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The Trends Survey was initially developed by the European University Association (EUA) and was administered in 2010 and 2014.

Survey aims to

- map changes in learning and teaching in higher education institutions in the MENA region, and
- provide a comprehensive overview of the most important developments in the MENA higher education landscape over several years.
- use the survey results to benchmark institutions in MENA region, and against EU higher education.
As higher education is becoming more complex, as a consequence range of topics and issues covered is growing. The questionnaire is divided into seven thematic sections:

I. The institution and its context
II. The enhancement of teaching and the role of academic staff
III. Student life cycle
IV. Study programmes
V. E-learning
VI. Internationalization
VII. Quality assurance, qualifications frameworks and recognition
Administration

- Around 60 institutions of higher education were approached last summer.
- Survey was available online in English and French.
- Answered by heads of 30 institutions coming from 9 countries.
Sample

Year University Founded

- Before 1900: 3%
- 1900-1949: 10%
- 1950-1969: 20%
- 1970-1989: 27%
- 1990-1999: 17%
- since 2000: 23%

Community institution primarily serves

- Local (1): 28%
- Regional (2): 24%
- National (3): 14%
- World-Wide (4): 28%
Findings Highlights: Context

Importance of national reform initiatives on the following issues for institution: High importance for:
1. Learning & teaching generally (68%);
2. Quality assurance (64%; 73%);
3. Implementation of learning outcomes 61%;
4. Student recruitment 43%;
5. Widening access & participation 36%.

Funding, governance & autonomy, and internationalization (EU)
Since 2010, high importance of developments for institution:
1. Use of communication technology (58%; 62%);
2. Economic crisis (52%; 43%);
3. Growing competition with other HEIs (52%; 40%);
4. Enhanced cooperation with other HEIs (42%; 53%);
5. National level initiatives in educational policies (37%).
6. Internationalization (35%; 70%).
7. Ranking & League Tables (30%; 33%)

Demographic Change (EU)
Enhancement of Teaching & Learning

Current situation at institution.
- Growing recognition of importance of teaching (89%; 59%) Yes
- Students value good teaching (78%).
- Innovative teaching methods are being introduced (52%; 40%, 57% Y)
- It is increasingly difficult to find people who are motivated to teach (52%; 40%); and
- Research plays a more important role for the career development of young academics (48%; 37%, 54% Y).

67% of institutions have a unit for pedagogical development

Assessment of academic staff : Regular
- ✔ Evaluation of teaching performance (92%; 89%)
- ✔ Evaluation of research performance (81%; 84%), and
- ✔ discussion of performance with chairs or deans (81%; 67%).
- ✔ Student feedback questionnaires are considered in the evaluation of teaching performance (73%; 93%)
Enhancement of Teaching & Learning

Systematic efforts to enhance teaching & learning
1. Optional courses to enhance teaching skills (70%);
2. Portfolios in which teachers document their teaching practices (59%; 45%);
3. Research on learning and teaching (59%);
4. Recognition of teaching (44%);
5. Compulsory courses to enhance teaching (41%).
6. Peer feedback system (41%; 37%)

Issues addressed at institution: steps have been taken
1. Developing libraries and learning resource centers (81%; 92%);
2. Investing in science and computer labs (73%; 90%);
3. Adapting physical spaces to meet the requirements of different teaching approaches (69%; 68%).
4. Creating common spaces for increased student-staff interaction (50%; 44%)

Strategic goals for staff recruitment
1. Enhancing diversity of academic staff (81%; 70%)
2. Hiring national staff with international experience (67%; 84%).

Internationalizing staff
## Study Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implemented in Institution to enhance learning &amp; teaching</th>
<th>Used throughout the institution</th>
<th>Used in some faculties/departments</th>
<th>Under discussion</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication technologies (e.g. e-learning, blended learning)</td>
<td>24 62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer learning (i.e. students learning with each other)</td>
<td>12 23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in small groups</td>
<td>16 26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-based or project-based learning</td>
<td>12 26</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships or work placements</td>
<td>36 43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration on learning and teaching with other HEIs</td>
<td>16 26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration on learning and teaching with non-HEI partners</td>
<td>8 15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation</td>
<td>4 64</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have learning outcomes been developed?

