommendation (98/561/EC) on European cooperation in quality assurance in higher education. The most substantial message of the recommendation is that different European organisations, which specialise and are involved in QA, should cooperate. Also the basic assumption of the recommendation is that all member states

[10] This model consists usually of self-evaluation, evaluation by external expert panel and the publication of the results without a ranking system. Also stakeholders' interests and meta-evaluation of the QA-system (the use of external QA-agencies) are a part of this international QA model. (Henry et. al. 2001, 77; Rhoades & Sporn 2002, 373; European Commission 1995, II; see also Trends I 1999.)

[11] Initially the agreement was undersigned by 26 European countries and now (May 2006) it is ratified in 41 countries (Council of Europe 2006).

should pursue quality, as the global competition and challenges from the labour market and new information technology grow.

The most enthusiastic contribution in promoting QA before the Bologna declaration came from the CRE. The EU-funded Trends I (1999) shares same motives for action as the Council recommendation: global competition, information technology and labour market. Trends I promotes the European QA model, which shares the characteristics of the internationally influenced models used in the pioneering countries. Also, Trends I (1999) notes, that

> "[t]here is a marked trend towards more autonomy of universities, coupled with new initiatives for quality control and evaluation in many countries".

This view pinpoints the change from the universities' stand in Magna Charta Universitatum in the previous decade. In the 1988 declaration the autonomy is closely connected to independent research and teaching. Also, the mobility is present but QA and evaluation are not. (CRE 1988; see Kwiek 2004, 762.) In the 1990s, universities are obliged to assure their quality to earn the autonomy.

The Bologna declaration's (1999) view on QA was vague, as the only criterion was to promote

> "European co-operation in quality assurance with a view to developing comparable criteria and methodologies".

This was due to the disintegrated view on QA in the 29 signatory states, which can be seen from the preceding documents described above. It seems that the somewhat more uniform view of QA was among the EU countries and this didn't reach the Bologna declaration. Still, it was reflected to the Trends I, because it focused upon EU and EEA countries. The EU-view was enhanced also because Trends I was funded by the Socrates-programme.

It is easy to see, that during the very first steps of the Bologna process, there was no common vision on QA in Europe. Also, if we understand the Sorbonne declaration as the first ring in the Bologna chain, quality assurance was not present, before it was actively promoted, mainly by EU's member countries and the CRE. Even if the European vision

of QA was lacking, the takeoff of the diffusion of the QA on the continent had happened, and the spread of the innovation was inevitable. The diffusion of the QA started separately from the Bologna process, QA was not caused by the process – although it was shaped by it.

Institutionalisation of quality assurance

After the takeoff and even before the Prague meeting in 2001 many things happened, which contributed to the institutionalisation of QA. One year before the ministerial meeting ENQA was established. This was based on the earlier Council recommendation (98/561/EC; COM(2004)620 Final, 2). In the first general assembly of ENQA (2000) the other author of the Trends I -report, Guy Haug, saw QA as the weak point in the Bologna declaration. The interpretation of this comment is that the vague formulation of QA in the Bologna process wasn't satisfactory. This was also true for ENQA members: in the discussion it was also noted, that QA is actually the "corner stone" for the whole process.

In the Salamanca declaration, the EUA (2001, 7) presented that universities have *accepted* the new competitive situation and in order to cope with it they need the adequate autonomy and financing. The universities' previous view of linking autonomy, public financing and the QA is present both in the Salamanca declaration and in Trends II (2001). Salamanca declaration uses also the same kind of language as ENQA when calling quality the "fundamental building stone" for the European Higher Education Area (EUA 2001, 8).

ENQA's (2001) contribution to the Prague meeting sketched some initial plans for European quality assurance system. This included the CRE's proposal for European co-operation forum, or "European platform", and accreditation of institutions. Also the stakeholders' interests are more emphasised in ENQA's view than in EUA's.[12] In ENQA's (2001) opinion accreditation is a process which is

> "based on established standards/criteria and that the result of the process is a decision – 'yes' or 'no' – as to whether these standards have in fact been met".

