

## **THE ACCREDITATION IN CHILE AND LATINOAMERICA 1998**

**Luis Eduardo González**

Let me start with the Chilean experience on private higher education, and then to go through the Latin American experience on evaluation and accreditation.

Chile has been a good social and political laboratory because in the last three decades we had three very different models kind of governments, and of course, we have drastically changes on post secondary education. Actually we com from the a complete state support system to a open free market competition among the institutions most of them private

Let me explain a little bit

In the middles sixties we had the Christian Democratic party on the government. Their policies was influenced by the ECLAC economic theories based on the self sustained development and the internal growth. For that purpose the education is crucial and the higher education received a strong state support.

At that time the post secondary system was constituted by 8 universities. 2 large state owner and national wide institutions and six smaller non profit privates institutions.

It is very important to note those are very especial kind of private institutions because they are Roman Catholic Church universities or community owner ones. That means very different of those private created later. Let me remark this point because in LA At least not all the private post secondary institutions are the same.

Because At that time the government knows that it was impossible to satisfy the increasing demand for higher education with their own institutions it began to partial finance those private universities. To support private universities was cheaper than to enlarge the state universities.

At the beginning of the seventies we had a three year socialist government. The government wanted to increase free post secondary for all and all the state and the private universities became totally financed by the state. The enrollments come up and because of the autonomy there are no state

control over the public funds. Also quality control was completely on the academic hands.

In 1973 the military government put universities under the military control and few years later, inspired on neo liberal ideas introduce drastically changes. Among them we can mention:

To divide the large 2 state universities in sixteen regional institutions.

To create three level of post secondary institutions The universities, the professional colleges and the technical centers for two or three years careers.

To open the possibilities than the private could create news post secondary institutions without state support. Moreover the colleges and technical centers are profitable institutions but not the universities.

To introduce evaluation procedures before the new institutions become autonomous.

To reduce the state financing for all the public and the old private universities in order they become self financed for At least in a 50% of their budget. Both had the same treatment

To introduce the efficiency criteria to administrate state universities and to increase the amount of competitive funds

To promote the free market competition as the best criteria to regulate the post secondary educational system. In practice that means a laizes faire sate policy

In 1990 we have elections again and two new democratic governments. Mainly the system keep the same, but the conception of the state role is different. Today the State has a more proactive role which intends to balance the institutional autonomy, the efficiency and self financing, the market competition with equity and national requirements for development

Let me analyze our experience with the increasing of private profitable institutions on post secondary education, under the free market regulation

It is clear than the post secondary education grow up in a few years. Today there are 256 post secondary institutions. Among them there are only

16 public state university and all others (240) are private. 73% of the enrollments is private, and half of the budget of state universities is self financed. That it had been impossible under a traditional state financing system.

However as a result of free market competition today we can characterize the Chilean post secondary system as a heterogeneous, complex, competitive segmented and deregulated.

Heterogeneous because there are not the same quality academic standards that it use to be in the sixties. Among the new institutions there are a wide variety of academic quality Perhaps a 10% excellent and more than the half are bad. Moreover some of these bad institutions have only the interest to make money.

Complex because there is not a clear the difference among institutions. University could be large research universities as the traditional ones or a small garage focalized in one career. Some professional colleges are better than some universities and there is an overlap between the technical centers careers and the professional colleges ones.

Competitive because all private and public want to increase the enrollments for self finance and to get more competitive state funds trough The Ministry of education competition (Transparence) That also implies a efficiency criteria on the management for both private and public institutions. Moreover because of the competence the system became disarticulated and there are not a good collaboration among then which is importance in developing country like Chile.

Segmented because the rich people goes to the better institutions and later they got the better jobs instead the poorer who get post secondary education went to a poor quality institutions and became underemployed Those post secondary education had lost its condition of social mobility

Deregulate because the market regulate the students demand but not the professional labor market. That implies to increase the number of students on the cheaper careers such as administration, and social sciences, but not engineering, medicine and the expensive but necessary ones. Moreover the self-control of quality doesn't work The most aggressive is the propaganda the more students they get. It is important to mention that there are not a good information system about post secondary education in the country

Therefore evaluation for both private and public institutions is a crucial to keep quality standard and to provide public information and because of the tradition The State in Chile and LA in general is a less bad option to regulate the system

Under the new democratic government the state wants to orient the system according the national goals. To oriented the system the state has three main tools.

The legislation and norms which in our case is very difficult to modify, second to put money in some specific areas such as student loans, school teacher manpowering and scientific human resources, using competitive project procedures, and third promoting evaluation through the requirement of the accountability of state funds and the evaluation and accreditation.

However in Chile there are not a accreditation for autonomous institutions, only for a new private ones.

Let me now go through a brief overview of accreditation in Chile and LA which is include in the paper

COUNTRY	RESPONSIBLE	LEGISLATION	KIND OF INSTITUTIONS	CURRENT SITUATION
ARGENTINA	STATE, INDEPENDENT INSTITUTION	YES	ALL	INITIATING THE OPERATION
BOLIVIA	UNDER THE COUNCIL OF RECTORS	YES	ALL	ACTUALLY OPERATING FOR THE NEW PRIVATES
BRAZIL	STATE DIFFERENT FOR PRIVATES, FEDERAL AND STATE	YES	ALL	OPERATING FOR NEW PRIVATES, AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS INITIATING FOR STATE UNITS
CHILE	STATE	YES	PRIVATE	OPERATING ONLY FOR NEWS INSTITUTIONS
COLOMBIA	STATE(NATIONAL COUNCIL OF ACCREDITATION	YES	ALL	INCITING THE OPERATION
COSTA RICA	COUNCIL OF RECTORS	YES PARTIALLY	NEW PRIVATES	NOT WORKING YET FOR STATE UNITS
CUBA	STATE	YES, SPECIAL CASE	ALL THERE ARE NOT PRIVATES	STATE CONTROL
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	COUNCIL OF RECTORS	YES	ALL	NOT WORKING JET
ECUADOR	COUNCIL OF RECTORS	GUIDELINES	ALL	NOT WORKING JET
MEXICO	STATE AGREEMENT WITH ANUIS	YES	ALL	OPERATING
VENEZUELA	STATE	YES	PRIVATE	OPERATING FOR NEWS

## CHILEAN POST SECONDARY EDUCATION SYSTEM

**HETEROGENEOUS**

**COMPLEX**

**COMPETITIVE**

**SEGMENTED**

**DEREGULATED**

INSTITUTIONS	STATE	PRIVATES	TOTAL
TRADITIONAL UNIVERSITIES	95,493	66,276	161,769
NEW UNIVERSITIES		77,212	77,212
PROFESSIONAL INSTITUTES		52,170	52,170
POST SECONDARY VOCATIONAL CENTERS		61,418	61,418
TOTAL	95,493	257,076	352,569
%	27.1	72.9	100.00

### Percent Distribution of state budget in Higher Education

ITEM	TRADITIONAL UNIVERSITIES(STATE OWNED AND PRIVATES)	OTHER INSTITUTIONS	TOTAL
STATE GRANT(TO BE DISTRIBUTED WITH PLENTY AUTONOMY BY THE INSTITUTIONS)	45.1		45.1
STUDENT LOANS AND FELLOWSHIPS	17.6	0.7	18.3
PRIZE TO THE 25% BETTER STUDENTS ON THE NATIONAL ADMISSION TEST		9.3	9.3
COMPETITIVE RESEARCH GRANTS AND OTHER COMPETITIVE PROGRAMS	15.9	11.4	27.3
TOTAL	78.6	21.4	100.0