Implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines developed by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education

A case study on Lund University

NICOLAI SLOTTE

ABSTRACT

The thesis studies the situation within Lund University in relation to the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) developed by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). The aim of the study is to answer the following research question *"How have Lund University implemented the European Standards and Guidelines developed by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) in its ongoing quality assurance work?"* In order to gather information on the state of implementation of the ESG the study conducts a number of interviews with centralized actors involved in the implementation process at Lund University in relation to two confrontational theoretical perspectives, the top-down perspective and the bottom-up perspective as well as looking at the impact of network aspects of the implementation process. As one of the first studies of a higher education institutions implementation of the ESG within the Swedish higher education area – after a number of studies being conducted in the central and eastern European countries – on the implementation of the ESG, the study will present results on the analysis of a Swedish higher education institutions implementation of supra-national standard and guidelines.

Key words: Quality Assurance, Institutional Evaluation, ENQA, IEP, European Standards and Guidelines, HEI, Top-down Perspective, Bottom-up, Multi-level implementation Perspective.
Words: 9953

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

As the Bologna signatories have been face with the implementation of the *European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education* (ESG) since 2005 (Kohoutek 2009 p. 17) I believe that a review on 'how' the implementation has been conducted at a Swedish higher education institution is in order. As *the* (ESG) is the most significant outcome of the Bologna process it is described as a "supranational Bologna policy programme" constructed out of three parts of standards and guidelines (ibid). The implementation of the ESG is not mandatory or compulsory, yet its implementation throughout any given higher education sector is essential to that specific sectors *Agency of Higher Education* ensuring the quality assurance to be able to acquire full membership to the *European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education* (ENQA) and to be listed within the *European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education* (EQAR) (Kohoutek 2009 pp.17-18). Even though this seems irrelevant in the eyes of a mere citizen I believe that quality assurance of higher education is essential, to be able to, ensure a high quality of higher education and subsequently also successful research in the future. Therefore I seek to answer the question presented below while only taking into account one of the three parts of the ESG – (*Part 1: European standards and guidelines for internal quality assurance within higher education institutions*) – as this part is the only on relevant to the higher education institutions in the work of assuring quality.

> *How have Lund University implemented the European Standards and Guidelines developed by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) in its on going quality assurance work?*

As the question entails, I will try to answer this question by conducting a qualitative case study on the case of Lund University. In conducting this case study I aim to analyze the implementation of the ESG by utilizing and challenging two confrontational theoretical perspectives – *the top-down perspective* and *the bottom-up perspective* – within the area of policy implementation. The perspectives will give structure to my analysis and allow me to identify key elements in the implementation process. I believe that the results of the case study are interesting (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 18) both in the sense that society wants to know more about how a sustainable society is secured in the area of education and to the scientific community in further understanding the way implementation of policy is conducted

within a complex structured, public higher education institution such as Lund University, one of Sweden's largest higher education institutions in both width and depth. As the institution inhabits these characteristics it seems likely that if the implementation finds a way to be successful in this specific case then it should be able to provide further insight into how implementation of the ESG would look like in a general sense throughout the Swedish higher education sector (Teorell, Svensson 2007 pp. 46-48). I also believe that there are benefits in identifying the challenges in the implementation process within such a large local actor. Gathering further insight into the implementation of the ESG at Lund University should also prove to be relevant to the creators of the ESG and the European Union as there are few case studies of the ESG implementation in Scandinavian countries at the moment, looking at the implementation process especially as the study preformed being of empirical design. Also it is not yet perfectly clear how the implementation of supra national policy of any kind is implemented at the local level which in itself implements the policy in a multi-level institutional structure. I believe this case to be a cornerstone in a cumulative research study hopefully developing into a future cluster study on more than one Swedish higher education institution in order to be able to draw more conclusive conclusions based on more data (Teorell, Svensson 2007 pp. 44, 46).

2. BACKGROUND

2.1 HISTORIC DEVELOPMENT OF QUALITY ASSURANCE

It was already in the 1950´s that five aspects brought forth the topic of the 'quality assurance' that we see today - in an obviously more developed form of course. (1) As the state bring forth the expression "mass higher education" more and more students are enrolling into higher education institutions, which increase the student numbers and results in lower state expenditure per student (Kohoutek 2009 p. 27). With this development in mind the state had to focus on ensuring quality of education due to society expressing interest in increased transparency into the costs and benefits of higher education (Kohoutek 2009 pp. 27-28). (2) The relationship between higher education and the labour market had become a topic of interest in society as further interest into quality of higher education developed (Kohoutek 2009 p. 28). (3) The discussion on quality of higher education became increasingly discussed due to the new conditions higher education would find itself in, with high student enrollment

and over time fewer state investments which would result in greater student numbers and fewer financial means. The expression "quality gap" would describe the dilemma that higher education would be confronted with in regards of ensuring provision of higher education with increased quality due to societies demand, without increased financial means (ibid). (4) As student exchanges and international cooperation's started to become popular in regards of the recent developments with "mass higher education" it had become increasingly clear that quality was a very important aspect to consider (ibid). (5) At the time governments believed that they should assign themselves a steering role in the development of higher education, this as development with an inherent process built with detailed regulation was the dominant thought of the day. In the 1980's this view changed and the idea was abandoned for increased institutional autonomy from the state in connection with an increased demand for quality assurance. This would result in a "steering from a distance" relationship between the state and the higher education institutions (ibid). With the development of the supranational bodies of today the "quality issue" became a topic discussed in the *European Union* (EU) and with the signing of the *Treaty of Maastricht* the European community was authorized "to contribute to the development of quality education" and methods of achieving it. In a report, a concept of quality assurance was brought forth with internal evaluation as a 'cornerstone'. This would lead to, the EU starting a pilot project on programme assessment in 17 countries from within the European community. It would later evolve into the *European University Association's* (EUA) *Institutional Evaluation Programme* (IEP) provided to members of the association for external evaluation of the member institution providing feedback on how to improve its quality assurance (Kohoutek 2009 pp. 28-29). This development would help spread the development of quality assurance within Europe through the support of the EU Commission later resulting, in the year 2000, with the EU recommendation to establish a "supportive agency network (ENQA)" (Kohoutek 2009 p. 30). With all this progress in mind a process of development in the 1990's would result in ambiguous views being presented with a "high degree of goal conflict" that would lead to the – in writing none documented – "Pirsing's famous "what the hell is quality", how we can measure it, and what we do about it" (Kohoutek 2009 p. 36). After more than 25 years of research the theories of implementation are many and contradicting in many ways resulting in not achieving consensus due to a number of reasons. Amongst them are researchers conducting research on different "explanations for different kinds of dependent variables" resulting in little dialog on what

would be the most likely explanation (Kohoutek 2009 p. 70). Although in 2000, a survey was conducted in 15 of the Central and East-European (CEE) countries within their respective agencies for higher education which showed the existence of a general trend towards "stressing the importance of an *improvement orientation* and relying more on *internal quality mechanisms* in higher education institutions" (Kohoutek 2009 p. 43).