[12] To put this statistically: ENQA's (2001) 10-page statement mentions the word stakeholder 3 times, where EUA's 90-page Trends II (2001) mentions stakeholders only two times.

Compared to the Bologna declaration (1999) the Prague communiqué (2001) takes QA seriously. The fresh actor, ENQA, is asked to collaborate with other parties and to develop common criteria for QA. After a slow and fumbling beginning, the European QA system started to take its form as the first network devoted only for QA was established. Behind ENQA, one can see the EU Commission's ideals of competition and stakeholders' interests. As an indication of moving towards Commission's view, the Commission was accepted as a full member in the Bologna process.

After the impetus from Prague meeting, the guidelines for the institutionalisation of QA in Europe started to take form in the Berlin meeting 2003. Before the meeting, EUA (2003, 7–9) declared in Graz, that academic quality is one of its core values. Implementing this value demands strong institutions. In practise, and in the light of Trends III (2003, esp. 11), the strong institutions refer to university autonomy without exaggerated governmental control and with governmental funding. QA is something that walks hand-in-hand with autonomy. Trends III (2003, 3–6) also presented the first disagreements from grass root level of the Bologna reforms. These views never re-appeared in the Bologna documents in focus.

For the Berlin meeting, ENQA presented plans for European wide QA. ENQA (2003, 2–3, 6–7) proposed a common framework for QA, a European wide register of QA-agencies and autonomy for the agencies. Before the Berlin meeting, ENQA evolved towards an association and was about to change its name accordingly. Becoming an association meant also criteria for the member associations and thus quality requirements for QA-agencies. The logic behind the system is analogical to the universities' QA: the QA-agencies assure their quality though internal quality assurance (documentation) and external quality assurance (the membership of ENQA).

The Berlin meeting was very receptive for suggestions made by ENQA and EUA. The Berlin communiqué (2003) raises QA as the first item after introduction and states that quality

> "has proven to be at the heart of the setting up of a European Higher Education Area".

The terminology is more or less analogical with EUA's and ENQA's conceptions of QA as a "cornerstone" and a "fundamental building stone". According to the communiqué, the national QA systems and European division of responsibilities should be ready before 2005. On the European level, the ministers' mandate ENQA with the rest of the E4-group[13] to develop standards and guidelines for QA in Europe and to find ways for

> "adequate peer review system for quality assurance and/or accreditation agencies or bodies"

before the next meeting in 2005 (Berlin communiqué 2003).

As a result of the Berlin mandate ENQA (2005) published *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area*. In the Glasgow declaration EUA (2005) supports fully these standards as do the ministers in the Bergen communiqué (2005). At the same time EUA (2005, 2–4) emphasises the need for institutional autonomy to ensure quality and the need for the governments to move from active regulation towards more passive supervision. The ministers for their part see the quality as one of the defining principles of the European Higher education area. Also the 4E-group is mandated further to arrange the practicalities related to fulfilling the requirements of the Standards and Guidelines. (Bergen communiqué 2005.)

The Standards and Guidelines (ENQA 2005) follow closely the ideas of TQM-based QA, which had its European diffusion's takeoff in the late 1990s.[14] The ideas thus emphasize the embedding of quality culture in every process of higher education institutions, the interests of different stakeholders and the evaluation of the internal QA processes by an external QA body. Evaluation takes place via documentation produced by institutions and expert groups performing site visits. ENQA (2005, 29–33) presents concrete proposals for the European system. The proposal of establishing a register of external QA-agencies is quite similar of what ENQA sketched for the Berlin meeting. The register would separate agencies which fulfil the requirements of the Standards and Guidelines from those which don't. The decision-making body for accreditation would be the European

[13] The E4-group consists of ENQA, EUA, EURASHE and ESIB.

[14] One parenthesis has to be made: the Standards and Guidelines is focused on education. Still, education is understood – at least from a Finnish perspective – in a broad sense covering different supportive procedures. However, the definition delimits administration and research out of the guidelines given.