- Yes, for all courses: 64%
- Yes, for some courses: 21%
- No, but we intend to develop them: 12%
- No: 8%
- Information unavailable: 44%

### Effect of the introduction of learning outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Yes, for all courses</th>
<th>Yes, for some courses</th>
<th>No, but we intend to develop them</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Information unavailable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course contents have been revised</td>
<td>40/60</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching methods have changed</td>
<td>25/75</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of teaching has improved</td>
<td>40/60</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course duplication has been reduced</td>
<td>25/75</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examinations have been revised</td>
<td>30/65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are more aware of their objectives</td>
<td>25/75</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT LIFE CYCLE

How has the total enrolment at your institution changed during the last five years?

- increased by more than 10%: 42%
- increased by less than 10%: 20%
- No change: 10%
- decreased by less than 10%: 16%
- decreased by more than 10% (5): 9%
STUDENT LIFE CYCLE

What are the main factors behind these changes in enrolment?

- Changes in admission policies: 28%
- Stronger emphasis on widening access and participation: 41%
- Changes in tuition fees: 22%
- Changes in loan or grant systems: 11%
- Financial situation of students and their families: 7%
- Improved employment opportunities for graduates: 7%
- Youth unemployment: 6%
- Immigration: 6%
- Changes in demography: 4%
- Institutional mergers: 4%
- International recruitment: 2%
- Changes in secondary education: 2%
- Other – please specify below: 2%
STUDENT LIFE CYCLE

How do you expect student enrolment at your institution to develop in the future?

- It will increase: 39%
- It will decrease: 14%
- It will remain at the current level: 35%
- Impossible to predict: 10%
## Change in Student Body over last Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>No Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Full-time students</td>
<td>- Adult students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National students</td>
<td>- Part-time students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Non-national students</td>
<td>- Students without Standard entry qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Students with Disabilities</td>
<td>- Students from ethnic Minority groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Socio- economically disadvantaged students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Body

Institutions have targeted strategies to attract

- national (78%)
- non-national (65%) students,
- students with disabilities (48%);
- part-time students (46%).
- Socio-economically disadvantaged students (35%)

Lifelong learning strategy

- Only 32% (65%) have a strategy regarding lifelong learning.
- 44% (24%) others are in the process of developing one.
STUDENT LIFE CYCLE

Does institution offer the following to **prospective** students?

- Academic orientation and advice: 90%
- Outreach programmes to secondary schools (information events at schools, schools visiting your institution): 82%
- Bridging courses (i.e., enabling graduates from secondary school or other education sectors to access higher education): 59%
- Recognition of prior learning

- Other special admissions policies (e.g., for disadvantaged groups, non-traditional students): 40%
- Open days/educational fairs: 95%
STUDENT LIFE CYCLE

Does your institution offer any of the following support services to enrolled students?

- Academic introduction to the institution  92%
- Academic advice  90%
- Psychological counselling services  81%
- Mentoring/ tutoring  83%
- Targeted support services for lifelong learners  44%
- Special support for first-year students  76%
- Other
STUDENT LIFE CYCLE

Does your institution offer the following to students who need additional support?

- Courses to enhance specific disciplinary knowledge and skills (math, sciences) 72%
- Courses on communication and presentation techniques 70%
- Courses to develop autonomous learning skills (time management, goal-setting, working to deadlines) 53%
- Courses on study skills (note-taking, learning strategies, test preparation, academic writing) 60%
- Computer courses 75%
- Additional courses in the language of instruction (national language or other) 80%
- Other
STUDENT LIFE CYCLE

Does your institution provide the following to students?

