November 9, 2015

Present: Norman Sharp (NS), Tove Bull (TB), Barbara Brittingham (BB), Rita McAllister (RM), Frank Quinault (FQ), Andrée Sursock (AS), Þorsteinn Gunnarsson (ÞG), Magnús Diðrik Baldursson (MDB), and Sigurður Óli Sigurðsson (SÓS).

1. NS updated QB on his meeting with Ministry Representative (Una Strand Viðarsdóttir) about QEF2 draft was very cordial. NS said that details were mostly up for discussion, but the general principles are in agreement. In email and through SOS is how discussions will take place. Membership of QB was a point of discussion with Una. One worry is that the Board may open itself to challenges of inconsistency if the renewal of the Board is slow. New membership of Board was also discussed

4. SLRs in QEF2 were discussed. RM noted that any CRIS system information in SLRS will most likely make them more sensitive. As a result, broad agreement has to be reached about what can be made public from SLRs.

5. Budget discussion. The resources available to the manager of the QB were discussed, and the QB agreed that it is impossible to think of that position as anything less than 100% position. For example, it is not realistic to apply for ENQA membership under QEF2 with the current budget.

6. Una would like to have conversations in 2016 as to how to incorporate accreditations into QEF2 and the work of the QB, if at all.

7. AS explained that she talked with Una about benchmarking the QEF2. Discussion about the context of the Icelandic Higher Education system: UoI during the crisis had taken on a lot of students, for example. Publication rates have gone down, and little time to innovate in teaching (based on information gathered in Institution-Wide Reviews across the sector).

8. Discussion about possible ENQA membership of the QB. Stefán Baldursson from MESC is an ENQA observer. Iceland is represented, but not as a full member. Associate membership is an option. SOS will look into rates for ENQA rates, at different levels of membership.

9. NS introduces document "Changes to Board following response from MESC".

NS noted that the QB is a resource that can be used in an advisory role for MESC's ongoing work on developing a policy framework for quality enhancement for the government and the HE sector as a whole. AS: One thing that could be developed is the system-wide analysis of Higher Education in Iceland. These are the kinds of (every 2 years or so) reports, with a high-level synthesis that the QB needs to produce to demonstrate its contribution. NS agrees, and that should be part of the QB's mission/list for the role of the board.

RM added that the QB needs to add the QC in this list, make sure to include them and make their place more prominent. We do provide an external view, and they provide the Icelandic HE view.

Discussion about student member of QB being international. AS noted that if the QB decides to get a member from the European Student Union, the QB should be given a chance to select an ESU member from a list with CVs. AS also asked what the QB would look for in a student member: experience of representing student interests in relation to quality above program level. ESU now has a pool of evaluators, but they are not always representatives.

BB and FQ added that 5 members and student member is the minimum number of members if QB plans to include research in QEF2.

Discussion about number of QB members. By Sept 2017 there should be a new Board in place, ideally 5 full members and 1 student member. 1 student should be brought in immediately, and then replace one of the 5 already with somebody with more research evaluation experience.

Cycle of membership: MDB offered the opinion that it is enough that student is observer like QC chair. ESU member will keep the Board international. May be a good idea, and brings in foreign experiences. The downside is that an ESU member does not represent the Icelandic student. QC Chair and student should not come from same institution if the student is Icelandic. AS added that a non-voting student as ad hoc member would not be in compliance with ESG.

The QB agrees that it needs a succession plan soon. Suggestions are to be sent to SOS. MDB emphasized that future QB members need to be committed to quality <u>enhancement</u>.

NS recommends that the QB suggest names in the next two weeks. Time scale is a bit flexible, names for chair and research evaluation member are needed soon.

10. MDB leaves meeting. SOS will finish University X's request for having accreditation exercises in Department Y count as SLRs. SOS will cc NS on emails to designated Board members about this request.

11. MDB enters meeting. QEF2 drafting committee. Main documents to be drafted:

- 1. Handbook. High-level setting out framework and principles, criteria.
- 2. "Student" explanation/guide of handbook in Icelandic. The Guide to QEF2. Student training manual. Faculty guide to QEF2 as well?
- 3. Set of guidelines for RA and SLRs to be produced through QC, based on handbook
- 4. Guide for reviewers for both IWRs and SLRs.

AS cautioned the QB to be careful not to have too many publications so as not to create confusion. BB noted that for SLRs, the QC could be generating quite a few of the guidelines. First meeting of drafting committee could be in February, SOS to schedule. Committee: NS, Einar Hreinsson, MDB, SOS. Task for the meeting would be to read the old Handbook and bring ideas from that to meeting. Committee should also read ESG, refer to part 1 and read recent publication: Are universities ready?