

RECOMMENDATION	FOLLOW-UP ACTION	LINK
<p>(1) The Review Committee recommends further investment in the learning networks for Programme Committee chairs and further incentives to encourage chairs to participate. The Review Committee suggests that 'how to create support for the new education policy model among the entire teaching staff' become a fixed theme in these learning network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the learning networks training sessions have become a permanent element in our professional development offer;</li> <li>- in the new career model for professorial staff, the quantitative approach is replaced by a qualitative one, in which talent development and collaboration take centre stage. Members of the professorial staff can set their own objectives and choose to lend more weight to education. An individual HR committee provides feedback to the member of the professorial staff and assesses them based on their personal development.</li> <li>- during the corona pandemic the learning networks for Programme Committee chairs were cancelled. The sessions were resumed in 2022 with one session starting in October 2022 and one starting in February 2023. The Director of Education and the faculty Directors of Studies launched an active call for participation in these networks.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="https://onderwijstips.ugent.be/en/tips/lerend-netwerk-voor-opleidingsvoorzitters/">https://onderwijstips.ugent.be/en/tips/lerend-netwerk-voor-opleidingsvoorzitters/</a></p>
<p>(2) With regard to the operationalization of the indicators, the Review Committee recommends ensuring that the indicators are a tool to measure what people want to know, and that they do not become a mechanical interpretation of the improvement policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- based on this recommendation, the indicators were thoroughly reviewed in collaboration with the study programmes and the faculties. The mandatory nature of these indicators was abandoned, and to keep the workload under control, indicators were clustered more. less. This led to a model in which the indicators became an incentive to allow the study programme to engage in self-reflection, and no longer a mandatory, mechanical implementation. More emphasis was placed on the fact that study programmes can use other sources for self-reflection, such as focus group reports, international study programme reviews, consultation with other stakeholders, etc.</li> <li>- the indicators are integrated into the monitor to support the 'check' or assessment of specific objectives. The study programmes are expected to update the checks at least annually.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ghent University's Business Intelligence System (UGI), offers overview pages that present the most important data (i.e. statistics, results of surveys) at different aggregation levels clearly. These technical interventions ensure faster and more substantive use of the indicators.</li> </ul>	
<p>(3) The further implementation of the system requires continuous effort. The Review Committee recommends that permanent attention be paid to the instruments and processes that are part of the education policy system, even after the external pressure of the institutional review has abated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- following the internal review of the peer learning visits, we chose to implement a lighter system, which involves a screening of the monitors by the Education Quality Board. With the introduction of the monitors, we focused strongly on targeted communication with all parties involved, and provided workshops and support at the level of the study programme and faculty. We have a permanent support offer: embedding the external perspective, workshops on the implementation of the objectives and the monitor as a useful tool, demo sessions on the UGI for Education Policy app, etc.</li> <li>- with the Quality Conduct 2.0, Ghent University has evolved towards a system in which the monitor is increasingly established as a tool for the Programme Committee. The responsibility for monitoring quality is increasingly placed with the faculty and study programmes themselves. However, this system is still relatively young. The full support of this system by every Programme Committee has yet to be realized. Upon implementation of the monitor, writing the Plans and Dos remains a labour-intensive job and study programmes do not always see the added value. Once this phase has been completed, study programmes recognize that an annual check of the objectives and the drafting of the Acts, followed by an automatic quality improvement plan, is a good way to ensure quality assurance in an efficient manner.</li> <li>- this will be further developed in the plans for the Quality Conduct 3.0. The monitor becomes a permanent tool for</li> </ul>	

