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Objectives

• Thinking about current instruments to execute 360° monitoring feedback within the context of educational quality assurance

• Discuss benefits and barriers of qualitative and quantitative evaluation instruments

• Sharing ideas about professionalization of stakeholders in giving valuable feedback

• Sharing ideas for increasing the participation rate of stakeholders in quality assurance surveys to get representative feedback
Workshop structure
Part 1: introduction  (20 min)
Part 2: teamwork   (40 min)
Part 3: plenary reflections  (25 min)
Part 4: take home messages  (5 min)
London 310 km
Paris 290 km
Amsterdam 220 km
Brussels 55 km
Berlin 790 km
Ghent university

- Central administration: managed by rector, vice rector and directors
- 11 faculties: managed by dean and the faculty board
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor programs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master programs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master after Masters</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduates</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDY PROGRAMS
8000 STUDENTS
Quality assurance system Ghent University

Combination of Centralised and Decentralised system

• Central department of educational quality gives structure and tools
• Faculties and study programs remain responsible for the development of their local quality assurance system with tailor-made tools
Using the PDCA cycle for Quality assurance

PDCA at 3 levels:
- Study Program Level
- Faculty Level
- Central Level
The 360° feedback method is a structured process of collecting, processing and discussing feedback from multiple perspectives for the purpose of improving and assessing organisations, teams, leaders … or study programs.

Check (PDCA): by using different sources of information

ALUMNI
Quantitative evaluation - alumni survey
Qualitative evaluation - participation of alumni in study program committee

PROFESSIONALS & REPRESENTATIVES OF SOCIETY
Quantitative evaluation - training mentor survey
Qualitative evaluation - participation of professionals & representatives of society in study advisory board
- depth-interviews with training mentors and representatives of the working field

STUDENTS
Quantitative evaluation - evaluation about specific topic
- course evaluation
- process evaluation of the master thesis
- evaluation of the trainee process
- study time allocation
- evaluation of the examination process
- study program evaluation
Qualitative evaluation - focus groups with students
- participation of students in study program committee

TEACHING STAFF
Quantitative evaluation - teaching staff survey
Qualitative evaluation - participation of teaching staff in study program committee

360° Monitoring Feedback
Faculty quality assurance system:

- Participative model
- Strongly student-centered (great commitment + additional value)
Check (PDCA)

Different **quantitative instruments** (central + faculty level):

1. Study program evaluation bachelor/master
2. Course evaluation
3. Internship Evaluation
4. Study time measurement
5. Evaluation of the examination process
6. Evaluation about specific topics
1. STUDY PROGRAM EVALUATION

• Two-yearly: 2010 – 2012 – 2014 – 2016 (even numbered years)
• Students at the end of the bachelor/master program

• Online
• Response rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bachelor</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Active strategy of recruitment (email, reminder, during courses, online messages, student counsels, teachers, ppt on screens, …)
• Results discussed in study program committee with relevant actions
EXAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE PROGRAM EVALUATION

GENERAL APPRECIATION
The content of the study programme meets your expectations.
The study programme has well prepared you for further study or career.
In general the study programme is of a high quality.

LEARNING EFFECT
The study programme stimulates creativity in developing and applying knowledge.
The acquired knowledge and skills are more complex than those of the preceding bachelor.
In the study programme you learned to design research plans.

STRUCTURE
The courses in the programme are organized in a logical sequence.
The study programme starts from a strong concept.
The study programme is coherently constructed.

ORGANISATION
The study programme is well-organised.
The class schedules are manageable.
The support by means of Minerva contributes to the quality of programme.
2. COURSE EVALUATION

