

**MINUTES OF THE BOARDMEETING(S)
DURING THE JAMAICA WORKSHOP**

1 - 4 May 2002

1st of May 2002 (18.00-21.00)

Present

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo (President)
Ton Vroeijsstijn (Secretary)
Ethley London
Marjorie Peace Lenn
Lee Harvey
Masateru Ohnami
Seamus Puirseil
Richard Lewis

Absent

Wong Wai Sum
Mala Singh
Birute Mockiene (not present at the workshop)
David Woodhouse

1 Opening

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo welcomed Masateru Ohnami as a new member in the board. He replaces John Randall. Masateru Ohnami presented himself and described his agency and the upcoming event in Tokyo in July.

2 Replacement of Juan Carlos Pugliese.

Because of the change in position of Juan Carlos, a replacement is needed. There has been only one response to the e-mail from Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo. After a short discussion, it was decided to ask Arum Gnanam to join the board.

3 Presence of the treasurer in the board meeting

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo proposed that Richard Lewis as treasurer is not only present during the discussion of financial matters but participate in the whole meeting. The board agreed

4 Program of the workshop

The program of the workshop was discussed. There will be about 70 participants. The Jamaica delegation (about 12) are members of the board of UCJ. It looks that the costs will break even.

5 Report of the secretary

5.1 Information project

The progress of the project is not satisfactory. There is too little progress. Reasons are:

- Late responses, so the planned time for processing could not be used
- Too little time for processing; not high priority (no real external pressure on it)

The returned questionnaires have been processed and the information is now available on the website. The members are asked for corrections and updating.

There are 60 questionnaires returned, 51 of which (85%) are full members.

Total full members is 91, so there is a response of 56% of full members.

According to world regions:

Europe:	41%
US+Canada	16%
Latin America +Caribbean	10 %
Asia	17%
Australia/New Zealand	10%
Africa	6%

Based on the returned questionnaires, some analysis has been made that will be presented tomorrow. It had been decided only to present the results and not to distribute them. At due time a fuller report will be made available.

5.2 The members data base

Since the Bangalore conference, there have been a number of new applications. At this moment there are 91 full members registered (85 in 2001) and 56 associate members - including 4 affiliates, that is individuals (50 in 2001).

There seem to be some problems with sending the journal. Several members have complained that they have not received the journal.

Concerning new applications, the following procedures will be applied in the future:

- agencies apply for membership
- they complete a questionnaire, which is circulated to the Board
- the Board decides.

5.3 Activities to get new members

There are still a number of agencies, that are not a member. If time is available, those agencies will be approached to become a member. The situation in Europe is more or less clear. But this is not so as far as the rest of the world is. The board members will investigate and provide the secretary with names and addresses. of potential members

5.4 Email data base

There is a need to have an email data base of the members. So far, most of the e-mails of the full members seem to be correct and it might be possible to set up a list. But again: this is also a matter of having time available. The secretary will try to have the list available as soon as possible.

5.5 The constitution

After the Bangalore conference, the proposed changes in the constitution were put on the website with the invitation to vote. There were 3 supporting votes and no votes against. Therefore, the changes were made and the updated constitution is now on the website.

5.6 Other issues

There was a discussion of the way to organize electronic board meetings are held, in order to have a summary of the discussions. It is also to ensure that the final decision are posted

Also, the board was reminded that any thing that is to be put for voting at the GA in Dublin should be circulated 40 days before the meeting (= approx. February 25)

Richard Lewis distributed a proposal by e-learn ACCREDIT, for the board members to read.

Because time was running out, it was decided to finish the board meeting at 21.00 hours.

2nd of May 2002 (08.30-12.30)

Present

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo (President)
Ton Vroeijsstijn (Secretary)
Ethley London
Marjorie Peace Lenn
Lee Harvey
Masateru Ohnami
Seamus Puirseil
David Woodhouse
Richard Lewis

Absent

Wong Wai Sum
Mala Singh
Birute Mockiene (not present at the workshop)

6 Program of the workshop

Because the absence of David Woodhouse yesterday, the meeting began with more discussion about the workshop program. Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo thanks David for all the efforts to make the program attractive.