Register Committee, which would consist of E4-group with governmental and labour market representatives. ENQA would be the secretary of this nine-member committee. The evaluation would take place in five year cycle. If no local initiative to start evaluation would be taken, ultimately ENQA and the Register Committee would control this. Also, the work of the E4-group would be consolidated in the future by establishing a consultative forum for QA. The forum would later be completed with labour market organisations.

According to ENQA's earlier opinion (the result of "yes" or "no"), the register system is a form of European accreditation: accreditation of universities' QA-systems and explicit accreditation of external QA-agencies. Still, the contested a-word is avoided.

When adopting the Standards and Guidelines, the Bergen communiqué (2005) becomes an agreement on division of labour in the QA of Europe. It consolidates the institutionalisation of the system proposed mainly by ENQA, EU and EUA. The roles of different actors in this new situation are now initially set.

INSTITUTIONALISATION OF QUALITY ASSURANCE AND POWER

The institutionalisation of QA in Europe advanced through developments in understanding the concepts QA and the "Bologna process". For universities, it was important that QA was seen as a way to increase institutional autonomy. This was made clear in the very first Trends-report before the Bologna declaration and the same agenda has been repeated consistently ever since. It remains unclear, whether the autonomy has indeed increased due to the juxtaposition with QA. This QA-connected autonomy is not the same autonomy as in the Magna Charta Universtitatum a decade before the Bologna declaration. The new scope of autonomy includes everything, whereas Magna Charta Universitatum was focused only on the autonomy of research and teaching. The reformulation of the concept of autonomy makes possible the inclusion of "stakeholders'" interests in different university procedures, because now the autonomy doesn't refer only to the untouchable area of freedom of thought. While the area of the autonomy was enlarged, the area which different stakeholders could affect also grew. The

most important stakeholders affecting everyday practises in university are the QA-agencies.

The QA-agencies are the new players on the scene. In the United States QA-agencies (as accreditation agencies) have been around over a century, but in Europe only a couple of decades (Rhoades & Sporn 2002, 359–360; cf. van Vught & Westerheijden 1994, 355–357). Because European QA-agencies are new, they, by default, are the ones that gain most in this new situation of power. This is due especially to the QA-agencies status of autonomy, which is regulated more or less the same as the universities' autonomy. After the pan-European agreement on QA in the university sector, QA-agencies are here to stay. QA became necessary after the adoption of the common truth of global competition. Analogically the idea of including labour market parties' representatives as stakeholders was an old one and it was visible in the accepted truth of contemporary challenges.

There are now two relatively new concepts: extensively autonomous universities and autonomous QA-agencies. Thus the notion of autonomy is crucial here. The education of autonomous subjects becomes the key-factor in organising behaviour. In the European higher education area, this happens through the standardisation and agreement on common criteria. The basis for this has been the agreement on basic principles. The most important – and somewhat questioned – premise was that global competition has challenged the European higher education and QA is the answer to this. The universities showed initial interest in accepting this before the Bologna declaration in the Trends I -report and finally accepted the global competition as the new situation in Salamanca declaration 2001. The unquestioned premise here is that Europe needs to function as one entity in higher education QA. This is possible because of the threat and the non-specific "common enemy" that was created for Europe – the global competition.

As the common premises were formed, it was possible to start the rapid development of the framework of QA. These premises anticipated the takeoff of European QA and were agreed after the slow beginning in Prague 2001. The logic of the open method of coordination was thus set and it was time to mandate the first European-wide institution, ENQA, to develop and enforce QA. ENQA in cooperation with EUA and the rest of the E4 started to develop common criteria and norms for European QA. The autonomous

subjects were then obliged to act according to these norms. The roles were set: ENQA supervises, the universities implement and the state monitors.

If we look at the institutionalisation of QA in regarding to models of the open method of coordination, the dynamics of the process unravel. First of all, Bologna process was the factor, which made it possible for QA to become institutionalised on continental scale. The takeoff of the QA took place separately from the Bologna process, which is clearly seen in the early documents of the process. Had the Bologna process never happened, QA practises would have been most likely to spread into everyday life of the academia, but maybe not in all of the Bologna countries and less likely in a homogeneous way. Due to the Bologna process, national applications of QA are more uniform and the coordination of the method is more centralised. It may be that the justification for national reforms would have been more difficult, if the conceptual construction of the Europe acting as one on QA had never been created.