2.2 THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE IN THE EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION AREA

Without warning the *European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education* (ENQA) would in the Berlin Communiqué in 2003 be assigned "…"to develop" an agreed set of standards, procedures and guidelines on quality assurance to explore ways of ensuring an adequate peer review system for quality assurance and/or accreditation agencies or bodies…" (Kohoutek 2009 p. 78). ENQA in cooperation with the so called E4 group – constructed of (1) ENQA, (2) *The European University Association* (EUA), (3) *National Unions of Students in Europe* (ESIB) (would later become *European Students' Union* (ESU)) and (4) *The European Association of Institutions in Higher Education* (EURASHE) – elaborated in order to develop a "…European dimension to quality assurance…"(ibid). The work resulted in a report submitted to the ministerial meeting in Bergen in 2005 and were there approved and "turned into" *The European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area* (ESG) (Kohoutek 2009 pp. 78-79). The ESG would result in twenty-three standards broken down into three sections following a "generic, non-prescriptive approach to quality" (Kohoutek 2009 pp. 79-80). This originated within the Graz Declaration in 2003, which stated "the purpose of a European dimension to quality assurance is to promote mutual trust and improve transparency while respecting the diversity of national contexts and subject areas" (ibid). Furthermore "underpinning the standards and guidelines there are three fundamental principles: (1) the interests of students, employers, and society more generally, in good quality higher education; (2) the central importance of institutional autonomy, tempered by a recognition that this brings with it heavy responsibilities; and (3) the need for a "fitness for purpose" test for external quality assurance, which ensures that the burden it places on institutions is no greater than is absolutely necessary" (ibid). The need for the ESG to be non-prescriptive was established due to the risk of the ESG being "…*decided by the power* of one actor, or of a coalition of actors enforcing a particular perspective on the

other participants down the implementation chain". This as it would reduce the ambiguity of the ESG to levels that would give rice to conflicts among the involved actors engaged in the ESG. It would risk the ESG becoming a "gamble" as the ESG would become a "case-by-case" bargaining game, which hopefully "would be in nobody's interests". Therefore interpretations of implementation dilemmas have been confined to the implementation unit level (Kohoutek 2009 p. 87).

2.3 THE EUROPEAN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS

Even though the study will focus on the process of implementation and not the fulfillment of the ESG. The following is stated within the European Standards and Guidelines on what's expected of an Institution in regards for policy and procedures for quality assurance.

> *"Institutions should have a policy and associated procedures for the assurance of the quality and standards of their programms and awards. They should also commit themselves explicitly to the development of a culture which recognizes the importance of quality, and quality assurance, in their work."*
>
> (The European Standards and Guidelines 2009 p. 7)

It's an important aspect that an institution has a policy and specific procedures for quality assurance in order to ensure the continuous work on improvement within all aspects of the learning process. It provides a well-needed framework for monitoring and developing its quality of education and its effectiveness (The European Standards and Guidelines 2009 p. 16). In accordance with the European Standards and Guidelines the policy statement is expected to include: (1) "the relationship between teaching and research in the institution"; (2) "the institution's strategy for quality and standards"; (3) "the organization of the quality assurance system"; (4) "the responsibilities of departments, schools, faculties and other organizational units and individuals for the assurance of quality"; (5) "the involvement of students in quality assurance"; (6) "the ways in which the policy is implemented, monitored and revised" (The European Standards and Guidelines 2009 p. 16). In order for an Institution to be able to develop the mentioned policy and procedures it needs to first develop a strategy as stated by the European Standards and Guidelines below.

> *"To achieve this, institutions should develop and implement a strategy for the continuous enhancement of quality. The strategy, policy and procedures should have*

a formal status and be publicly available. They should also include a role for
students and other stakeholders."

<div align="right">(The European Standards and Guidelines 2009 p. 7)</div>

3. THEORY

In this study I have chosen to utilize two conflicting theoretical perspectives – the *top-down perspective* and *bottom-up perspective* – as I conduct my analysis of the implementation of the ESG at Lund University. Even though – as I will show you – both perspectives have been much criticized they are among the most developed in the area of policy implementation and the reason why I've selected them for my analysis Although Pressman and Wildawsky stated, that "policies normally contain both goals and the means for achieving them" (Pressman and Wildawsky quoted in Hill and Hupe 2006 p. 44). As of yet researchers have not been able to develop a general theory of implementation even though many have tried and contributed to the work (Winter 2003 p. 205). The two schools of thought – the top-down and bottom-up – emerged in order to be able to study and describe implementation (Paudel 2009 p. 39). The perspectives are on two sides of a divide as they are in confrontation with each other and have long divided the researchers within the field of policy implementation (Winter 2003 p. 213). The two perspectives where developed during what's called the second generation of implementation studies which "focused on describing and analyzing the relationships between policy and practice" (Paudel 2009 p. 39). In this period researchers came to a number of important conclusions such as "policy cannot always mandate what matters to outcomes at local level; individual incentives and beliefs are central to local response; effective implementation requires a strategic balance of pressure and support; policy-directed change ultimately is a problem of the smallest unit" (ibid). Van Horn also mentions the importance of time periods "at what point in history implementation occurs and over what period of time" (Van Horn in Paudel 2009 p. 39). Further the "implementations variability over time and across policies and governments" were recognized as an important part of understanding policy implementation. With this in mind success or failure depended "heavily on an explicit or implicit model of policy implementation process" (ibid). It was in the development of these models and research strategies that the confrontation between the top-down and bottom-up perspectives of policy implementation became apparent (Winter 2003 p. 213). I believe that

the ESG provides a clear framework for the institutions to work with in developing its policy and conducting its implementation.