7 Towards a WQR

At 10.30, a delegation of the IAUP will have a discussion with the board about the proposal for a Worldwide Quality Register for QAA&A .There were different remarks made by the board members:

- To what problem is this an answer ? There is no clear problem formulation.
- The proposal looks like an attempt to impose a Western-European/North American quality model upon the agencies.
- What does a trustworthy agency mean?
- Problems with the criteria. It looks like that everybody might fulfill the requirements.
- Problems with interpretations, for example: what does "autonomous and independent" mean?
- There is a need for mutual recognition and a need for professional quality. That part can be supported. The question is whether the consortium is the right solution for the organizational structure.
- What is IAUP? What is the role of UNESCO?
- If we go ahead with the consortium, this will mean the death of INQAAHE. The consortium will take over the activities of INQAAHE.
- In fact this should be a task of INQAAHE. Being a full member should mean being a reliable agency, except that the INQAAHE philosophy has always been to be inclusive, and to accept members that are bona fide agencies even if they are not (yet) very good at the job. Question: what is the role of INQAAHE?

The questions and comments will be discussed with the representatives of IAUP.

8 Meeting of the board with representatives of IAUP (11.00-12.30)

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo welcomed Jef van de Perre (Secretary General of IAUP) and Dirk van Damme.

Van de Perre started with a short introduction of IAUP and the working group, responsible for the proposal. He thanked the chair for the invitation. IAUP is interested in co-operation with INQAAHE.

Dirk van Damme gave a short summary of the proposal. Some remarks made by the speaker:

- The ideas are not only ideas of IAUP. There is a contribution from the side of INQAAHE (David Woodhouse and Ton Vroeijenstijn). There are three important links: the institutions should trust the work of the agencies (involvement IAUP), the QA-agencies have to set the professional requirements and criteria (INQAAHE), the international community should support it. Therefore the (moral) support of UNESCO is wanted.
- It is not a closed initiative. Even though the initial consortium speaks of IAUP, INQAAHE and UNESCO, it should be kept open for other participants.
- It is essential that the QA-agencies community formulates its own professional quality criteria and the framework for its own functioning. What we expect of the institutions, may also be expected from the agencies.
- QA-agencies have to cope with globalization and transnationalisation.
- The paper was discussed in the Lisbon meeting of UNESCO. It was well received, especially by the developing countries.
- IAUP supports the idea. In the meeting in Sydney (June), the proposal will be discussed.
- Funding is required. The World Bank had positive comments. However the ideas should have a broad support.

In the discussion Dirk van Damme reacted on the questions of the board members:

- The role of UNESCO? Daniel and Stamenka support the idea, which is consistent with UNESCO's Global Forum. However, it will be mainly moral support, as UNESCO could not be party to a negative decision about an agency of one of its member governments.
- Role of INQAAHE? INQAAHE must make clear how it sees its role and suggest who else should be included in the consortium.
- Discriminative versus development? The WQR will have a discriminative character, but the development function is also important. This could be achieved through the concept of candidate status. Dirk van Damme admits that the way it is formulated now is a political formulation. WQR will not take care of the development aspect. This is a role of INQAAHE and regional networks.
- Time planning? So far we are only in the stage of discussion. There is no fixed schedule yet. There has to be room for dynamic change. It is too early to decide upon the consortium in the Sydney meeting.
- If IAUP (= the presidents of the institutions) are the ones who see the need for the WQR, would it not be appropriate for them to pay for it? Yes, the IAUP feels it is responsible for arranging the financing, but not necessarily for providing it all. However, not all universities are already convinced about the globalization.

- Is IAUP setting the criteria? No, the QA-agencies have to develop the professional quality criteria. They can not be decided by IAUP. There is institutional support.
- Are the ideas tested among non-members? No, but feedback has been obtained via regional meetings.
- What is the problem for this solution? There is a need for professional quality of QA agencies. It is not so much an answer to a problem as a pro-active initiative. It is also a response to demands from institutions.