As soon as QA found its way in to the Bologna process, the inclusion of ideas and actors began. The shared truth of QA as an answer to global competition broke through before the Prague meeting in 2001. At the same time the involvement of the E4-group became stronger and the EU's Commission became a full member of the process. Also the national QA-agencies' central organisation – ENQA – started to function. From the Prague meeting onwards, the basic idea of inclusion still remained, but the exclusion-process became more visible. This can be observed in the intensified creation of accreditation criteria for QA processes and agencies, which started comprehensively after ENQA was established. After the common truth and the goals had been accepted, no critique could dissolve the construction. From that point forward, all critique was mere development. To put it another way, the efficiency of the open method of coordination has made the whole process look like a bureaucratic exercise. QA in the ministerial meetings have caused little or no friction. In the beginning the view on QA wasn't very coherent, but the common goal made the European-wide institutionalisation possible.

The diffusion of QA benefited all different main actors – at least discursively. Universities started to pursue QA, because it was conceptualised as an answer to the challenges of global competition. QA was also connected to autonomy. The connection

between QA and global competition was made by European governments and was presented in Lisbon 1997 and in EU's Council in 1998. Universities had adopted the connection somewhere during the 1990s, and it was maintained by the EUA.

The QA-agencies have benefited most from the new strategic situation. Agencies have gained power over internal affairs of universities, which earlier were under the influence of the state. European states have been able to create a self-guiding system, which, in some respect is out of the states' direct control, but still works for the benefit of the state in terms of economic efficiency.

European development can be understood through the Foucault's triangle of power, truth and right. The truth of the global competition demanding QA was created before the Prague meeting. The right was formed in Berlin in setting the implementation of the QA as a common goal. This right is monitored through accreditation of QA systems. The power can be seen in the situation, which is created by a new agreement on institutionalising the QA. In this situation, autonomous actors work according to the given universal rules of the new institution of QA.

Universities accepted the new power situation quite easily. However, it is a generalisation to speak about universities as whole. To outsiders, QA processes seem to have spread all over Europe, but a grass root level scrutiny can give another view as it did in Trends III. One reason for success and institutionalisation of QA can be found in its adoption among university and state administration and management.

Indeed, the institutionalisation of QA has changed the whole strategic field of actors at least in non-pioneering countries during the Bologna process. One aspect, which this brief paper doesn't deal with, is that when power functions in a persuading and discursive way, the possibility of variation increases. The possibility for local applications and local alternations is important in a way that it is possible to satisfy discursive needs of national and international systems, while making decisions at institutional level.

To achieve this, there is a need for reflection of dominant discourse. I argue that, if the organisational change, which is posed by the new institutionalised QA-agencies, would be challenged, the possibility for a true institutional reform would rise. Challenging the dominant discourse would bring options to the discourse and would thus make it possible

to do something which is not predestined. In practise, this would mean an open discussion inside universities asking “do we really need this?” Now the question usually is “how do we do this?” If the dominant discourse of change is not reflected, the alternative usually is an unconscious non-change, where institutions continue as before, but introduce new bureaucratic apparatuses to represent institutional activities according to the new common discourse.

I argue that window-dressing is discursively possible also for more advanced QA-systems (c.f. Jeliazkowa & Westerheijden 2002, 435–440). Hence, it would be better, if the window-dressing would be conscious, or if it would be avoided consciously by introducing true alternatives and not operate merely inside the taken-for-granted discourse.

REFERENCES

Amaral, Alberto & Magalhães, António (2004) *Epidemiology and the Bologna Saga*. Higher Education 48(1), 79–101.

Bergen communiqué (2005) *The European Higher Education Area - Achieving the Goals*. Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education. Bergen, 19.–20.5.2005. Downloaded 17.10.2005: http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/050520_Bergen_Communique.pdf.