3.1 THE TOP-DOWN PERSPECTIVE

The top-down perspective puts – as the single implementing agency in the implementation process – the policymaker's at the centre of the policy development and implementation process (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 50). It's important that when agreed upon objects are reached the complete process and sequence of implementation is possible to be plotted in detailed in such a way that all participants know their role in the implementation process (ibid). The perspective assumes that the policymaker's can specify the policy goals and that mechanisms can ensure that the implementation can be carried out successfully (Paudel 2009 p. 39). Although control over the process is a cornerstone in the top-down perspective I believe that as it takes the statutory text as its starting point, this tends to fail to consider the significance of actions taken earlier in the policy-making process (Paudel 2009 p. 40). Eugene Bardach adds two variants of advise to the in implementation from a top-down perspective. The (1) "scenario writing" has to be designed in a way that the desired outcome can be achieved and (2) attention has to be awarded into "fixing the game" this has to be done in two ways both by working on the composition of the policy to be as comprehensive as possible and following the process of implementation to ensure success and by influencing other policy to remove obstacles in the way of success (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 48). This shows that Bardach views the process as political, but there exists criticism suggesting that the top-down perspective tries to eliminate the political aspects of the implementation as they perceive the process as purely administrative (Paudel 2009 p. 40). In this potential none-political process success seems to therefore rely to a large extent on the policymaker's abilities and influence in the implementation process (Paudel 2009 p. 39). As politics steps into this discussion I would argue that this accounts for a high conflict probability in the implementation process. As the top-down perspective seems to view the process as purely administrative and the local implementers as impediments in the implementation process in order to achieve success (Paudel 2009 pp. 40-41). In the quest of defining 'implementation' several influential researchers have contributed their views. Meter, Horn, Mazmanian and Sabatier views "implementation as concerned with the degree to which the actions of implementation officials and target groups coincide with the goals embodied in an authoritative decision"

(Paudel 2009 p. 39). Pressman and Wildavsky brought forward the discussion on "to what extent implementation depends upon linkages between different organizations and departments at local level" (ibid). Further Matland describes the top-down perspective as exhibiting a "strong desire to develop generalizable policy advice", and states, "This requires finding consistent and recognizable patterns across different policy areas" (Matland 1995 p. 146). Elmore points out that the top-down perspective focuses on "formal steering of problems and factors, which are easy to manipulate and lead to centralization and control". This shifts the focus more towards focusing on steering mechanisms such as "funding formulas", "formal organisational structures and authoritative relationships between administrative units" and "regulation and administrative controls" such as "budget, planning and evaluation requirements" (Elmore in Paudel 2009 p. 40). I believe that this to a measure is sound but in controlling the environment throughout the whole process seems impossible in a large organisation. According to Elmore "it begins at the top of the process, with as clear a statement as possible of the policy-maker's intent, and proceeds through a sequence of increasingly more specific steps to define what is expected of implementers at each level. At the bottom of the process, one states, again with as much precision as possible, what a satisfactory outcome would be, measured in the terms of the original statement of intent" (Elmore 1979 p. 602). The problem with this is that it assumes that the discretion of the local implementers – street-level bureaucrats – doesn't affect the implementation process in a previously unplanned way. The assumption that "priorities are known and can be ranked" (Paudel 2009 pp. 40-41), gives way for the assumption that implementation in a top-down process have to be fully transparent to be able to assure success and would not be able to attend to discrepancies. Those promoting the bottom-up perspective usually argue – in order to prove the superiority of the bottom-up perspective – that the bottom-up solution with its focus on the street-level bureaucrats expertise in the true problems at local level would be able to attend to these unintended effects throughout any specific local environment which the implementation process would encounter due to the street-level bureaucrats widespread discretion in delivering purposeful policy (ibid).

3.2 THE BOTTOM-UP PERSPECTIVE

The bottom-up perspective focuses its attention towards the "formal and informal relationships constituting the policy subsystems involved in making and implementing

policies" (Paudel 2009 p. 41). Michael Lipsky argues that "the decision of street-level bureaucrats, the routines they establish, and the devices they invent to cope with uncertainties and work pressures, effectively become the public policies they carry out" (Lipsky quoted in Hill and Hupe 2006 p. 52). This suggests that the street-level bureaucrats through the bottom-up perspective attends to the implementation process while focusing on putting the *social problems in society* in the centre of the implementation (Paudel 2009 p. 41), instead of the policymakers directives within the *statutory text* which is presented in the top-down perspective. This as they are considered to have a better understanding as well as direct contact with their clients the street-level bureaucrats are seen as having considerably superior knowledge of their clients needs (ibid). Street-level bureaucrats are, according to Lipsky, the real policymakers as their roll in delivering and enforcing regulations makes them essential actors in implementing public policies (Winter 2003 p. 214). The main criticism of this is the perspectives insufficient solution to the standard problems of public policy. As it rejects the authority of policymakers, which clearly goes against everything stated in a standard democratic theory where all power policymakers have aggregated "derives from their accountability to sovereign voters through their elected representatives" (Paudel 2009 p. 42). "The authority of local service deliverers does not derive from this base of power" (Matland 1995 pp. 149-150). Further the perspective lacks the ability to successfully explain why certain strategies work and others fail. In context of this model, changing the behaviour at street-level is difficult and no consideration has been allotted to how to use "discretion" as an expedient for "improving the effectiveness of policies at street level" (Paudel 2009 p. 42). Lipsky argues that in the process of street-level policy making the street-level bureaucrats are not intended to spread their own ideals but instead incorporates their practices in enabling the implementers to cope with the pressures at local level in the implementation process (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 52). That being said implementing failure is closely associated with "discretion and routine, together with personal malfunction" which makes for a challenging task of identifying where in the organizational structure discretion is congregated in order to correct the problem and get the implementation process working efficiently again (Paudel 2009 p. 41). In trying to control for this, the top usually decide to intensify the pressures of the street-level bureaucrats (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 53). Hull and Hjern describes the purpose of the bottom-up perspective to be to identify the actors affecting the problems and to map relations between them. The focus is put on the roll that the different local networks play in affecting the

problems in the implementation process (Paudel 2009 pp. 41-42). Hull and Hjern also suggests a comprehensive way of identifying the networks with "a combination of a snowball and socio-metric methods" (Winter 2003 p. 214). The method allows the policymaker's – essentially the implementers – to map the networks and identify the network with the most relevant implementation structure for a specific policy at local, regional and national level. By doing so they are able to evaluate the relevance of governmental programs as well as other variables. But, most of all, they are able to identify "strategic coalitions" and "unintended effects of policy and the dynamic nature of policy implementation" (Matland 1995 p. 149). According to Hull and Hjern, "central initiatives are poorly adapted to local conditions". The success in implementing a public policy is to a large extent dependent on individual implementers skills in the local implementation structure. As they are "able to adapt the policy to local conditions" to a degree to which, the central level bureaucrats are not capable of achieving (Paudel 2009 p. 42). I believe that this is both a blessing and a curse as local adaptation seems necessary but it would be dependent on the implementers ability and knowledge, here I would say that widespread awareness of the underlying agenda and a good selection of different models are key to success. "The methodological perspectives overemphasize the level of local autonomy" and as Lipsky mentions the great importance of the street-level bureaucrats, Hull and Hjern stress the importance of local networking, though each of the actions can fall "within a limited range where boarders are set by centrally determined policy" (Matland 1995 p. 150). "While central actors do not act in detail or intervene in specific cases, they can structure the goals and strategies of those participants who are active". As such the "institutional structure, the available resources, and the access to an implementing arena may be determined centrally, and substantially can affect policy outcomes (ibid). I believe that the benefit of networking is great especially in the case with implementing policy within a number of different levels.

