Finland

Introduction

According to the analysis in St. Aubyn et al. (2009), the tertiary education system in Finland seems to perform very well in terms of quality and efficiency. As regards changes over time (DEA analysis), the situation of Finland has somewhat deteriorated between the first period (1998 – 2001) and the second (2002 – 2005), but Finland remains very close to the production possibility frontier, essentially due to excellent scientific production.

Indicators

Table - Summary of indicators in St. Aubyn (2009)

Scores of efficiency indicators

	Average ISI citation		Recruiter review		Peer review	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
FI	5.14	2	1.31	6	2.00	1
best performer	NL - 5,51	1	IE - 2	1	FI - 2	1
worst performer	RO - 1,63	26	CZ -1.06	16	GR - 1.02	16

	Funding rules		Staff policy		Evaluation	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
FI	6.20	3	7,5	11	4	17
best performer	PT - 7,8	1	CZ, DK, NL, AT, SK, SE, UK - 10	1	HU - 8,3	1
worst performer	SK - 2,9	18	FR - 1,8	18	GR - 2,3	18

Descriptive indicators

	Academic staff	Students	Graduates *per capita*	Publications	Students *per academic staff*	Graduates *per academic staff*	Graduates *per student*
FI	3.4	58.3	7.9	1.3	17.1	2.3	13.5
EU27	1.9	33.7	7.1	0.6	17.8	3.7	19.8

	PISA	
	Score 2000*	Rank
FI	540	1
best performer	FI - 540	1
worst performer	RO - 410	18

Finland combines excellent quality both in research and teaching.

The quality of secondary education in Finland, as measured by average PISA scores, is excellent: Finland scores the best average results.

The available efficiency indicators suggest that the funding rules are very good, the staff policy indicator is above average while the evaluation indicator is weak. However, Finland seems to have a sophisticated evaluation system, with the possible exception of the impact of evaluation on funding decisions.

The tertiary education system is particularly large in Finland, with extensive provision of higher education and large numbers of students and academic staff. In fact, Finland has the largest number of students in the EU and above average number of graduates per capita. However, both the number of students and graduates relative to academic staff are below average.

Students' work is one of the reasons behind a length of studies longer than normative time.

TEIs determine selection criteria and arrange student selection and entrance examination.

Policy developments

Legislation implemented in 2010 increases the autonomy of HEIs, notably as regards staff policy[1] and financial aspects.

Universities focus on academic research and education, while Polytechnics are professionally oriented. The organisational structure and funding systems differ across the two types of TEIs, which risks undermining the development of a coherent higher education policy.

Finland offers a wide range of study opportunities for adult population, with half of the working-age population in adult education and training

The Ministry of Education uses performance management and target outcomes to steer the operations of TEIs.

[1] The statutes governing civil service and private employment contracts are fairly similar at present.