

NAQA Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Date: February 9, 2021

Present: *Advisory Board members.* Tricia Bertram Gallant, Ian Welch, Irine Darchia, Jean-Hugues Chauchat, Lennart Ståhle, Olgun Cicek, Tomáš Foltýnek, Zbigniew Marciniak.

NAQA representative: Albina Tsiatkovska.

Excused: Alison Johns.

Agenda:

1. *Election of the moderator of the meeting.*

Olgun Cicek was elected to be a moderator of the meeting.

2. *Election of the Chair of NAQA Advisory Board.*

Lennart Ståhle asked what is expected from the Chair of the Advisory Board.

Ian Welch asked whether there is a rotating basis for the Chair of the Advisory Board.

Tomáš Foltýnek asked if the Chair is expected to put new issues to the agenda of the meetings and to be more proactive than other members?

Lennart Ståhle asked is the Chair expected to prepare the meetings and decide together with NAQA about the agenda?

Albina Tsiatkovska briefly informed everyone on the [Provisions on the NAQA Advisory Board](#) and the authority of the Chair of the Advisory Board.

Ian Welch and Lennart Ståhle were self-nominated.

All the present have unanimously voted to choose Ian Welch as the Chair of the Advisory Board.

All the present have unanimously voted to choose Lennart Ståhle as the Vice Chair of the Advisory Board.

3. *Discussing strategies to support NAQA for ENQA Full membership;*

Ian Welch expressed an opinion that it would be useful to know how far NAQA has got with ENQA membership.

Albina Tsiatkovska has updated the Advisory Board members on the steps that NAQA has made towards ENQA full membership.

Lennart Ståhle proposed that one of the questions for the next meeting is to discuss the SAR in detail after reading it before the next meeting; other questions should come from NAQA on the issues NAQA needs to receive the advisory support for going further on with the ENQA application; what are the most sensitive items that Advisory Board members are expected to look into.

4. Exploring new projects and collaboration opportunities for NAQA.

Olgun Cicek. Maybe it's time to think about what else we could introduce to NAQA as a new opportunity whether it's a project or collaboration opportunities, networking etc.

Tomáš Foltýnek proposed NAQA to become a member of European Network for Academic Integrity (ENAI). As NAQA is already a member of ICAI, ENAI membership will make sense. ENAI provides materials, support, advise, trainings, it's a possibility to make contacts with international experts, take part in conferences for ENAI members (next conference is in June, 2021, NAQA can take part).

Irine Darchia suggested affiliate membership in EUA-CDE (The European University Association-Council for Doctoral Education) – a very good platform for getting familiar with the development, challenges, achievements within the European doctoral education.

Lennart Ståhle spoke about NAQA institutional independence as a must criterion for ENQA membership. Proposed this issue to be discussed next meeting. Second question is doctoral education. This can also be discussed and see how far NAQA and Ukraine have proceeded in this matter. Lennart Ståhle is an expert in reforming the doctoral education in Sweden. It will be useful for NAQA if the Advisory Board members will bring experience from their countries.

Albina Tsiatkovska informed the Advisory Board members that NAQA took part in the independence survey conducted by SQAA and received the report. She will share the link on the report with the Advisory Board members.

5. Discussing agenda and possible dates for the next meeting.

The members decided to have the meetings on a monthly basis, preferable at the same day of the week; 3 pm GMT is suitable time for everyone; each member should allocate 2 hours' slot for the meeting (the duration of the meeting depends on

the amount of the question to be discussed and may be less than 2 hours).

The members will look through the Self-Assessment Report before the next meeting and leave their comments beforehand to make the meeting more efficient. **Albina Tsiatkovska** will share a document for members to leave their comments.

Jean-Hugues Chauchat. Given that there are differences in countries he proposed to talk about the basic terms (university, professor, PhD) to understand the meaning (content) of basics.

Albina Tsiatkovska pointed out that the SAR and NAQA 2019 Report contain a detailed description on the Ukraine higher education system. She will share the links on these documents. However, this could be discussed during next meetings.

Zbigniew Marciniak told that of course everyone needs to understand the basics, however ENQA and European accreditation agencies are very diversified and it is better to rather seek for substantial things than to look for differences. If the substance is pretty the same, then we can ignore the differences.

Tricia Bertram Gallant raised a question of existence of the conflict of interests as she works for ICAI and supports Ukraine.

Albina Tsiatkovska expressed an opinion that a conflict of interests is not applicable as the Advisory Board does not make any final decisions that bind NAQA. The role of the Advisory Board is to support, consult and express the expert opinions. However, she will follow this question to the NAQA Board.

Olgun Cicek agreed with Ian Welch and Tricia Bertram Gallant and summarised that NAQA Advisory Board should develop its own Terms of Reference (TOR) that should be approved by NAQA Board.

The members agreed to share the samples of TOR to use. Albina Tsiatkovska will upload the documents to the cloud.

Albina Tsiatkovska will make a general poll to choose the date of the meetings.

Next meeting:

- Date: TBC. A poll is sent to all Advisory Board members. (March 9-12).