Berlin communiqué (2003) *Realising the European Higher Education Area.* Communiqué of the Conference of Ministers responsible for Higher Education. 19.9. 2003 Berlin. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/030919Berlin_Communique.PDF.

Birnbaum, Robert (2000) *The Life Cycle of Academic Management Fads*. The Journal of Higher Education. 71(1), 1–16.

Bologna declaration (1999) *European Higher Education Area. Joint declaration of the European Ministers of Education.* Bologna 19.6.1999. Downloaded 17.10.2005: http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/990719BOLOGNA_DECLARATION.PDF.

Brennan, John & Shah, Tarla (2000) *Managing Quality in Higher Education*. Buckingham: OECD, SRHE & Open University Press.

Brunsson, Nils & Olsen, Johan P. (1993) *The Reforming of Organization*. London: Routledge.

Burchell, Graham, Gordon, Colin, Miller, Peter (1991) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

COM(2004) 620 Final *Report from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions on the implementation of Council Recommendation 98/561/EC of 24 September 1998 on European cooperation in quality assurance in higher education.*

Council of Europe (2006) *Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region CETS No.: 165.* Accessed 9.5.2006: http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/Commun/ChercheSig.asp?NT=165&CM=&DF=&CL=ENG.

Council recommendation (98/561/EC) *of 24 September 1998 on European Cooperation in Quality Assurance in Higher Education.*

CRE (1988) *Magna Charta Universitatum.* 18.9.1988, Bologna. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/880918_Magna_Charta_Universitatum.pdf.

ENQA (2000) *General Assembly meeting*. Downloaded 7.4.2006: http://www.enqa.eu/files/GA2000.pdf.

ENQA (2001) *ENQA Statement to the Conference of European Ministers in Prague*. Downloaded 17.10.2005: http://www.enqa.net/files/030918-19STATEMENT_ENQA.pdf.

ENQA (2003) *ENQA Statement to the Conference of European Education Ministers in Berlin*. Downloaded 17.10.2005: http://www.enqa.net/files/ENQA_POSITION_PAPER.pdf.

ENQA (2005) *Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area.* Downloaded 17.10.2005: http://www.enqa.net/files/ENQA%20Bergen%20Report.pdf.

ETS 165 (1997) *Convention on the Recognition of Qualifications concerning Higher Education in the European Region*. *Lisbon 11.4.1997.* European Treaty Series No. 165. Council of Europe.

EUA (2001) *Salamanca Convention. The Bologna process and the European Higher Education Area.* Genève. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/SALAMANCA_final.1069342668187.pdf.

EUA (2003) *Graz Declaration. Forward from Berlin: the role of universities* 30.5.2003. Graz. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/COM_PUB_Graz_publication_final.1069326105539.pdf.

EUA (2005) *Glasgow Declaration. Strong Universities for a Strong Europe* 2.4.2005. Glasgow. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/Glasgow_Declaration.1114612714258.pdf.

European Commission (1995) *Socrates. European Pilot Project for Evaluating Quality in Higher Education. European Report.*

Fejes, Andreas (2005) *The Bologna process – Governing higher education in Europe through standardization*. Paper presented at the third conference on Knowledge and Politics – the Bologna Process and the Shaping of the Future Knowledge Societies. University of Bergen, Norway 18-20 May 2005.

Foucault, Michel (1991) *Governmentality*. In Burchell et. al. (1991), 87–104.

Foucault, Michel (2003) *Society must be defended – Lectures at the Collége de France*. English ed. Arnold I. Davidson. Translated by David Macey. Original publication 1997. New York: Picador.

Foucault, Michel (1975/2005) *Tarkkailla ja rangaista [Discipline and Punish]*. Helsinki: Otava.

Furubo, Jan-Eric, Rist, Ray C., Sandahl, Rolf (eds.) (2002) *International Atlas of Evaluation.* New Brunswick: Transaction.

Henry, Miriam, Lingard, Bob, Rizvi, Fazal & Taylor, Sandra (2001) *The OECD, Globalisation and Education Policy*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.

