



**GHENT  
UNIVERSITY**

Frederik De Decker  
Head International Relations Office

# THE IMPACT OF QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORKS ON UNIVERSITIES IN FLANDERS (BELGIUM)

ARMENQA CLOSING EVENT – YEREVAN – 17 MAY 2017





EST. 1817	11 FACULTIES	TOP 100 UNIVERSITY
57 BACHELOR PROGRAMMES	150 MASTER PROGRAMMES	50 ENGLISH TAUGHT PROGRAMMES
42.000 STUDENTS	2.800 EXCHANGES YEARLY	600 PHD'S YEARLY

# COMPREHENSIVE UNIVERSITY

PROGRAMMES AND  
EXCHANGE OPPORTUNITIES  
IN ALMOST ALL DISCIPLINES





Ghent: a genuine student city with +70,000 students  
in the heart of the European Union



# QUALIFICATIONS FRAMEWORKS IN FLANDERS

- In 2003 → “**Structural Decree**” (for higher education only)  
= kind of de facto QF for HE in Flanders (based on Dublin descriptors)  
→ validated in Nov-Dec 2008 (coordinated by NVAO)  
[based on the European “Bologna” Framework: QF for EHEA]
- In 2009 → “**Flemish Decree on the Qualification Structure**” (overarching framework , i.e. including HE)  
= Flemish Qualifications Structure  
[based on the European “Copenhagen” Framework: EQF for LLL]

# FLEMISH QUALIFICATIONS STRUCTURE

- FQS = 8 levels (cf. EQF for LLL), with level descriptors
- Level descriptors: described in terms of “competences” (for HE = learning outcomes)
  - Knowledge / Skills
  - Context / Autonomy / Responsibility
- The descriptors are:
  - Inclusive (all types of learning → including non/informal learning)
  - Cumulative (2= also 1; 3= also 2 and 1 etc.)
  - distinctive (focused at the differences between levels)
- Only essential characteristics have been included  
(hence: never attitudes because these can not be levelled)

## EXAMPLE: LEVEL 6 (“BACHELOR”)

FQS level	Level descriptor elements	
	Knowledge Skills	Context Autonomy Responsibility
<b>Level 6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– critically evaluating and combining knowledge and insights from a specific area</li><li>– applying complex specialised skills, linked to research results</li><li>– gathering and interpreting relevant data and making innovative use of selected methods and resources to solve non-familiar complex problems</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– acting in complex and specialised contexts</li><li>– functioning with complete autonomy and considerable initiative</li><li>– taking shared responsibility for the definition of collective results</li></ul>



## EXAMPLE: LEVEL 7 (“MASTER”)

FQS level	Level descriptor elements	
	Knowledge Skills	Context Autonomy Responsibility
<b>Level 7</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– integrating and reformulating knowledge and insights from a specific area or at the interface between different areas</li><li>– applying complex new skills, linked to autonomous, standardised research</li><li>– critically evaluating and applying complex, advanced and/or innovative problem-solving techniques and methods</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– acting in unpredictable, complex and specialised contexts</li><li>– functioning with complete autonomy and a right of decision</li><li>– taking final responsibility for the definition of collective outcomes</li></ul>



## PROCEDURE FOR UNIVERSITIES

- All universities together define *domain* specific (e.g. “communication studies”) learning outcomes → **“Domain Specific Reference Framework” (DSRF)**
- NVAO (Dutch-Flemish Accreditation Organisation) validates the descriptions → automatic recognition as qualification
- NVAO sends qualifications to Agency for QA in Education and Training (part of Ministry)

# CHARACTERISTICS OF DSRF

DSRF = generic but provides space for profiling by each university/university college:

- additional learning outcomes, compatible with the DSRF
- own approach to learning, teaching, assessment
- organisation of course modules
- design of course modules

→ A framework not a straitjacket!

## A LESSON LEARNED...

- Remember: 2 QF's (°2003 and °2009)
- A lot of work had already been done → each university has defined LO's for each discipline and each course unit/module [as the result of the Structural Decree; in the framework of the external quality assurance procedures;...]
- But.. outside a framework; based on different methodologies

# DSRF PROCEDURE (1)

- Procedure coordinated by VLIR (Rectors Conference) & VLHORA (Flemish Board of University Colleges)
- Universities/University colleges that propose a similar programme → develop a set of 12-15 learning outcomes
- Each set of learning outcomes → has to be linked to generic level descriptors (level 6 or 7)
- In line with the Dublin descriptors and with the Flemish, Belgian and international regulations about access to a profession
- **Does not lead to common programmes or course units!**

## DSRF PROCEDURE (2)

### Elements of the “Learning Outcomes File”

- Name of the Qualification
- Programme level and type
- Institutions offering the programme
- Relevant legislation
- Admission requirements
- Further study possibilities in the field
- Sources of information
- ... **and of course the learning outcomes**

## DSRF PROCEDURE (2)

- Phase 1: Introductory meeting
- Phase 2: Development of a proposal by a Task force
  - 1 person per institution per discipline (ownership!) + 1 “project guide” (Conny/Isabelle)
  - Consultation of colleagues inside HEI
  - Based on an agreed methodology (with elements of Tuning, EUA Bologna Handbook, Core2,...)
- Phase 3: Tuning the proposal by a consultation group
- Phase 4: The stakeholder check
  - The proposal is checked with stakeholder representatives for compliance with scientific & societal expectations and international standards
  - Stakeholders include students/recent graduates, field representatives, domain specific experts (academics), (former) members of evaluation committees,...
- Phase 5: Settling the framework
- Phase 6: Validation by NVAO

# CONCLUSIONS



## SOME CONCLUSIONS

- The procedure
  - is time consuming ( $\simeq$  money!)
  - requires input from different stakeholders
- But:
  - generates quality
  - assures ownership
  - guarantees broad support
  - creates a lot of **added value**
    - At different levels

## ADDED VALUE AT HE-SYSTEM LEVEL

- Stimulates auto-regulation of the field
- Creates transparency
- Enhances communication with students & employers
- Allows to detect similarities and differences between programmes
- Creates both stability and dynamism
- Offers a base for recognition of prior learning at programme level
- Offers a base for international recognition

# ADDED VALUE FOR THE UNIVERSITIES

- Creates ownership of curriculum development
- Offers a good basis for internal and external quality assurance
- Facilitates communication with external stakeholders
- Facilitates international cooperation (LO = basis of a common language)
- Allows for regulatory initiatives
- Creates profiling opportunities
- Puts the focus on the *real* implementation of LO-based education!

## POINTS OF DISCUSSION (IN ARMENIA?)

- Is there a danger for bureaucratisation?
- Is it worth the investment?
- Is there a danger for uniformity in the field?  
Do institutions still have the chance to profile themselves?
- Is it useful for the labour market and for students?
- Does it work for recognition purposes?
- How to cluster the disciplines?
- New programmes → 1 institution decides? Is this a sufficient basis?
- How to go from the programme to the course modules?
  - Is the whole more than the sum of the parts?
  - What can be done for course modules present in different programmes?

[www.ugent.be](http://www.ugent.be)



Universiteit Gent



@ugent @FrederikDD



[instagram.com/ugent](https://www.instagram.com/ugent)



Ghent University

[Frederik.DeDecker@UGent.be](mailto:Frederik.DeDecker@UGent.be)



Co-funded by the  
Tempus Programme  
of the European Union