- Support for student associations: 93%
- Support for alumni associations: 76%
- Information on students’ rights (e.g. brochure): 76%
- Official for student affairs: 47%
- Promotion of student representative bodies: 87%
- Promotion of student engagement in voluntary work and community service: 58%
- Support for social and cultural activities (e.g. cafes, cinema clubs, theatre, music): 90%
- Support for student entrepreneurship: 74%
### Senate Board/Council Faculty/department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student representatives formal participation in the governance of institution</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Board/Council</th>
<th>Faculty/department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting rights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultative role</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of committees (e.g. quality assurance, curricular)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are not involved</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – please specify below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governing Bodies**

- **Senate**: 17%
- **Board/Council**: 45%
- **Faculty/departmental governing bodies**: 38%
Collected information from student surveys is used

- Yes: 50%
- Yes, at faculty/department level: 34%
- No, not really: 8%
- Information unavailable: 8%

Samples Systematically Conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry survey on backgrounds and expectations of newly enrolled students</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey on general student experience (i.e. current students)</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit surveys for students who drop out</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit surveys at graduation</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Existence of a central unit (e.g. planning department, research unit) which analyses the data collected

- Yes 76%
- No, this is handled at faculty/department level 6%
- No, but we are planning to set one up 6%
- No 0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution collects feedback on</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching (through questionnaires or other means)</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services (e.g. advising, career services)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General learning environment (e.g. classrooms, libraries)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Tracking Employment of Graduates**

**Institution Tracks Employability?**

- Yes, we regularly track all recent graduates: 32%
- Yes, but only in some faculties/departments: 45%
- Yes, we track a sample of graduates: 14%
- No: 9%

**If yes, which Cycle?**

- 1st cycle (Bachelor): 60%
- 2nd cycle (Master): 30%
- 3rd cycle (Doctorate): 10%
Institution provides to promote the employability of graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes, across the institution</th>
<th>Yes, in some faculties</th>
<th>No, but we are planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career guidance</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work placement opportunities</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary work</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment events/ employer presentations</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External mentoring</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating transferable skills development into curricula</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrating entrepreneurship into curricula</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website portal and social media facilitating contacts with employers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Life Cycle Further Results

Data from graduate tracking is used
- It is assessed for strategic purposes and to enhance the quality of teaching provision and services 30% 81%
- It is used to develop alumni services 20% 51%
- It is used for marketing purposes/ strategic positioning 14%

Data on Graduates
- 48% of Bachelor degree students continue at their institutions for a Master degree
- 50% of Masters students come from institution itself, same discipline or different discipline.
- Since 2010 following have increased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrolment at Bachelor level</th>
<th>79%</th>
<th>Students working &amp; studying</th>
<th>36%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment at Master’s level</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Employment opp. for BA</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolment at doctoral level</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Employment opp. For MA</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for studies that lead to a professional degree</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E- LEARNING

Institution has a strategy or policy regarding e-learning

- Yes, we have a strategy or policy in place: 44%
- No, but we are developing a strategy or policy: 27%
- Some faculties/departments have developed their own strategy or policy: 13%
- No: 7%
E-LEARNING

Institution’s experience with e-learning

- 19%: It works well
- 13%: It changes the approach to learning and teaching
- 13%: It improves the quality of learning and teaching
- 15%: It takes time to introduce
- 21%: It is costly, but worth the investment
- 13%: It is costly and not worth the investment
- 13%: It is not very flexible
- 0%: We are not yet certain about the benefits
- 4%: There are no real benefits
## E-Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IT Systems or Tools Used at Institution</th>
<th>Yes, for all students</th>
<th>Yes, for some students</th>
<th>Not yet, but we are planning to provide this</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University email accounts</td>
<td>68 87</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wifi access throughout the institution</td>
<td>72 91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to computer rooms</td>
<td>80 92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online access to libraries</td>
<td>80 91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus licences for software needed by students for their studies</td>
<td>48 70</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online study course catalogue</td>
<td>48 76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalised study portal (registration, transcripts, grades, study plan, etc.)</td>
<td>64 66</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repositories (for course materials, source books, etc.)</td>
<td>60 60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student portal (general information on course schedules, cancelled classes, etc.)</td>
<td>72 75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media to communicate with students or alumni (wikis, blogs, Facebook, etc.)</td>
<td>72 72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic student portfolio</td>
<td>20 36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online examinations and tests</td>
<td>12 19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institution’s most important objective regarding the development of e-learning in the future