Jeliazkova, Margarita & Westerheijden, Don F. (2002) *Systemic Adaptation to a Changing Environment: Towards a Next Generation of Quality Assurance Models.* Higher Education 44, 433-448.

Khazar University (2006) *Projects and Programs*. Accessed 22.5.2006: http://www.khazar.org/pprograms/index.shtml.

Kwiek, Marek (2004) *The Emergent European Educational Policies under Scrutiny: the Bologna Process from a Central European perspective*. European Educational Research 3(4).

Lumijärvi, Ismo & Jylhäsaari, Jussi (1999) *Laatujohtaminen ja julkinen sektori: Laadun ja tuloksen tasapaino johtamishaasteena [Quality Management and the Public Sector: the Balance between Quality and Profit as a Challenge for Management]*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Miller, Peter & Rose, Nikolas (1989) *Poliittiset rationalisaatiot ja hallintatekniikat [Political Rationalities and Technologies of Government]*. Politiikka 31(3), 145–158.

Morley, Louise (2003) *Quality and Power in Higher Education.* Berkshire: SRHE & Open University Press.

Newton, Jethro (2002) *Views from Below: Academics Coping with Quality.* Quality in Higher Education (8)2, 39–61.

Prague communiqué (2001) *Towards the European Higher Education Area. Communiqué of the meeting of European Ministers in charge of Higher Education.* Prague 19.5.2001. Downloaded 17.10.2005: http://www.bologna-bergen2005.no/Docs/00-Main_doc/010519PRAGUE_COMMUNIQUE.PDF.

Rhoades, Gary & Sporn, Barbara (2002) *Quality Assurance in Europe and the U.S.: Professional and Political Economic Framing of Higher Education Policy.* Higher Education 43(3), 355–390.

Rinne, Risto & Simola, Hannu (2005) *Koulutuksen ylikansalliset paineet ja yliopistojen uusi hallinta [Supranational Pressures on Education and the new Government of Universities]*. Tiede & edistys 1/2005. Helsinki: Tutkijaliitto.

Rinne, Risto, Kallo, Johanna & Hokka, Sanna (2004) *Liian innokas mukautumaan? OECD:n koulutuspolitiikka ja Suomen vastauksia [Too Keen to Adapt? OECD's Educational Policy and Finnish Responses]*. Kasvatus 35(1), 34–54.

Rogers, Everett M. (1983) *Diffusion of Innovations.* 3rd ed. New York, NY: Free Press.

Saarinen, Taina (2005) *'Quality' in the Bologna Process: from 'Competitive Edge' to Quality Assurance Techniques.* European Journal of Education 40(2), 189–204.

Sorbonne declaration (1998) *Joint Declaration on Harmonisation of the Architecture of the European Higher Education System by the four Ministers in Charge for France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom.* 25.5.1998. Sorbonne. Downloaded 17.10.2005: http://www.bologna-berlin2003.de/pdf/Sorbonne_declaration.pdf.

Trends I (1999) *Trends in Learning Structures in Higher Education.* Haug, Guy & Kirstein, Jette. EUA. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/OFFDOC_BP_trend_I.1068715136182.pdf.

Trends II (2001) *Towards the European Higher Education Area.* Haug, Guy & Kirstein Jette. EUA. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/OFFDOC_BP_trend_II.10687154-83262.pdf.

Trends III (2003) *Trends 2003. Progress towards the European Higher Education Area. Summary.* Reichert, Sybille & Tauch, Christian. EUA. Downloaded 19.10.2005: http://www.eua.be/eua/jsp/en/upload/Trends2003_summary.1064412673141.pdf.

University of Iceland (2006) *Research and Education Policy.* Accessed 22.5.2006: http://www.hi.is/id/1007042.

Van Vught, Frans A. & Westerheijden, Don F. (1994) *Towards a General Model of Quality Assessment in Higher Education.* Higher Education 28(3), 355–371.

Walters, William & Haahr, Jens H. (2005) *Governing Europe. Discourse, Governmentality and European Integration.* London: Routledge.