3.4 POLICY NETWORKS

To add to the discussion on the theory used in this study I have chosen to add Fritz Scharpf discourse on the value of networks in explaining the policy process. "It is unlikely, if not impossible, that public policy of any significance could result from the choice process of any single unified actor. Policy formulation and policy implementation are inevitably the result of interactions among a plurality of separate actors with separate interests, goals and strategies"

(Scharpf in Hill and Hupe 2006 p. 59). He would go on to argue that the introduction of policy networks into the discourse on policy implementation would give way to a reconciling solution to the dividing state/civil society dichotomy presented above (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 60). Although I incline to agree with this reasoning, the networks tend to be none-transparent and sometimes impenetrable to new actors, which hampers policy innovation and is a direct threat to a democratic legitimacy within the institution (ibid). I believe the value of networks to be an essential part in explaining how an implementation has occurred and to ensure success in such a process. As the members of the academic leadership of the institution is a part of the academic society and will eventually return to this environment – after their mandate finishes. These actors are, influenced by the networks in which they encounter members of the academic society in their decisions (ibid). Therefore the nature of the policy networks, have a great impact on shaping the interests of the academic leadership and the autonomy of these actors in the policy process (ibid). This connects the two perspectives over a spectrum of possible ways of implementing policy and as such I believe that it proves to stabilize an otherwise dichotomist culture of policy implementation. The idea of policy network reduces conflict and makes it possible to depoliticizing issues, it allows for policy to become predictable and relates well to the departmental structure (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 61), in which Lund University fits well.

3.5 SUMMARIZATION

Both perspectives focus on the implementation process and still there is a clear divide between them as each ignores the "implementation reality explained by the other" (Paudel 2009 p. 43). The top-down perspective is considered to be 'prescriptive' – "what ought to happen" – whereas the bottom-up perspective has been described as a 'descriptive' – describing what has/is happening (Paudel 2009 p. 46). Clearly in the eyes of the ESG the bottom-up perspective is preferred as of its none-prescriptive nature. As both are part of the second generation of implementation there are a few things that needs to be mentioned about the generation as a whole. The researchers have not been able to "agree on a common definition of the term 'implementation'". Neither has the second generation given any explanation to why implementation occurs the way that it does or a way of predicting how implementers might behave in the future (ibid). With this said the main criticism remains to be the "approach: too many case studies, not enough validation and replications" (ibid).

Further there are issues with conceptual clarification. "The meaning of implementation is loosely developed and lack adequate specifications of causal mechanisms" (Paudel 2009 p. 46). This has created confusion and a miss use of the concept 'implementation' as mentioned by Winter, "The concept 'implementation' is often used to characterize both the implementation process and the output – and sometimes also the outcome – of the implementation process" (Winter 2003 p. 217). As "outcome or output targets are harder criteria to measure performance" (Paudel 2009 p. 46). Below you are able to find a table describing the differences between the two perspectives presented above. I aim to analyse the implementation of the ESG at Lund University using these variables and indicators in order to find out how the ESG has been implemented utilizing the two theoretical perspectives presented.

Tabel 1. *Differences between Top-down and Bottom-up Implementation Perspectives*

Variables	Top-down perspective	Bottom-up perspective
Policy decision-maker	Policymakers	Street-level bureaucrats
Starting point	Statutory language	Social problems
Structure	Formal	Both formal and informal
Process	Purely administrative	Networking, including administrative
Authority	Centralization	Decentralization
Output/Outcomes	Prescriptive	Descriptive
Discretion	Top-level bureaucrats	Bottom-level bureucrats

(Paubel 2009 p. 40)

4. METHOD

Throughout the process of conducting this study I will try to explain the research process I have selected as well as its twists and turns in order to ensure appropriate intersubjectivity and trying to strive to be objective in my analysis in order to achieve this (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 54). With the variables and their indicators within the two theoretical perspectives I aim to gather sufficient information to be able to conduct an analysis. Seven variables are to be used, which I believe will thoroughly secure a good validity and reliability to the results in the operationalization of the theory. Validity as the number of indicators will make it easier to establish if there are any systematic errors to the information that is gathered in the interviews conducted. Reliability the sense that it establishes if there are any unsystematic errors due to the amount of interview subjects being exhaustive and originating from within close

proximity the implementation of in this case, the ESG, inconsistencies as such should become apparent in the interviews (Teorell, Svensson 2007 pp. 55-57). I have chosen to conduct an intensive none experimental case study only focusing on the case of Lund University (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 80). The reason for this is because I will interview a small number of centralized individuals based on – in my opinion, in this case – a large amount of variables and in doing so I will be looking to past events in a retrospective manner (ibid). I have decided to conduct interviews using the snowball effect as I'm therefore able to gather information on where to get further answers as I interview each interview subject (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 86). The interviews will be conducted with the *informant survey* method (Esaiasson et al 2009 p. 257), focusing on gathering information on how the ESG have been implemented within the institution using the theoretical framework through an open and interactive discussion between me and the subjects interviewed. This method allows for the interviews to be less structured, allowing for the interviews subjects to be asked different sets of questions instead of asking the same questions in all the conducted interviews. By conducting the interviews in this way I allow for elaborative answers that give way for further, more specific questions generating more in depth material for the analysis (Esaiasson et al 2009 p. 283). I believe that this will result in the best of interview scenarios as it opens up for further questions being asked (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 90). I intend to conduct the interviews in this way in order to obtain as detailed and reliable answers as possible (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 90). I've also selected this method as the questioner survey focuses on *frequency* and I aim to focus my study on revealing the current state of implementation of the ESG and making the process of the implementation *visible* which the *informant survey* aims to achieve (Esaiasson et al 2009 p. 284). In the selection of the interview subjects I have looked for what Esaiasson et al calls "centralization" which is describe as finding sources (interview subjects) that are of greatest importance within the possible selection (Esaiasson et al 2009 p. 291). I have chosen to establish this in order to ensure the above-mentioned criteria to allow for relevant and accurate information to be collected. In preparing for an interview using this method one first have to present ones preunderstanding of the phenomenon the study focuses on. In doing this I will give the study a point of reference in the valuation of the interviews. To do so I have to (1) establish that there is an existing knowledge gap in current research of the phenomenon and (2) that the gathered information will give way for precise results (Esaiasson et al 2009 pp. 289-290). First of all, I believe that I have established the gap