	the Programme Committee and the annual check of the objectives and the quality improvement plan is a guideline for following up quality culture.	
(4) The Review Committee recommends continuous monitoring to ensure that the investment of time associated with the new policy does not become unnecessarily high, for example by introducing formalities that do not benefit the content.	Reviewing the Quality Conduct 1.0 brought to light that (1) the peer learning visits required a large investment of time by each individual study programme, and that (2) it often confirmed what was already known. In consultation with the stakeholders involved, a new system was implemented (Quality Conduct 2.0) in which the monitor serves not as a one-off report, but as a dynamic tool that keeps track of vision, (action) plans, actions, etc. and in which adjustments can be made with limited effort. Together with meeting minutes of the Programme Committee, the monitor at all times gives a clear picture of a study programme's quality culture. Quality of education is guaranteed by the Education Quality Board (EQB)'s screening of each monitor in the background. This saves a lot of time as no more reports have to be drawn up and no panel visits have to be organized.	
(5) The Review Committee recommends further reflection on the role of peer learning visits, in particular on the trade-off between 'process' and 'content' and the role of external parties.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- we took the recommendations of the committee to heart in the transition to the Quality Conduct 2.0;</li> <li>- the process is now monitored by the EQB's screening of the monitors;</li> <li>- when monitoring and improving their education quality, study programmes themselves are expected to embed the external perspective in a structural manner. This external perspective guarantees a systematic harmonization of programme content. Part of the EQB's screening is devoted to follow up on how study programmes embed the external perspective. Various initiatives are available to support study programmes in carrying out this external perspective (workshops, study days, consultations with quality assurance staff, inspiration cards, etc.).</li> </ul>	<a href="https://onderwijstips.ugent.be/en/tips/verankeren-externe-blik/">https://onderwijstips.ugent.be/en/tips/verankeren-externe-blik/</a>
(6) The Review Committee recommends that university management continues to think about possible incentives to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a review of the allocation model includes such incentives. Specifically, all mechanisms that had a negative effect on</li> </ul>	

<p>support cross-faculty initiatives. When revising the allocation model, it is important that incentives in this area are built in.</p>	<p>faculty funding when collaborating with other faculties were removed from the model. Support mechanisms for collaboration were also introduced, such as, e.g., the full inclusion of students from interfaculty study programmes in all faculties involved;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- this is not to say that there is no room for improvement. There are still obstacles for faculties to collaborate even more closely.</li> </ul>	
<p>(7) The Review Committee recommends continuing to invest in honours programmes so that more students can participate. By way of suggestion, the Review Committee points out other students that first-year students could be admitted into honours programmes, in order to give all promising students a chance.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- since the previous institutional review, the number of honours programmes has increased. Ghent University currently has four cross-faculty honours programmes: in addition to the 'Quetelet lectures' (all faculties), our offer now includes the honours programme 'Think &amp; Talk' (alpha faculties), the honours programme in Life Sciences (gamma faculties) and the honours programme Education (gamma faculties + faculty of Science and Engineering and Architecture). Some of these programmes also allow second- or third-year Bachelor's students, or Master's students;</li> <li>- the faculties of Science, Economics and Business, and Engineering and Architecture also offer their own excellence study programme for their excelling students.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="https://www.uqent.be/student/en/studeren/honoursprogramma">https://www.uqent.be/student/en/studeren/honoursprogramma</a></p>
<p>8) The Review Committee recommends involving professional field representatives at the level of the Programme Committee.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- professional field representatives are involved in each Programme Committee. One of the objectives in the monitor explicitly assesses this and it is also part of the EQB screening exercise;</li> <li>- one of the criteria related to the external perspective entails that a Programme Committee collects input from the professional field in a structural manner.</li> </ul>	<p><a href="https://onderwijstips.uqent.be/en/tips/verankeren-externe-blik/">https://onderwijstips.uqent.be/en/tips/verankeren-externe-blik/</a></p>
<p>(9) The Review Committee suggests a continuation of student involvement when it comes to formulating study programme strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the Programme Committees consist for 1/3 of student representatives;</li> <li>- students are represented in all governing bodies (i.e. at study programme, faculty or university level).</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- the student representatives in the EQB take part in the screening of the Education Monitors;</li><li>- students are frequently asked (via surveys) to give their feedback about their course units, study programme, and the Master's dissertation;</li><li>- many study programmes organize additional surveys on their own initiative (focus groups, additional surveys among students, etc.).</li><li>- new in the Quality Conduct 2.0 is that we have introduced so-called student reflection sessions for each study programme. These sessions are organized for and by students every three years. With all of the above initiatives, we ensure that strengths and weaknesses are always included.</li></ul>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--