Marie Jose thanked Jef van de Perre and Dirk van Dam for the clarifications and the discussions and noted that the proposal will be discussed by all participants in the workshop on the following day

After the meeting with JvdP and DvD, the board agreed that at the plenary session, the history of the issue within INQAAHE would be given: It started in the Krugerpark conference (1997) with the discussion about the full membership; then in Santiago (1999) Ton presented a paper on the subject. The topic was discussed in the first INQAAHE-workshop in Budapest (2000) Budapest, where it was decided to start the membership database and to establish a working group on the subject.

Simultaneously, IAUP expressed an interest on the same issue, which evolved into the presentation that will be made at the session.

After the presentation, the discussion should focus on the need for QA for QAA, the role the Network should play, and how does the membership view the possibility of collaboration with other associations, such as IAUP.

4th of May 2002 (14.30-18.00)

Present

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo (President)
Ton Vrocijenstijn (Secretary)
Ethley London
Marjorie Peace Lenn
Masateru Ohnami
Seamus Puirseil
David Woodhouse
Richard Lewis

Absent

Wong Wai Sum
Mala Singh
Birute Mockiene (not present at the workshop)
Lee Harvey

9 Retrospective view on the workshop

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo concluded that it had been a successful workshop and thanked Ethley London and her staff for the organization and the hospitality. Although in general there were only positive sounds to be heard, there are some questions:

- There was too little time for discussions by the length of the introductions. Because a good introduction is necessary, one might think for next time to cover fewer topics.
- Next time take care that facilitators are chosen before breaking up into groups.
- Division into groups should also be regulated
- Opinions differ if there should be a plenary feedback session or not.

For the organization of the next workshop (2004), there has been 2 offers. The board decides that there will be an open invitation to bid for the workshop, however there is a preference to have it in Asia in a country that is easily accessible. One might think about Malaysia.¹

10 INQAAHE and the WQR-proposal

Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo summarizes the discussions the board had with IAUP and the discussions during the workshop. The feeling is that many people support or at least do not object to the idea of promoting the professional quality and the idea of a sort of quality label for QA-agencies. As said, this is already a long time topic of discussion in INQAAHE. The idea of the consortium and the role of IAUP is not supported. It is not clear what decisions IAUP will make in Sydney in June. Are they going ahead with the consortium or a business plan? The general feeling of the board is that IAUP can do nothing without the support of INQAAHE. IAUP is not the only player in the field. The proposed consortium is too small, especially since it

¹ Talking about the invitation for the workshop 2004, the board decided in the same time to have an open invitation for the conference 2005. Since the New Zealand offer finished a close second in Bangalore, it must be checked whether New Zealand is now interested in hosting the 2005 conference.

appears that UNESCO will have a very marginal role. Other stakeholders (non-university sector, students, employers, professional bodies could also be included).

The board decided on the following strategy:

- Seamus Puirseil will write a draft position paper and send this to the board for comments as soon as possible. The, but at such time schedule, should be such as allow David to be able to use the document in the meeting in Sydney (end of June).
- After comments of the board, the new draft will be circulated among all full members, asking for comments (second half 2002)
- Discussion by Board at a formal electronic Board meeting (October 2002)
- Produce a revised draft (late 2002/early 2003)
- Input for the General Assembly in Dublin 2003 (ultimate date for sending it to the members: 1st of March 2003).
- IAUP needs to be told that INQAAHE did not agree the proposal to establish a consortium at this time. It was noted that IAUP meet on a triennial basis and that means that we should aim to be in a position to be party to proposals that might be put to their 2005 conference.
- The basic idea behind the position paper is e support for the need for such a quality label. Criteria will be discussed and the question raised as to who will responsible for it? What is the role of INQAAHE? What is the involvement of other parties and which ones? In writing the paper, use will be made of existing material like the CHEA criteria.

Marjory will sound out informally how UNESCO sees its position concerning the proposal.