in the introduction of this thesis. Second, since I myself hold a prominent position as a representative of the students I also have a varied professional relationship with the interview subjects in this study. In order for the interviews to not be tainted by this I will have to clarify the situation with all subjects interviewed and to explain why I will be asking obvious questions in order for the interviews to achieve the best results without my own preunderstandings getting in the way. Although this might be challenging I believe that my current position will allow for honest answers as of the relationship with the interview subjects (Esaiasson et al 2009 p. 292). I will continue to interview persons of interest until I have achieved a good picture of how well the ESG have been implemented at the institution. I believe that in conducting interviews with individuals from a number of levels within the institutions organizational structure close to the implementation process will allow for a clear picture to be presented due to the share knowledge these individuals collectively have obtained (Esaiasson et al 2009 p. 292). In the interviews I aim to focus on constructing short and concise interview questions, which allows for long and elaborative answers. In order for this to happen I will construct an interview guide which will be a good reference during my interviews in order to gather some structure and focus more on the answers than having to explain what I aim to answer and get side tracked by academic jargon, even though in this case some complicated jargon is hard to escape (Esaiasson et al 2009 pp. 298-299). I will not allow the interview guide to restrict me in my questioning but help me if more structure is needed at any given time (Esaiasson et al 2009 p. 301). As to ensure accurate gathering of information and the integrity of the interview subjects I will also ask the interview subjects if they want to remain anonymous (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 20) and if I'm allowed to record the interviews. If I need more information I would ask for it at a later time if the interview subjects allowed me. All interviews will be conducted in Swedish and later translated into English to make the interview setting more relaxed and the interviews are designed to take between 45-70 minutes. In order to be sure of the materials gathered to be reliable I should analyze the gathered materials and individuals from a number of perspectives; (1) History, (2) Maturity and Development, (3) Changes in Measurements, (4) Systematic Selection and Non-response problems and (5) Test effects (Teorell, Svensson 2007 pp. 93-94). As I recognize only one perspective that seems to be relevant to this study I will only be analyzing the materials in regards to 'History' as the process has an historic aspect to it and interview subjects with perspectives from different parts of the implementation. When gathering

information about an historic event I need to be sure of the authenticity of the sources and how close a relation the materials or individuals are to the case studied. To establish this I have to analyze the sources and materials origin and then determine how close in relation the information that's gathered is in a spatial and temporal aspect to the events studied (Teorell, Svensson 2007 p. 104).

5. ANALYSIS

I have structured my analysis as mentioned above in accordance with the variables presented in "*Table 1 Differences between Top-down and Bottom-up Implementation Perspectives*".

5.1 INTERVIEW SUBJECTS

I would interview eight individuals within the institution in order to seek information about how the reality was shaped in the case of Lund University. I consider them all essential in understanding the implementation of the ESG at Lund University. Åsa Lindberg-Sand working at the institution since 1996 as a project manager has observed how a number of different systems of quality assurance have developed over time. Since one year back she has been the director of the center for educational development at Lund University. She also held the position of quality coordinator for Lund University in 2008-2009. In her roll working with pedagogical courses for the academics within the institution she's been very close to the implementation. Since autumn of 2006 Kristina Arnrup Thorsbro working with issues regarding strategic planning of higher education and has over time worked on both the department level as well as the faculty level and is currently working on the institutional level. She works closely with the board of education on the institutional level on all matters regarding higher education. Having never been in the centre of the process she has been apart of the implementation at the department-, faculty- and institutional level. Erik Hedberg began working in the section for students and education he had 15 years experience in higher education and would later in 2005 begin working within the quality assurance unit working on the new cornerstone of higher education at the institution, validation of new study programs. At present he is working on new models for ensuring quality in higher education at the institution. Susanne Kristensson is since the end of the spring of 2012 the university director in charge of the university administration at Lund University. All major decisions made by the vice chancellor have to be made in the presence of the university director. Margareta

Nordstrand has been the executive director for the section external relations since 2011 and has been working with issues connected with international students in higher education. Previously she had 11 years of experience working with higher education elsewhere. Currently she is apart of the board of education at Lund University as a representative of the administrative staff. Eva Lindgren has been working in the quality assurance unit since the restructuring of this unit in the beginning of the 1990's. She was the secretary for the EQ11 project, a project initiated in 2009 to improve the education quality at the institution. At current she is the institutions contact person to the agency for higher education in regards to the national evaluations being conducted by the agency. Lars Trägen started in the early 2000's and has over time created a number of student barometers up until now when he's working with the dialogs between different levels of the institution on issues regarding education. He also supports the faculties in the work they do on the national evaluations. Eva Wiberg is currently the deputy vice-chancellor at Lund University and have since 2005 up until now been thoroughly involved with the bologna process the implementation of the ESG and higher education in a general sense.

5.2 MATERIALS GATHERED AND THE ANALYTICAL DISCUSSION

5.2.1 THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

As Lund University have not made an official decision to implement the ESG the implementation is considered to have been part of "the process of open coordination" where all parties voluntarily joins in the reform agenda of changing the way they work with quality assurance in higher education, in this there would be no need for an official decision as everyone would comply with these – agreed upon – source documents in the evolutionary process. In this case Sweden was one of these parties in a European arena (Lindberg-Sand). This is interesting as the implementation of the ESG is such a great reform endeavour within the higher education sector of Europe. With no official decision made, the importance of the central leadership have been emphasized in the interviews in initiating the process at the institution (Arnrup Thorsbro), at the same time the eight faculties – as the ones in charge of education – began the process of implementation (Wiberg). I also believe that the routines and devises that the street-level implementers have invented would as Lipsky argues influenced the work at the beginning (Lipsky quoted in Hill and Hupe 2006 p. 52), due to the share number of uncertainties of the implementation of the ESG that was mentioned to have been

