Appendix 8: Education Quality Board: Screening the Monitors (2021-2023)

In the course of a three-year period after the implementation of the Education Monitors, (2021-2023 'quality reflection phase'), the EQB will perform a one-time screening of all study programmes. The screening is based on trust: the EQB does not aim at assessing programme-specific contents but rather at gaining clear insight into the study programmes' quality culture and actual improvement capacity.

1. **Screening: Practicalities**

In order to make the screening of more than a hundred study programmes/Education Monitors organisationally possible, the EQB will avail itself of a **screening calendar** will be (see Appendix 9).

2. **Points to Consider for Study Programmes Prior to the Screening**

Study programmes must meet a number of admission criteria before a screening of their Education Monitor can take place. They must have available:

(1) a fully operational Education Monitor
The Education Monitor contains all the relevant with regard to a study programme's policy and day-to-day workings. As such, it is an indispensable source of information for the screening process. It goes without saying that the Education Monitor must be fully operational before the screening can take place. The Education Quality Board will perform its screenings on the basis of a number of predetermined criteria (see below).

(2) Student Reflection
In order to anchor student participation even more firmly in our quality assurance policy, we ask our study programmes for a critical reflection drawn up by their own students, and to include this critical reflection in the Education Monitor (see Appendix 5).

a. **Screening Methodology**

The actual screening aims at:
- a uniform process, using the same set of criteria to all study programmes;
- providing an accurate and nuanced insight into a study programme's actual quality culture;
- smooth and efficient processes;
- being transparent.

In order to meet these conditions, the Education Department's Quality Assurance Office provides a uniform and easily manageable template. This template is built in such a way that the following **three general domains/criteria are assessed**:

(1) Data congruence (information in UGI, in the Education Monitor, including, among other things, a programme's self-assessment)
A first aspect that will be screened is the degree to which data from a number of different information sources are congruent with each other. Study programmes are encouraged to regularly engage in (1) self-assessment, in which programme objectives are scored and concomitant improvement actions are drawn up by using the Education Monitor's PDCA cycle. Thanks to the (2) integration of UGI into the Education Monitors, study programmes will have important (quantitative) data with which to feed their self-assessment. Once operational, the Education Monitor will therefore function as a dashboard for study programmes, in which data input related to education quality assurance from different sources come together.

The first question that needs answering is whether or not the picture study programmes have, and give of themselves (in the self-assessment, among other things) in their Education Monitors is accurate and in accordance with the available data from (e.g.) UGI. Study programmes where this is evidently the case must be considered as having sufficient policy-making capacity: i.e. that they are able to set up, implement, assess and report on the necessary improvement actions based on an informed and realistic picture of themselves.

(2) Embedding the external perspective
Ghent University's Quality Conduct is in alignment with the criteria laid down by the new Flemish Quality Code. The involvement of external parties in quality assurance is one of those criteria. The involvement of a broad range of external parties in education policy is an important aspect of quality assurance, as is a regular assessment of content-related aspects. This broad range may include international peers as well as professional field representatives (alumni, international professional associations and accreditation organizations). The extent to which such a critical external perspective is structurally embedded in a study programme's education (policy) is the second criterion of the screening.

The second question that needs answering is whether or not the actions planned and/or undertaken by a study programme to embed the external perspective guarantees a structural, content-related check of (at least) study programme competencies, curriculum, assessment and exit level by international peers and representatives of the professional field.

(3) Quality culture
The third part of the screening relates to the quality culture and the efficiency of quality assurance processes in a study programme, involving two components:
  i.   whether or not, and if so, in what way, a study programme effectively succeeds in identifying and resolving problems. In other words, is the study programme able to close the PDCA cycle. During the 2021-2023 screening period, information from the (still relatively new) Education Monitor can be supplemented with information from other sources (e.g. quality improvement plan, report of the Annual Quality Meeting, Programme Committee reports, etc.) for the screeners to form a clear picture of a study programme's improvement culture.

  ii. the day-to-day working of the Programme Committee (and other policy bodies), the efficiency of policy processes and internal stakeholder policy. In a study programme with a shared quality culture, quality assurance processes are set up by a high-performance Programme Committee

(and other policy bodies), and in consultation with all stakeholders. In other words, quality assurance is not the individual responsibility of e.g. the Programme Committee chair, but the shared responsibility of a broader group. The screening template will include a number of elements that need to be checked, like .e.g. the frequency of Programme Committee meetings, the information flow between the Programme Committee and its stakeholders, the functioning of other programme-specific consultation bodies and their interaction with the Programme Committee, the presence of education-related consultation moments (e.g. term consultations, lecturer consultation, study programme meeting, etc.).

The question that needs answering is whether or not, and if so, to what extent a study programme is able to do a proper bottleneck analysis and set up improvement actions if necessary. In addition, the Programme Committee's and other policy bodies' efficiency is examined, as are the structural processes they have in place to ensure an efficient follow-up of quality assurance, and to ensure well-informed and involved stakeholders.

3. Outcome of the screening

On the basis of the screenings, the EQB will pronounce a quality assurance resolution for each study programme (and its education quality and quality culture).

There are three possible outcomes:

(1) **basic (education) quality is guaranteed, with confidence in the study programme's policy-making capacity: positive quality assurance resolution**. In a partnership with the Education Department, the study programme might be invited to share one or more good practices with other study programmes/faculties. The study programme is made aware of the Education Department's support services. The EQB can advise to follow up on certain improvement actions, and to participate in specific education support initiatives.

(2) **basic (education) quality is guaranteed, though immediate improvement actions are needed: positive quality assurance resolution** with a compulsory referral to specific coaching (see Appendix 9: Tailored Coaching) tailored to the identified points of concern. The study programme delivers a three-monthly progress report to the EQB. In addition, the study programme is free to participate in specific education support initiatives.

(3) **basic (education) quality is not guaranteed: negative quality assurance resolution** with urgent measures, and if necessary, immediate discontinuation of the study programme.

The proposed screening calendar (see Appendix 10: Screening Calendar) makes it possible to screen all study programmes with an operational Education Monitor in the period 2021-2023, and to pronounce a quality assurance resolution for each of them. The new system provides for an **appeal proceedings** against EQB decisions. This appeal will come before a (n internal or external) panel (e.g. consisting of former vice-chancellors and deputy vice-chancellors). Appeal proceedings are only invoked in the event of a negative quality assurance resolution