- Specific course (every 3 year) linked to one or more teachers (action points, new curriculum, new teaching staff: more regular)
- One instrument for the whole university
- Dimension oriented
- Participation not obligatory but encouraged
- 30% participation is minimum for reporting
- Educational quality control units report and inform teachers
- Limited access to results (confidentiality agreement)
## Example Questionnaire Course Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning/Academic Value</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. You found the class intellectually challenging and stimulating.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. You have learned something which you consider valuable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Your interest in the subject has increased as a consequence of this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Enthusiasm</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The staff member was enthusiastic about teaching the class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The staff member was dynamic and energetic in conducting this class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The staff member’s style of presentation held your interest during class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Rapport</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The staff member was friendly towards individual students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The staff member encouraged students to seek advice during and outside off class time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The staff member’s availability during office hours or after class was adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation/Clarity</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. The staff member’s explanations were clear.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The staff member’s lessons were well structured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The staff member made a clear distinction between primary and secondary points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Materials</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The course materials were well structured.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The course materials were readily available and easily accessible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The subject was well supported by the course materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examinations/Grading</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. You were sufficiently informed about the criteria for evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Methods of evaluating student work were fair and appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Examinations/graded materials tested class content as emphasised by the staff member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercises/Tutorials/Tasks</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. The exercises formed a useful part of the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Students were prepared well for the content of the exercises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Effective guidance was provided for during the exercises.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. INTERNSHIP EVALUATION

Evaluation of …

• learning process during the internships
• supervision
• organisation
• assessment process
4. STUDY TIME MEASUREMENT

- Is the study time in line with the study guide / ECTS points
- Study course level/ study program level
- All students of a study year
- Selection of 10 groups at random, during 40 weeks
- Each group participates 4 weeks equally divided over the academic year = prospective method
  - 2 normal lesson weeks
  - 1 preparatory week
  - 1 exam week
- Strictly structured questionnaire
- Detailed registration study time, study activity tools, ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of course</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Theoretical</th>
<th>Measured</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>min</td>
<td>gids</td>
<td>max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niet toegewezen</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwaliteits-, welzijns- en milieuzorg in</td>
<td>Jan Goossens</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristalchemie</td>
<td>Diederik Depla</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inleiding tot de polymeerwetenschap</td>
<td>Filip Du Prez</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwantumchemie</td>
<td>Patrick Bultinck</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fysische chemie II: elektrochemie, kine</td>
<td>Katrien Strubbe</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic Methods in Organic Chemistry</td>
<td>Johan Van der Eycken</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Separation Methods</td>
<td>Patrick Sandra</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAJOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACHELORPROEF</td>
<td>Pierre De Clercq</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiochemie</td>
<td>Karel Strijckmans</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>90 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totaal:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. EVALUATION EXAMINATION PROCESS

- Questionnaire immediately after exam
- Evaluation of written exams/ papers
- Questions on
  - Preparation by the teacher during classes
  - Quality and difficulty level
  - Organisational aspects
  - ...

STUDENTS

20
6. EVALUATION SPECIFIC TOPICS

- Study program oriented
- Related to specific context and identity of the program

For example: evaluation of hands on teaching, of learning climate, ...
Qualitative instruments for monitoring quality of education:

- Focus groups:
  - +/- 12 students (ad random)
  - 1,5 h discussion
  - topics: new curriculum, study program, student mobility, results quantitative evaluations
  - at least once in 4 years
Qualitative instruments for monitoring quality of education:

- Representation of students in the study program committee
  
  • 1/3 members are students
  • Co-creation of agenda
Check (PDCA)

360° Monitoring Feedback

ALUMNI
- Quantitative evaluation: alumni survey
- Qualitative evaluation: participation of alumni in study program committee

PROFESSIONALS & REPRESENTATIVES OF SOCIETY
- Quantitative evaluation: training mentor survey
- Qualitative evaluation: participation of professionals & representatives of society in study advisory board, depth-interviews with training mentors and representatives of the working field

STUDENTS
- Quantitative evaluation: evaluation about specific topic, course evaluation, process evaluation of the master thesis, evaluation of the trainee process, study time allocation, evaluation of the examination process, study program evaluation
- Qualitative evaluation: focus groups with students, participation of students in study program committee

TEACHING STAFF
- Quantitative evaluation: teaching staff survey
- Qualitative evaluation: participation of teaching staff in study program committee
Quantitative instruments for monitoring quality of education:

1. Teaching staff survey (central)
2. Study program evaluation (faculty – specific context study program)

!! Limited number of quantitative instruments compared to the students group
Set of Questions about the UGhent educational goals

Example:
- I use activating teaching methods to stimulate students in their learning process.
- I use the ‘four eyes principle’ which means that two individuals review and approve my exams or other evaluations before it is given to the students.
- I would prefer to decrease the time I spend in teaching and increase the time I spend in research.
2. STUDY PROGRAM SURVEY

- every 4 years linked to a specific study program

Set of questions on:

- their role as a teacher in the study program and their knowledge about the study program
- organization of the study program
- communication about the study program
- ...