involved in the discussions. Together with a strong participation at the national level with both interest and awareness of what was to come the institution was well prepared for the challenge (Trägen). At the same time other big changes where happening such as the new law on higher education created in 2006 and the discussions on the new national system of evaluations conducted by the agency of higher education. The bologna process was well under way and as such there were a lot of other things happening at the time in regards to creation of new syllabus throughout the institution connected with a new way of working with learning outcomes (Arnrup Thorsbro). Taking all this into consideration I believe that the university adapted its work on higher education at that time so to include the implementation of the ESG in its on going policy creation as a source document for all new policy. Utilizing the inherent structures and perspectives within the ESG in the development of new policy and action plans throughout the institution. Almost everything within the work of quality assurance at the institution stems from interplay between different stages, which are all, originating in the structures described in the ESG today (Hedberg). Even though it was established that the work on 'Quality Assurance' at the time was sufficient it was also recognised that there existed a need for 'Quality Enhancement' (Arnrup Thorsbro). This seems to have initiated a number of innovations in the area of quality assurance, which I believe to have supported the process of implementing the ESG throughout the institution due to the checking and rechecking of the criteria before allowing programs to continue. New internal validation of all new programs where developed in order to ensure that they would uphold the new standards (Hedberg). Today the ESG is fully seen as a part of the work with quality assurance, even though all might not know that this work is a part of the ESG framework (Nordstrand).

5.2.2 THE IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS AT LUND UNIVERSITY

In implementing the ESG in the policy of the institution the (1) policy decision-makers have been the traditional centralized policy-makers of the institution (Arnrup Thorsbro). In doing so, all policy decisions seems to stem from a strong centralized hierarchal structure within the institution, which to a large extent takes into account the input of the street-level bureaucrats – with the input being gathered through centralized boards and councils where street-level bureaucrats are represented (Arnrup Thorsbro) – this in order to ensure realistic goals for the implementation. This suggests a top-down perspective in the way the policy decision-makers

are controlling the implementation (Elmore 1979 p. 602). But as they also allow for the input of the street-level bureaucrats to arise to the surface in considering the best composition of the policy and path of the implementation, as such, I distinguish the bottom-up perspective being recognized as important as to the informal aspects of the decision-making (Paudel 2009 p. 41). Still, the traditional policy decision-maker seems to strongly suggest the policymakers in a centralized sense. I don't believe that the implementation would have worked if the street-level bureaucrats weren't involved at this level as of the share size of the institution. To control the entire process and the numerous environments this entails (Lipsky in Hill and Hupe 2006 p. 52) seems to me to be an impossible feat. By involving the street-level bureaucrats the institution would gain further control over the implementation process – as it's able to take into account the implementers and the environment of the implementation – which is key in a top-down implementation (ibid). Although I believe it will not be able to account for all conditions but instead attend only to the major foreseeable problems that might arise. Centralized policy in regards to education is utilized throughout the institution as of its adaptable design to different conditions (Trägen). This is of course dependent on the extensive knowledge and ability of the policy decision-maker at the institutional level (Paudel 2009 p. 39), which have to be assured. Clearly the institution has taken into consideration that the "individual incentives and beliefs are central to local response" in the case of implementing policy (ibid). This reasoning would suggest an implementation utilizing the top-down perspective and still including the 'street-level bureaucrats' in the discussions of the work on quality assurance which suggests a networking aspect to the process to reduce conflicts within the process of implementation (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 61). Which ensures adaptability of the policy to all conditions encountered.

The policy created involving the ESG seems to take its (2) starting point within both a vague statutory text prescribing the overarching goals – due to the policy originating from a centralized level – and the social problems describing the ideal conditions in which to work with education. I recognize here that the ESG clearly states in one of its core principles that the implementing units should be left to interpret how to implement the ESG tackling the implementation dilemmas (Kohoutek 2009 p. 87). Although I believe that the institution makes this possible. The statutory text would prescribe the goals, which are to be reached when working with quality of higher education within the institution, but left it up to the

implementing units to interpret 'how' this was to be achieved (Wiberg). Though the ESG would provide awareness throughout the institution of the increased responsibility that the institution holds in ensuring quality in higher education. The implementers tend to sometimes write the syllabus so to incorporate a much to wide a spectrum of for example forms of examinations to ensure that it would could be applied to all conditions that may occur (ibid) by doing this I would argue that it would instead hamper the message provided to the students on what the expectations where on their efforts in order to achieve the presented learning outcomes of the course. Clearly there exists a need for a prescriptive statement of 'what' which suggests a statutory text to be needed, in order for the policy-decision maker to dictate the desired prescriptive objectives of the implementation (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 48). As the institution involves street-level representatives (Wiberg) – appointed to institution level councils and boards – in discussing the policy content based on the social problems that they encountered in their day-to-day work (Paudel 2009 p. 41). I believe it allows the street-level bureaucrats through their input to shape the centralized policies to become vague on 'how' in order to be able to apply different models at the local levels in achieving the desired goals Although the statutory text is vague in its nature the policies tend to be concrete enough for all working with education within the institution to be able to apply it within their specific conditions (Trägen). To further ensure that social problems are taken into account 'quality dialogs' occur between the different levels involving what social problems that need to be attended to in 'quality assurance' (Wiberg), which seems to allow for 'problems' to be brought up and to create awareness throughout the institution (Hedberg). Making the starting point of the policy a mix of taking into account statutory text and social problems.

I consider the (3) structure of the implementation to have been a mix of formal and informal – due to the nature of the implementation – having no official decision of implementation it's been an on going discussion between different levels on 'what' and 'how' to achieve the desired goals. I believe that the institution established that it would be impossible to create a single generalizable policy – as the top-down perspective desires according to Matland (Matland 1995 p. 146) – able take into account all structures of the institution in a formal manner focusing on "steering mechanisms" and "regulation and administrative controls" (Elmore in Paudel 2009 p. 40), without making the statutory text quite vague in order to take into account the street-level bureaucrats emphasizing on social

problems (Paudel 2009 p. 41) which underlines the bottom-up perspective. Too much detail might create challenges in the implementation process at other levels within the institutions organisational structure due to the diverse conditions (Lindgren). This as the institution is too diverse in its range of courses that had to adapt to the new policy stemming from the ESG and their numerous conditions in which they found themselves. At the same time the traditional hierarchy provides a formal structure to the process (Arnrup Thorsbro). Although the structure become more formal the informal structure remains and is still considered essential in achieving any success in implementing policy at the institution, relying to a large extent on different networks (Hedberg) due to what I would perceive as the size of the institution with multiple levels of implementing units.

