

September 12-13, 2016

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

1. Agenda introduced.
2. Minutes from Jan 31 and Feb 1 QB meetings accepted.
3. TB suggested the creation of an annual schedule that outlines when meetings with stakeholder occur in relation to the four annual meetings of the QB. SOS agreed to draft a schedule for the November meeting.
4. NS and SÓS provided an update on an earlier meeting with Una Strand Viðarsdóttir from the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture (MESC) on the latest draft of the QEF2 Handbook. NS and SÓS reported that the meeting was in general very helpful and will inform later discussions about the Handbook. SÓS will draft a memo to Una following the QB meeting that will describe the QB's responses to her suggestions and concerns.
5. Discussion about Cost of Appeals in QEF2. SÓS will draft a budget estimate for the different types of Appeals for the November meeting.
6. The duration of the QEF2 cycle is discussed, and the QB agrees that NS will continue discussions with MESC on that topic. One option is a 7-year cycle with 1 IWR per year for all years except 2 IWRs in one of the years, followed by a year of reflection. The other option is an 8-year cycle with 1 IWR per year for all years, followed by a year of reflection.
7. Discussion about the language and consistency of sections on evaluating management of research. NS will take this into consideration when writing the next draft of the QEF2 Handbook. Discussion about a possible visual in the Handbook to depict the different aspects and activities in QEF2, and their relations. SÓS will create a draft for that.
8. Discussion about coverage of management of research in IWR reports. There is to be no confidence judgment on management of research. Coverage of management of research will be included in SLRs, and institutional follow-up discussed in IWR visits and reports. The execution of an institution's research plan will be included in coverage of the execution of the strategic plan in the IWR report. It should also be emphasized that the focus of the Reflective Analysis on research should be the institutions' own evaluation(s) of their research activities and the criteria used in those evaluations. Also, what support do they get, what is the impact, and then finally detail any exceptional blue skies research.

9. Discussion about the extent of materials to be made public from SLRs. Board agrees that an executive summary of the Review needs to be published, including areas for action.

10. Discussion about the consequences of judgments of limited and no confidence to institutions, and what ministerial actions would possibly follow these judgments. The QB acknowledged that there can be a wide variety of issues that can lead to limited confidence. Some will take little time, others will have to take longer. A possible solution would be for the Handbook to state that after a given number of weeks following a judgment of limited confidence, there would be a meeting between HEI and QB to agree on a timeframe. Normally, the time would not exceed 2 years from the publication of the report. Ongoing monitoring relationship would then be established to safeguard the interests of the students during that time. QB agrees that NS will continue to discuss this with MESC representatives.

11. Discussion about possibility of commending instances of exemplary practice in QE in the absence of a possible “full confidence” judgment. NS suggests that exemplary practice would need to be highlighted in the actual text of IWR reports instead. Exemplary practice could also be explicitly highlighted in sections that put judgments into context. These statements could be repeated in summaries, and included as part of overall statements about strengths of the institution under review.

12. QB agreed to not include in the next draft of the QEF2 Handbook that appeals can be made on the basis that material that was available at time of review, but was not made available, and HEI could bring it forward at that point.

13. MDB leaves meeting. Discussion of UNAK’s application for accreditation of 5 interdisciplinary doctoral programmes. FQ will chair a team of 8 other experts, and visit will need to take place before end of academic year 2016-2017. SÓS will assist FQ in planning and executing the review.

14. MDB re-joins meeting. Discussion about draft Annex on The Quality Board: role, functions and membership. QB agrees to add language on its role in developing and maintaining the QEF, in addition to overseeing its execution. A note will also be added about the Board’s operations being designed to be in line with international good practice and ENQA guidelines.

15. Discussion about names of future Board members.

16. Discussion about a possible Memorandum of Understanding between QB, MESC and Rannís.

17. Discussion of draft Frame of Reference for Judgements in QEF2. BB suggests that two broad paragraphs or 2 different pages also be provided to Review Team Members for training purposes: 1 on Standards and 1 on Learning experience and

the difference between the two. QB agrees that it would be best left to Quality Council to decide if it wants the text of the ESG freestanding or incorporated into Frame of Reference Annex. NS will draft the Preamble to the Frame of Reference, and share with QB prior to the November 2016 meeting.

18. Discussion about annex on Quality Council members and remit.

19. Discussion about annex on Conflict of interest. Recent employee is to be defined as one that has been employed within the last 5 years. It will be the responsibility of the person signing the statement to identify if a COI exists. In terms of application, institutions have the responsibility for confirming that no material conflict of interest applies.

20. Discussion about annex on role of externals in SLRs.

21. Discussion on annex on Research evaluation committee, which would start operating in academic year 2017-2018. QB agrees that the language of this committee should be English.

22. Discussion about Annex on Reflective analyses. SÓS will draft a versions in which headings will be suggested, and 1-2 paragraphs on suggested content. Emphasis should be put on the Reflective Analyses being reflective and analytical.

23. Discussion on Timeline for IWR report following Team visit. SÓS will re-draft and share with NS.

24. Quality Council joins meeting. Bjarni Kristófer Kristjánsson, David Mollberg, Einar Hreinsson, MDB, Ólöf Gerður Skúladóttir and Sunna Mjöll Sverrisdóttir. NS updates on QEF2 progress and timelines, and emphasizes that all plans are subject to MESC approval.

25. Quality Council leaves meeting, but student representatives from LÍS remain: David Mollberg, and Sunna Mjöll Sverrisdóttir.

26. The 2017 QB meeting schedule is finalized:

Jan 30 and 31

May 29 and 30

September 11 and 12

November 13 and 14

28. Meeting adjourned.