JAIST Repository
https://dspace.jaist.ac.jp/

Title	認証評価政策による高等教育の質保証 －エジプトと日本の比較事例研究－
Author(s)	Ramadan, Farida Ibrahim Mahmoud
Citation	
Issue Date	2013-09
Type	Thesis or Dissertation
Text version	ETD
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10119/11554
Rights	
Description	Supervisor:梅本　勝博，知識科学研究科，博士

JAIST
JAPAN
ADVANCED INSTITUTE OF
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology

Abstract

Keywords: Quality assurance (QA), accreditation, higher education (HE), HE system (HES), HE institutions (HEIs), NAQAAE, JUAA, NIAD-UE, JIHEE, knowledge transfer (KT)

The purpose of this research is to clarify KT process during accreditation policy process of HE in Egypt and Japan in a comparative study. By the end of 19th century the transition from elite to mass HE created many fundamental changes as well as challenges decision makers in the field of HE that the real *pre-quality era* started. Therefore, QA was already a concern of nearly all nations, most of which have implemented schemes to evaluate the quality of institutions and programs in HE. Since 1990s, there was a significant change in the quality mechanisms and this decade can be seen as *the decade of quality* in HE. From this time on and with the push of globalization on HE, HEIs are required to demonstrate, through their institutional leaders to and to express in a comparable measure, the quality of its activities. The relevant literature reveals that there are four main approaches of evaluation in QA, the external reviewing or examiner system, quality audit, quality assessment and accreditation. Countries have begun to implement innovative procedures for HE quality. There are attempts to identify KT in the public policy process. However, there is a significant void about the modeling of the KT process in the QA of HE in general and in the accreditation policy process in particular.

To accomplish the objectives of the study, we conducted a case study. In the first stage of the study, we analyzed the case of NAQAAE as the only certified accrediting agency of HE in Egypt. In the second stage, we conducted a case analysis of three certified accrediting agencies in Japan; JUAA, NIAD-UE and JIHEE. In both stages, we focus on the KT process on the accreditation policy process. Particularly, we addressed this major research question; How has accreditation policy been made in Egypt and Japan?, and three subsidiary questions: (1) How have accrediting agencies in Egypt and Japan acquired, shared and transferred QA and accreditation knowledge?; (2) What factors have affected the QA and accreditation policy process in Egypt and Japan?; and (3) What are the similarities and the differences in QA and accreditation policy processes in Egypt and Japan?

The result show that the accrediting agencies in both Egypt and Japan build up their QA and accreditation knowledge base based on several mechanisms of knowledge acquisition, sharing and transferring such as; IQAS knowledge, agency's surveys, governmental releases, networks knowledge, CoP knowledge, global, regional and international projects and conducting and sharing in global, regional and international seminars, workshops and conferences.

Concerning theoretical implications, this study proposes a model of the accreditation policy process. This EEII model consists of four phases: Emulation, Evaluation, Integration and Internalization. These phases are based on the knowledge base of each accrediting agency of each country. These phases of QA and accreditation policy making process also depend on the national context, which is affected by globalization trends, of each country which is consists of social culture factor, economic factor and etc.

Regarding practical implications, this study suggests that the independence of accrediting agencies in acquiring, sharing and transferring accreditation knowledge moreover in issuing its own standards is crucial. Finally, in order to understand the accreditation process this study provides directions for future research suggesting the study of other positional perspectives who are likely to differ in the views of QA and accreditation policy such as; political, bureaucratic, and union policy actors.