I view the implementation (4) process of the ESG as not just an administrative but it would also involve different councils and networks in which the conditions where agreed upon in order to achieve the desired conditions in which to work with higher education. The different boards and councils provided an environment in which the process could be monitored and adapted over time (Arnrup Thorsbro). This supports the bottom-up perspective in the sense that it views the networks to be a crucial part of the implementation process (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 60), making it possible to identify "strategic coalitions" and "unintended effects of policy and the dynamic nature of the policy implementation" (Matland 1995 p. 149). Susanne Kristensson emphasises the importance of the different boards involving the different representatives from within the institution (Kristensson). But it's still important to emphasise the administrative work in order for boards and councils to be able to gather input and also informing about decisions that are made (Wiberg). As such I find that in implementing the ESG at Lund University networks have a major impact in achieving success, which deems to describe this implementation a combination of a network and administrative process.

The (5) authority in implementing policy at Lund University is centralized as it's derived from centralized bodies, in the case of implementing the ESG it currently stems from the board of education at the institution (Arnrup Thorsbro). This supports that the top-down perspective is utilized due to the centralization of authority where the policymaker's ability to exercise control is vital (Paudel 2009 p. 39). Decentralized actors are encouraged to advise the centralized derived authority in the decisions regarding policy implementation in such a way that it includes representatives from the decentralized groups in the authoritative bodies

themselves (Wiberg), taking into consideration what I assume is the superior knowledge of the street-level bureaucrats on conditions and needs in implementing policy in their specific case (Paudel 2009 p. 41). Allowing for the policy decided by the centralized bodies to take a number of previously unknown factors into consideration (Hedberg). I have in the interviews conducted observed that the control is not as widespread throughout the institution as the centralized actors would need it to be and therefore I believe that the inclusion of decentralized actors is essential in gaining this control. This suggests that networks contribute to a considerable part in the creation of adaptable and realistic policy. It's important that all decisions derived from the authoritative body is clear and easy to understand as change tend to bring with it conflict when it is to be implemented at other levels (Wiberg).

I view the (6) output/outcome of the policies implemented stemming from the ESG as both prescriptive and descriptive of the overarching goals, this due to the nature of implementation at Lund University (Hedberg). I believe that this is due to the mix of having authority derive from the centralized level through boards and councils, which contains decentralized representatives (Kristensson). The language used in different policy stemming from the ESG have a prescriptive character so to show 'what' the institution is working towards in accordance with the policymakers directive (Hill, Hupe 2006 p. 50) but also containing a descriptive way of suggesting a structure to 'how' the ideal conditions in working towards assured quality in higher education should look like within the institution (Wiberg). By leaving the policy at the institutional level quite vague on 'how' to achieve change it allows for the street-level bureaucrats to adapt their efforts in achieving the goals set before them of which they are more qualified according to the bottom-up perspective (Paudel 2009 p. 42. This as no single model of implementation is able to achieve the desired outcome and therefore a number of models have been created taking into account the specific conditions of the implementation environment where the implementation is set to occur (Arnrup Thorsbro). If you become too detailed in the policy at the institutional level it creates challenges at the faculty and department level in implementing the policy (Lindgren). As such I believe that the output/outcome of the ESG implementation is a mix of prescriptive and descriptive language.

The bottom-level bureaucrats have a great level of (7) discretion in their work of implementing policy in general at the institution and this is also due to the problem mentioned above with no single model achieving the desired outcome (Lindberg-Sand). As such the

institution makes use of the fact that the bottom-level bureaucrats are the implementers closest to the environment in which the implementation is conducted (Winters 2003 p. 214) and are therefore considered in accordance with the bottom-up perspective to have better understanding of the conditions in which the implementation is conducted (Paudel 2009 p. 41). Although this makes the implementation possible in numerous conditions within the institution failure with this lies in the "routine and personal malfunction" connected with bottom-level bureaucrats being allotted a great level of discretion (ibid). I believe this is the only way of implementing policy at the institution due to the width and depth of the institutions multi-level organisational structure. In adding to this, key factors for success seems to be the networks, which are involved in the process. Whether or not you have a policy at hand the implementation depends to a great extent on existing structures (Arnrup Thorsbro) and networks capable and interested in working with the content of the policy in achieving the desired change throughout the different areas of the institutions (Hedberg).

5.2.3 CHALLENGES OF IMPLEMENTATION AT LUND UNIVERSITY

The challenges that tend to hinder the success of an implementation in general partly has do with the issue with time, many times the time to created a functional policy and then later implementing it throughout the institution is limited in such a way that the policy 'created' and therefore the 'implementation process' both suffers problems (Arnrup Thorsbro). With a lot of other major changes the implementers would have had to take into consideration the priorities of what had to be put in place at what time (Paudel 2009 p. 39). Too much to fast seems to eventually not turn implementation into a success. The time in which the process is done and the success of the desired policy is interconnected in such a way that the more time that is allotted the higher chance for success (Hedberg). Another challenge is having the resources available at the implementation arena (Matland 1995 p. 150) that's needed in the creation of new policy and implementation in order to ensure success (Nordstrand) and has to be considered in all decisions made by any authoritative body initiating a process (Kristensson). One of the reasons for why the ESG being implemented so successfully, might have to do with the economic consequences of not being implemented. The agency for higher education has the authority to remove national funding of a programme if these measures are not met (Trägen). Incentives are important in an implementation process in order to get other

levels involved in working with the desired change, still this is not the only reason for success (Wiberg).

6. CONCLUSION

As the policy decision-makers in the implementation of the ESG at Lund University inhabits a centralized character, in shaping policy throughout the institution it is gives the implementation a controlled top-down approach where the institutional level seeks to control the overall policy design in a small number of clear set goals. Still the institution seeks to extensively gather input from the street-level bureaucrats before deciding on a policy, which allows for a policy designed to be adaptable in a wide range of conditions. This is of course dependent on the extensive knowledge and ability of the policy decision-makers at the institutional level. As the policy stemming from the ESG at Lund University is derived from both statutory text and social problems I established that both the top-down and bottom-up perspectives have been utilized in implementing this throughout the institution. This as the statutory text is balanced by "quality dialogs" bringing awareness to social problems throughout different levels of the institution. Although the ESG inhabits a principle of leaving the implementation dilemmas up to the implementing unit the institution allows for this to be possible by leaving it up to the implementer to determine 'how' while determining 'what' at an institutional level. I could also identify that both the top-down and bottom-up perspectives have been involved in the structure of the implementation as of the nature of the process. Even though the institution relies to a large extent on its traditional formal structure the informal aspects have a major part in ensuring the success of the implementation in such a large organisation with multiple levels of implementing units. Also that the implementation process clearly involved both networks and administrative aspects in order to ensure success in such an extensive implementation. As I established where the authority lies in the implementation process I found it to be residing in the centralized levels of the institution. Even though this is the case the decentralized levels have been awarded extensive latitude to be heard before decisions are made. As for the output/outcome of the policies being created and implemented stemming from the ESG I recognized in the analysis that the policies seem to inhabit both a prescriptive and descriptive language and how this might be caused by the combination of having authority derived from the centralized level – through boards and