11 The future of the secretariat

Ton Vroeijsstijn gave the background for the discussion:

- The VSNU has been hosting the secretariat since the Krugerpark conference in 1997. This means that he is finishing his 3rd term in April 2003 at the Dublin conference. It is necessary to look for an other secretary because he cannot be re-elected according to the constitution and therefore it will be necessary to look for an other agency to host the secretariat.
- Before the board starts looking for a secretariat, it is important to discuss the future role of the secretariat. If we wish to develop the INQAAHE as a strong Network, it will be necessary to strengthen the secretariat. It is not longer possible to run the secretariat at a voluntary base. Therefore, the following proposal is put forward for discussion:
 - Let us make a clear distinction between the activities we are expecting from the secretariat
 - If it is not possible to have a professional secretariat of at least 0.25 fte,² we have to share the activities among member agencies.

² For a well functioning secretariat that can take care of ongoing activities, but also a more active role in developing activities, the following estimation of time might be made:

- 10 days a year for applications, updating data base, invoices etc
- 10 days a year for the web site
- 10 days for the QA-newsletter
- 10 days a year for activities like running discussion groups, support of the chairperson and other board members
- 10 days a year for the organisation of workshop and conference; elections etc
- 10 days for developing activity plans, discussion papers, representation INQAAHE.

In total 60 days = 0.25 full time equivalent a year.

- Assign the activities to certain individuals. This does not need to be the secretary .
 - Make financial support available.
- Concerning the division of activities one might think about the following:
 - *Membership data base*
New applications, updating, invoices. These activities might be in the hands of the treasurer (Richard Lewis)
 - *Website*
Updating and development of the website. Developing new ideas. The proposal is to leave the website for the coming years (until conference 2005) at the VSNU and Ton Vroeijenstijn responsible for the website.
 - *QA-newsletter*
This is in good hands of Wong Wai Sum
 - *The secretariat*
All other activities will be the task of the new secretary to be chosen. Looking at the time requirements, this will mean about 30 days a year.
 - The secretary stated that the time is past when INQAAHE can rely on the goodwill of the agencies offering the services. We have also to pay for the time spent in secretarial support. The proposal is to have a differentiated fee, for example for US, Canada, Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand (about 50% of the members) a fee of 500 US\$ would be acceptable and means about 13.000 US\$ more income, enough to run the secretariat and the above mentioned activities.

The board members supported the idea of the division of activities. Richard Lewis accepted the combination of treasurer and membership registration, and asks for his title to be changed to reflect his new role: Treasurer and Registrar

Concerning the web-site the conclusion was that quick action is needed to remedy existing problems and to make the web site more professional. The board decides that Ton Vroeijenstijn can spend US\$ 2000 to re-design the website.

Concerning the other activities, one may make a distinction between activities that can be done by a junior or middle ranking staff and activities for a senior staff (= the secretary of INQAAHE). The secretariat of ENQA can act as an example.

Concerning the finance the following has been discussed:

- Differentiation in fees might be a good idea. To make the decision how to differentiate between countries, a list of the UNESCO, indicating which countries are considered 'less developed', will be considered. Ethley London will send the list to the secretary.
 - A problem is that the fee including 2003 has been fixed. Not until the Dublin General Assembly can we decide about the contribution from 2004 on. This means that the secretariat has to be run in 2003 without extra money. INQAAHE might see how much
-

- money there might be already available for 2003 and give the assurance that in 2004 and thereafter money will be available
- There will be an open invitation for the secretariat. There will be an offer of a compensation of 10.000 US\$ yearly (provided that our discussions on fees indicate that this is realistic).
 - The secretary and the secretariat need to be in the same location.

12 The elections

- In Dublin there will again be elections of the board. Ton Vroeijenstijn, Marjorie Peace Lenn and Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo cannot stand because they have served 3 terms. The other members will be asked soon if they will stand for re-election. David will lose his position as immediate past president, but can stand for election.

The following actions will be taken:

- Sending a letter to all members, telling which board members are eligible for nomination and are willing to stand for election and an invitation for other candidates. The letter to be sent in September 2002 requesting that nominations to be made by 1 November 2002. The nominees need the support of 3 other agencies. It is expected that the nomination will include a short CV of the nominee.
- Selection of candidates: November/December 2002.
- Sending the voting letter January 2003.
- Ultimate date for returning the votes: 15 March 2003.