TEACHING STAFF
Check (PDCA)

Qualitative instruments

- Participation of teaching staff in study program committee (1/2 of the members is teaching staff)

!! lack of qualitative instruments for monitoring quality in group of teaching staff
Check (PDCA)

External stakeholders

ALUMNI
- Quantitative evaluation:
  - alumni survey
- Qualitative evaluation:
  - participation of alumni in study program committee

PROFESSIONALS & REPRESENTATIVES OF SOCIETY
- Quantitative evaluation:
  - training mentor survey
- Qualitative evaluation:
  - participation of professionals & representatives of society in study advisory board
  - depth-interviews with training mentors and representatives of the working field

STUDENTS
- Quantitative evaluation:
  - evaluation about specific topic
  - course evaluation
  - process evaluation of the master thesis
  - evaluation of the trainee process
  - study time allocation
  - evaluation of the examination process
  - study program evaluation
- Qualitative evaluation:
  - focus groups with students
  - participation of students in study program committee

TEACHING STAFF
- Quantitative evaluation:
  - teaching staff survey
- Qualitative evaluation:
  - participation of teaching staff in study program committee

360° Monitoring Feedback
Quantitative instruments

- Alumni survey:
  
  • Every 4 years
  • Specific questions on employment, competences, program, etc.
Example item: “Which skills and competencies that you acquired during your BA and MA program Movement Sciences are important in your current employment?”

- Other competencies: 4.00
- Management competencies: 4.24
- Scientific competencies: 3.27
- Analytical competencies: 3.75
- Research competencies: 2.98
- Sport competencies: 3.14
- Social competencies: 4.53

n = 172
Check (PDCA)

Qualitative instruments

• Participation of alumni in study program committee or other advisory commissions
Check (PDCA)

Quantitative instruments

- Supervisor survey:
  - Every 4 years
  - Questions on:
    - Preparedness for practice
    - Performances of trainees during “workplace learning”
    - Communication and practical organization of internship
Example item:

- What is your opinion on the competences of the trainee/intern when he/she started the internship?
- Is it clear for you which knowledge, skills and attitudes the trainee/intern has to achieve at the end of the internship
Qualitative instruments

- Participation of professionals in study advisory board
- In-depth interviews with training mentors and representatives of work field / society
Part 2 teamwork
3 GROUPS

- Student Group (RED glasses)
- Teaching staff group (YELLOW glasses)
- External stakeholder group (BLUE glasses)

CHALLENGE: “DARE TO THINK”

→ Look at the current instruments with “different” glasses and obtain new perspectives
Questions to be answered

Q1: Is there a good **balance** between qualitative and quantitative instruments for the specific stakeholder group?
Q2: What are the **benefits and barriers** of this kind of evaluation? Are there any suggestions for **extra instruments**?
Q3: Does the group of stakeholders need specific information in order to give valuable feedback?
Q4: How can the stakeholder group be **informed about the impact of their feedback** on the quality of education?
Q5: How can we **encourage** the stakeholder groups **to participate** in these evaluations in order to get representative feedback?
Q6: How can we **increase the co-ownership** of quality assurance among the stakeholder group?
Part 3: plenary reflections (25 min)

- Students
- Teaching staff
- Alumni + professionals / representatives of society
STUDENTS

— Reflections of the group discussion
TEACHING STAFF

— Reflections of the group discussion
ALUMNI / PROFESSIONALS / REPRESENTATIVES OF SOCIETY

— Reflections of the group discussion
TAKE HOME MESSAGES

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 

„I never teach my pupils, I only provide the conditions in which they can learn“

Albert Einstein
1879-1955