- Provide more learning opportunities for students who are not based on campus: 18%
- Provide more learning opportunities for on-campus students: 13%
- Increase effectiveness of classroom time: 20%
- Provide more flexible learning offer, leaving it to the student to decide whether they learn on or off campus: 24%
- Provide learning opportunities for adult learners: 17%
- Enhance internationalisation: 17%
- We do not intend to develop or extend e-learning in the near future: 9%
Internationalization

Have an internationalization strategy

- Yes, we have a strategy in place (50%)
- Yes, as part of the general institutional strategy (35%)
- No, but we are developing a strategy (8%)
- No
- Other

Where like to enhance international effectiveness

- European Union 73%
- Eastern Europe 32%
- Asia 48%
- USA / Canada 35%
- Latin America 19%
- Middle East
- Northern Africa
- Africa
- Australia / New Zealand
- Other

EU Figures
## Activities Institution Takes to Support Internationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, but we are planning this activity</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Information unavailable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student exchanges</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student work placements/ internships</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff exchanges</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programmes taught in English</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programmes taught in languages other than English</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer schools</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalisation at home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International marketing (e.g. through participation in fairs)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student recruitment campaigns</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic partnerships with a select number of foreign institutions</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity-building projects with partners in developing countries</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in international higher education networks</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offshore campuses</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOOCs and other types of online learning</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERNATIONALIZATION

which of the following has contributed most to the enhancement of learning and teaching?

- Staff mobility: 43%
- Student mobility: 66%
- International staff: 24%
- International students: 40%
- International collaboration in learning and teaching: 41%
- International research collaboration: 39%
- Additional income/funding for the institution: 10%
- Teaching in English: 19%
- Teaching in other foreign languages: 10%
- Increased emphasis on language learning: 10%
Internationalization

- Contributed to improving learning and teaching at institution
  48% Yes 29% No

- Internationalization had any negative effects
  3% Yes (5%) 74% No 29% No answer

- Institution offers joint programs with institutions in other countries
  - At Bachelors level 17% 37%
  - At Masters level 20% 70%
  - At doctorate level 20% 44%
  - No 40% 18%
### Main challenges associated with these programmes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
<th>Not at all challenging</th>
<th>Somewhat challenging</th>
<th>Very challenging</th>
<th>Extremely challenging</th>
<th>Information unavailable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of programs into the institution</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6 (44)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality assurance process</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60 (37)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative constraints</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70 (28)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability of funding</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30 (26)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in fee structures between partner institutions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40 (33)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional work for staff</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50 (35)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbalanced mobility between partner institutions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50 (38)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low student interest</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40 (41)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition problems</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40 (32)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30 (36)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other – please specify below</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Numbers in parentheses indicate percentages.
QUALITY ASSURANCE

Institution have an institutional quality assurance policy and system

- We have an institutional QA policy and an integrated approach to QA at institutional level  63%
- We have an institutional QA policy, but the QA systems are faculty/department based  10%
- Both QA policy and systems are faculty/department based (i.e. there is no institutional approach)  3%
- We have a QA policy, but the QA processes are being developed  11%
- We have QA processes in place, but no QA policy  4%
- We neither have a QA policy nor a QA system  1%
QUALITY ASSURANCE

Has your institution (or a unit within it) been evaluated, audited or accredited in the last five years

- 43% Yes, as a mandatory evaluation (replacing the evaluation by our national QA body)
- 35% Yes, as a non-mandatory evaluation (in addition to the mandatory evaluation carried out by our national QA body)
- 13% No, but we are considering it
- 9% No
QUALITY ASSURANCE

What are criteria for choosing a foreign quality assurance agency?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not so important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency’s international reputation</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency’s expertise in a specific field/ discipline</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency’s methodological approach</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability of the service</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better recognition of degrees abroad</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency’s geographical proximity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency’s working language</td>
<td>☐ 45</td>
<td>☐ 27</td>
<td>☐ 9</td>
<td>☐ 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency is a member of ENQA*</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>☐ 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency is registered in EQAR**</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other – *please specify below*
Credit Recognition

