



# EDUCATION QUALITY BOARD

## EXTRACT FROM THE MEETING MINUTES

Education Department  
Quality Assurance Office

E [janis.vanacker@ugent.be](mailto:janis.vanacker@ugent.be)

T +32 9 331 00 57

Campus UF0  
Sint-Pietersnieuwstraat 33, 9000 Gent

[www.ugent.be](http://www.ugent.be)

**DATE**

05-12-2019

**LOCATION**

Raadzaal UFO

**PRESENT**

Femke De Backere, Koen De Bosschere, Ilse De Bourdeaudhuij, Guido Galle, Nele Mahieu, Julien Marbaix, Janis Vanacker (taker of minutes), Mieke Van Herreweghe (Chair), Hilde Van Keer, Wout Vierbergen

**EXCUSED**

Lieve Bradt, Mia Eeckhout

Points to Discuss

**3. Implementation of a new quality assurance model: Memo for the Education Council Memorandum/Board of Governors + appendices**

The memo and appendices are explained, including their coming into existence and their further handling. The documents were prepared by the Quality Assurance Office. It was decided to provide a global overview of the new quality assurance model in a policy memorandum ('*Quality Conduct 2.0*' memorandum) and to explain the main components of this model more thoroughly in separate appendices. However, these appendices do not constitute operational manuals or guidelines. The policy memorandum and the appendices are first submitted to the EQB. In the next instance, these will be placed on the agenda of the Education Council on 10 December and the Board of Governors in January. Passing the Board of Governors is necessary because the memo entails a fundamental change of the internal quality assurance model.

Reference is made to the integration of quality assurance processes – *Quality Conduct 2.0* – and professional development policy (Support Services 2.0). Virtually all aspects of the *Quality Conduct 2.0* have already been presented to, and discussed by the EQB in various phases. Only Appendix 7 (The Education Quality Board: Role and Composition) and the new support offer have not yet been discussed in detail.

The basic principles of the new **support offer** are explained. Up until now, professional development initiatives have mainly focused on individual lecturers. The new offer provides training sessions for lecturers as well as study programmes. A basic and an in-depth offer will be developed for both target groups.

The following comments are made by members of the EQB:

- it is proposed to align the basic trajectory for professorial staff with the new professorial staff career model in terms of duration. For a tenure track lecturer, a feedback interview is held after two years of appointment and an assessment takes place after three years. The EQB members agree not to give newly appointed lecturers three years, but two years to complete the basic training trajectory. It is a good thing that newly appointed lecturers quickly acquire the necessary frameworks about Ghent University teaching so that they can already apply these in the first course units they teach.
- It is a good thing that the role of administrative and technical staff involved in education/quality assurance is included in the policy memorandum. After all, these staff members are part of a permanent team that ensures continuity in the follow-up of education. Support from this group will gain increased importance in the future.
- It is proposed to provide professional development initiatives on education (policy) and education management for professorial staff members in PCs. This basic offer with regard to education (management) can be complementary or attuned to the training that the Personnel and Organisation Department already offers with regard to (for example) 'leadership'. Such training sessions can be interesting for members of the professorial staff who want to take on the role of PC chairman in the future. In addition, such training can also enhance PC activity in general. The members of the EQB indicate that they are positive about further professional development of PCs. They think it is a good idea to integrate training with regard to education (policy) and education management in the offer.
- The student representatives believe that it would be beneficial to provide professional development for student representatives as well: new student representatives often do not know how to fulfil their

role properly. Training sessions might help. It is noted that there is a proposal to have the quality assurance staff in the faculties to give an annual information session to student representatives. The daily functioning of a PC and the role of student representatives could be part of such a session. The Education Department (DOWA) could provide short training session for the student co-ordinators and student representatives responsible for the student reflection in their study programme. Such a training could be linked to the framework on 'credits and merits' that is currently being developed. For this, reference is made to the Student Reflection memorandum (p.3).

- A brief explanation is still needed regarding the financial implications of the new model. The new model, which, among other things, entails the professional development of a broad group of internal stakeholders, will strengthen the identity of our institution. In this regard, it is important to explain the financial implications. It is noted that this explanation can be included in the accompanying cover note accompanying when the dossier is brought before the Board of Governors. The new model will be realized by the existing DOWA-quality assurance staff. The discontinuation of the portfolios and peer learning visits will result in a significantly changed job content for the quality assurance staff. Additional capacity will be required to significantly expand the support offer. DOWA sees a possible opportunity in the broader deployment of the four Activo liaisons. These liaisons could gradually broaden their scope to include a broader pedagogical-didactic focus in addition to their current focus on active learning.