13 Next steps in the information gathering project

Ton Vroeijenstijn said that he will approach as soon as possible the full members who have not yet completed the questionnaire. The aim is to have a hard copy available at the Dublin conference. This means that the material has to be ready for printing around the 15th of February 2003. Richard Lewis and Ton Vroeijenstijn will look at what interesting questions can be formulated for analyzing the material and Richard will see how this can be done.

14 The Dublin conference

Marjorie Peace Lenn reported back from the Program committee's meetings.

- Logistics of the Dublin conference are very sound
- Fee is not yet known, but probably US\$ 400³
- There is a need for the board members to look for additional funding. Maria Jose Lemaitre del Campo will write to the UNESCO, asking for support.
- The theme has already been approved. It is more elaborated now: "Quality and standards: national, regional and global."
- There will be no post-conference publication. Lee Harvey will be asked about the possibility to have a specific conference journal⁴

³ During the board meeting, the problem of non-paying members was addressed. How to cope with it? It was decided that in the future the participants in the workshop or the conference of a not-paid member have to pay, in addition to the registration fee, the normal subscription fee for the year.

- There will be a number of pre-conference workshops, the day before.

As soon as the outline is ready, it will be communicated to the board.

14 Approval of the financial statement

14.1 Financial Statements for 2001.

The treasurer presented draft Financial Statements for 2001.

The board confirmed its agreement to the payment of USD 650 to the Hong Kong Council for Academic Accreditation as a contribution towards the cost of the printed version of the Newsletter and approved the Financial Statement subject to the following amendments

- The UNESCO contribution to the support of those attending the 2001 conference, of USD 30,000, should be added to both expenditure and income.
- That the Network should pay the amount originally agreed, USD 2,597, for the work undertaken by the Secretary in connection with the survey.

14.2 Financial Projections for 2002

There was an error in the financial projections for 2002 for which the Treasurer apologised. The projections were withdrawn.

14.3 2002 Workshop

It was agreed that the University Council of Jamaica should be paid USD 15 per delegate up to a maximum of 66 delegates.

The board agreed the suggestion of Seamus Puirseil that INQAAHE should bear the costs of a social event for Ethley London's staff in recognition of all their hard work. The board believed that they had done a wonderful job and asked Ethley London to convey its gratitude.

14.4 Banking arrangements

The Treasurer reported that he had opened a dollar account at Citibank in order to provide a economical way of making payments to the beneficiaries of the Scholarship and Mentoring Fund.. This meant that the he now held three accounts on behalf of the network, there are two accounts in sterling, a current account and reserve account that pays a modest amount of interest. The sterling accounts are styled "Richard Lewis trading as INQAAHE" but unfortunately Citibank would not allow this style to be used and the dollar account is accordingly in the name of Richard Lewis.

⁴ Maria Jose checked this with Lee. He agrees that this is a good thing, but pointed out that in order to have a full issue of the Journal dedicated to the Conference, those papers that should be included in the Journal must be selected with enough time, so that the full texts are available at the Conference. Otherwise, the papers arrive at different times, and they end up being published in different issues.

15 Regulations of the applications for scholarship

It is decided that:

- David Woodhouse will develop a form for application for scholarship and also a text about the scholarship to put on the web.
- Richard Lewis will write a letter to the full members with a request for a donation for the scholarship fund. This will be done when sending out the subscriptions of 2003. Seamus Puirseil asked whether it could be phrased in such a way as that members who are not allowed to give donations can contribute too.

16 Activity plan 2003-2005

It was decided that an activity plan should be put to the members at the General Assembly in Dublin. The board members are asked to send suggestions and ideas for the activity plan to the President or secretary.

Some suggestions already made

- An evaluation/review of the functioning of the Network
- Publications, maybe also in co-operation with for example ENQA, about good practices
- Some support for research about the impact of QA on HE.

17 Any other business

Having no other business to discuss, the president thanked for the board members for their participation and input and closed the meeting at 18.00 hours.