- Institution has an institutional policy/guidelines for recognition
  - Yes 70% 81%
  - No 22%
- 43% do not recognize prior learning
- Responsible for recognition decisions on the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A central office</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Individual academic teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrees from other institutions in your country</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees from abroad</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periods of study in other institutions in your country</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periods of study abroad</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition of non-formal and informal learning</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credit Recognition

- 67% claim that fewer than 5% have recognition problems
- These problems are 52% in some faculties & 48% across university
- 38% (39%) evaluate recognition procedures regularly, while 29% do not
- With respect to NQF
  - have one 25% (64%)
  - Have one but not in use 12% (14%)
  - Do not have one 63%
- Found useful in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very useful</th>
<th>Somewhat useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promoting transparency and comparability between degrees and across education sectors</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the development of learning outcomes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing international mobility</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuring the quality of education</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the recognition of prior learning</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting lifelong learning</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing employability</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion & Summary

Results provided an overview of developments in important MENA higher education domains:

I. Context
   a. National reform initiatives had impact on learning & teaching, quality assurance, & implementation of learning outcomes
   b. ICT, economic crises, cooperation and competitiveness with other HE institutions had great impact.
Enhancement of Teaching & Learning

a. Growing recognition of importance of teaching, and use of innovative teaching methods
b. Two thirds of institutions have a unit for pedagogical development
c. There is regular assessment of academic staff teaching and research performance. Use of student feedback.
d. Systematic efforts are done to enhance teaching & learning including hiring of diversified academic staff and ones with international experience and infra structure improvements.
e. Internships/work placements and use of ICT are most used tools across university.
f. 80% of institutions have developed learning outcomes either for all or some of their courses and they rate positively rate the experience.
Student Cycle

a. Nearly all institutions reported an increase in enrollment in the last ten years and they expect it to keep increasing.

b. Increase due emphasis on widening access and participation, changes in admission policies and grant systems.

c. Institutions have a number of strategies to attract prospective students for enrolled students in terms of additional support, and to promote employability of graduates.

d. In terms of governance, student representation is mostly in terms of committee membership, and consultative role.

e. Institutions collect information from student surveys through mostly a central unit on teaching, support services, and general learning environment.

f. Mostly first cycle graduated are tracked, and information is used to enhance quality of teaching and to develop alumni services.
E-Learning

a. Majority either have an e-learning strategy or are in process of developing one.

b. In general, they are positive about the experience as it enhances quality of learning and changes approach to learning. However, some noted that it takes time to implement, is costly and not very flexible.

c. Tools most used: access to computer labs, online access to libraries, wifi, student portals, social media, etc..

d. Objectives for using e-learning to increase effectiveness of classroom time, provide more learning opportunities for on-campus students, and more flexible offerings.
Internationalization

a. Around 60% have an internationalization strategy or are in process of developing one.

b. It is mostly oriented towards Europe, Middle East, US/Canada and Asia.

c. Mostly done through participation in international HE networks, partnerships with foreign institutions, teaching in English, and student exchanges and work placements.

d. Of various activities, collaboration on international research and teaching and learning were most effective, followed by staff mobility and international students.

e. Generally positively viewed as contributing to teaching & learning (48%).

f. Associated challenges: legislative constraints, quality, additional work for staff, & imbalanced mobility between partner institutions.
Quality Assurance

a. Majority have an institutional QA policy but an integrated QA approach at Institutional level. They have it at faculty level.

b. Around half have gone through evaluation or accreditation in last five years, either mandatory or non-mandatory one.

c. Choice of foreign accrediting body is based on its reputation, methodological approach, and expertise in a specific field.

d. Most of institutions have an institutional policy for credit recognition mostly through a central office.

e. Only few have National Qualification Frameworks

f. These recognition procedures are evaluated regularly by some and are found useful assuring quality of education, enhancing international mobility, and promoting comparability between degrees.
Recommendation

- Results have been reported in aggregate and this may conceal important information.
- Comparability should be done by public private, countries-regions, and size.
- Compare to Governance Score Card, when applicable, and benchmark against European universities.
- Repeat survey periodically.
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