**Appendix 5 Student Reflection** will be discussed next.

The following comments are made:

- According to the students, the statement that the student reflection falls under objective 34 in the monitor (p.1 of the memorandum) can be misinterpreted. The paragraph seems to suggest that the students' reflection exercise only relates to the content of objective 34, while in fact, it relates to all themes in the monitor. It is proposed to state (more) clearly that the student reflection procedure is in line with objective 34. The students agree with this.
- With regard to the threefold objective of the student reflection (p.1 of the memorandum), the student representatives indicate that the third component ('teaching participating students critical reflection skills and shaping them into active citizens...') is not an objective of the reflection for them. This is a (positive) consequence of the reflection exercise, but not a goal in itself. It is suggested that this be made explicit in the text. The students agree to this.
- As an alternative to the third of the threefold objectives, the student representatives propose to state that the student reflection will lead to a deepening of the dialogue in the PC and the detection of possible action points.
- The term 'local Student Representatives' (p.2 of the memorandum) is best replaced by 'student representatives'.
- Regarding the sentence 'The intention is to collect more in-depth feedback and identify possible strengths and proposals for improvement from the student's perspective' (p.2)', the student representatives propose to speak of *possible* proposals for improvement. The students also want to provide the possibility to only signal problems. In addition, it can be specified that the aim is to collect in-depth and *constructive* feedback.

- Also, in the sentence 'The Student Reflection culminates in a critical constructive reflection report (...)', the student representatives would like to mention the possibility of only signalling points to consider (without having to formulate solutions).
- The memorandum states that student reflection must be discussed by the PC of the relevant study programme (p.2). The student representatives propose to specify that the reflection is discussed at a PC *where student representatives are present*.
- The student representatives wish to include in the memorandum that a student co-ordinator from another faculty can be present at a focus group meeting. The aim of this is to give students a broader perspective in the focus group meeting than the perspective of only one specific study programme.
- It is proposed to add a guideline regarding providing as diverse a group of participants as possible for the focus group discussion. It is also important to bring in the perspective of, for example, foreign students and representatives of specific target groups (personalized learning track, students in a bridging programme, students working their way through university, etc.). At present, these specific groups less often have a voice in the PC.

The student representatives indicate that student reflections should also be discussed at the EQB. It is clarified that student reflection has been set up as a tool for study programmes: taken together, the student reflection, data from UGI, data from the external perspective, etc..., form a set of instruments that support study programmes in their policymaking. The tools are not designed as instruments for the EQB. The EQB must check whether a study programme's self-evaluation and improvement policy are congruent with the results obtained by these tools (e.g. findings of external experts, results of programme feedback, focus group sessions). The students indicate that it should be possible to quickly detect problems. The answer is that problems will arise in the study programmes through the available resources if a study programme does not address them.

**Appendix 7 The Education Quality Board: Role and Composition** is discussed next.

The screening of the monitors is an important new element in the functioning of the EQB. The proposal is to use a method that is similar to that of the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO), which involves working with "pre-rapporteurs". This allows for a balanced distribution of the screenings among the members of the EQB. For each screening, two EQB members act as pre-rapporteur and prepare a substantiated report. A DOWA staff member is also assigned to each screening.

The following comments are made:

- It is asked whether all professorial staff members will be replaced at the same time, as a result of which all experienced members would disappear in one term. It is noted that not all members of the professorial staff started their term at the same time, so this does not seem to be a problem.
- A student representative assumes that students from Ghent University's Student Union will receive a mandate of two years to be seated in the EQB. In principle, students have a one-year term, but they can always do an extra term.

- The students indicate that in certain periods they may not have time to screen full monitors. The reply is that this can be accommodated by working with the “pre-rapporteurs”.
- It is asked whether it is not possible to add two assistant academic staff members to the EQB. The answer is that the purpose of the new composition is certainly not to strengthen the different staff sections, but to bring in various expertise. The EQB does not act as a representative body. It is noted that it may also be interesting to add a member of the faculty quality assurance staff, or other members of the administrative and technical staff involved in education. These staff members will play an important role in implementing the Quality Conduct 2.0. It should be noted that the expansion of the EQB with two external members and administrative and technical staff will bring in expertise from different angles on education. The question is how many additional members are necessary to have sufficient screening capacity. It is proposed to expand the composition of the EQB with two administrative and technical staff members (involved in education) and an additional assistant academic staff member (in addition to the 2 extra external members).

The members of the EQB agree to the system of “pre-rapporteurs” for the screenings of the study programmes. In addition, the members propose to expand the EQB with two external members, an additional assistant academic staff member and two administrative and technical staff members who are involved in education/ quality assurance. The intention is not to strengthen the representation of the different staff sections, but to bring together expertise on education from different perspectives and to ensure sufficient screening capacity.

With regard to **Appendix 11 Teaching Competencies for Lecturers-in-Charge** lecturers, it can be added that lecturers should have an eye for student well-being. If a student is struggling visibly, a lecturer should have the attitude to refer them to the appropriate support services. A Welfare Task Force is currently being set up within the Education Council, chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor: the aim is to formulate proposals for the promotion of student well-being.