councils – which contains decentralized representatives. Making the policies adaptable to a wide range of conditions while emphasising the overarching goals of the policies. As I, established in the implementing of the different policies that the bottom-level bureaucrats have a great level of discretion in their work. I would come to this conclusion due to the problem of no single model achieving the desired outcome, which had to allow for extensive discretion for the bottom-level bureaucrats in order to make the implementation possible. The implementation of the ESG has incorporated many aspects shaping the process in the case of Lund University. In accepting the challenge of successfully implementing a meta-policy into the previously avant-garde experimental quality assurance work of this institution it has clearly changed the mentality and awareness completely. Providing new structure and perspective to a multi-level governance with an almost infinite number of diverse conditions. The case with Lund University has proven to be a complex implementation with aspects from both the top-down and bottom-up perspectives being utilized as well as networking aspects, which cannot be refuted to have a major impact on the success of the implementation. I think this is why the researcher hasn't been able to agree on 'one' theory of implementation and that's why I would recommend further studies being conducted throughout the Swedish higher education sector to better understand the policy implementation process.

7. REFERENCES

7.1 LITTERATURE

Esaiasson, Peter – Gilljam, Mikael – Oscarsson, Henrik – Wängnerud, Lena, 2009. "Metodpraktikan: konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad". 3rd edition. Stockholm: Norstedtsjuridik.

Hill, Michael – Hupe, Peter, 2006. "Implementing Public Policy". Gateshead: Athenaeum Press Limited.

Kohoutek, Jan, 2009. "Implementation of the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Higher Education in the Central and East-European Countries – Agenda Ahead". Bucharest: UNESCO.

Teorell, Jan – Svensson, Torsten, 2007. "Att fråga och att svara: Samhällsvetenskaplig metod". Slovenien: Liber AB.

Winter, Soren C, 2003. "Implementation Perspective: Status and Reconsideration", (Chapter 16) *In Handbook of Public Administration*, (ed.) BG Peter and J Pierre. London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi: Sage pp. 212-222.

Winter, Soren C, 2003. "Implementation", (Section 5) *In Handbook of Public Administration*, (ed.) BG Peter and J Pierre. London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi: Sage pp. 206-211.

7.2 JOURNALS

Elmore, Richard F, 1979. "Backward Mapping: Implementation Research and Policy Decisions", *Political Science Quarterly*, Volume 94, No. 4, pp. 601-616.

Matland, Richard E, 1995. "Synthesizing the Implementation Literature: The Ambiguity-Conflict Model of Policy Implementation", *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory:* J-PART, Vol. 5, No. 2, April 1995, pp. 145-174.

Paudel, Narendra Raj, 2009. "A Critical Account of Policy Implementation Theories: Status and Reconsideration". *Nepalese Journal of Public Policy and Governance*, Vol. xxv, No. 2, December 2009, pp. 36-54.

7.2 REPORTS

European Association or Quality Assurance in Higher Education, 2009. "Standards and
Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area", 3rd Edition.
Helsinki, 2013-01-04, http://www.enqa.eu/files/ESG_3edition%20%282%29.pdf

7.3 INTERVIEWS

Kristina Arnrup Thorsbro, Operations Controller, Section for Student and
Education at Lund University, 2013-08-05, 14:00.

Erik Hedberg, Project Manager, The Quality Assurance Unit at Lund University,
2013-08-07, 10:00.

Susanne Kristensson, University Director at Lund University, 2013-08-06, 17:00,
(Phone interview).

Åsa Lindberg-Sand, Director, Center for Educational Development at Lund
University, 2013-08-05, 09:00, (Phone interview).

Eva Lindgren, Coordinator, The Quality Assurance Unit at Lund University, 2013-
08-06, 19:00, (Phone interview).

Margareta Nordstrand, Executive Director, Section of External Relations at Lund
University, 2013-08-06, 18:00, (Phone interview).

Lars Trägen, Project Secretary, The Quality Assurance Unit at Lund University,
2013-08-09, 10:00.

Eva Wiberg, Deputy Vice-Chancellor at Lund University and Chairperson of the
Board of Education at Lund University, 2013-08-10, 11:30.

8. APPENDIX

8.1 THE INTERVIEW GUIDE

INTRODUCTIONAL ABSTRACT

The thesis studies the situation within Lund University in relation to the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) developed by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). The aim of the study is to answer the following research question *"How have Lund University implemented the European Standards and Guidelines developed by The European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) in its ongoing quality assurance work?"* In order to gather information on the state of implementation of the ESG the study conducts a number of interviews with centralized actors involved in the implementation process at Lund University in relation to two confrontational theoretical perspectives, the top-down perspective and the bottom-up perspective as well as looking at the impact of network aspects of the implementation process. As one of the first studies of a Higher Education Institutions implementation of the ESG within the Swedish Higher Education Area – after a number of studies being conducted in the central and eastern European countries – on the implementation of the ESG, the study will present results on the analysis of a Swedish Higher Education Institutions implementation of supra-national standard and guidelines.

QUESTIONS

1. Do you wish to be anonymous in this interview?

2. Would it be ok if I record this interview?

3. Could you explain the role you play at Lund University?

4. Could you tell me a little about what you know about the European Standards and Guidelines?

5. How have you been involved in the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines at Lund University?

6. Has the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines been an on going process, and if so, in what way?

7. What impact has the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines had on the work with Quality Assurance at Lund University?

8. In the process of implementing the European Standards and Guidelines who was considered to be the policy decision-maker?

9. In what way did the process of implementing the European Standards and Guidelines take its starting point?

10. What was the structure of the implementation?

11. Can you tell me a little about how specifically the implementation process was conducted?

12. Where within the organisation of Lund University did the authority lie in implementing the European Standards and Guidelines?

13. What was the desired output/outcome of the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines?

14. Which where the actors in the process that would utilize its or their discretion in the implementation of the European Standards and Guidelines at Lund University?

15. How is other policy at Lund University implemented?

16. When Lund University began to implement the European Standards and Guidelines did the institution look elsewhere for guidance?

17. Could the implementation process be improved in some way?

18. Do you know anyone else I should interview in order to further find answers to my research question?