

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE IOB MANAGEMENT CONTRACT - 2019 SELF-EVALUATION

This document is a model of self-evaluation that the evaluation committee must allow in order to verify in a structured manner how the IOB has implemented the provisions of the management agreement. The questions listed with the different items are not normative. It is certainly not the intention to reply punctually to this, they have been added as an illustration.

In completing this self-assessment, it is important that you check how strongly a certain topic is integrated into the functioning of the IOB. We see this on 4 levels:

- Is there a planning around the specific item?
- Is this planning actively used in practice?
- Is there a structural assessment of the effects of a particular measure?
- Have any adjustments been made on the basis of this evaluation?

Provide a short description for each topic (maximum 10 lines). Refer to the necessary documentation where this is substantiated. If necessary, indicate who can explain this during the visit of the evaluation committee.

You also give a score for each topic. The scale used is next:

0: non-existent	Within the organization there is little or no planning around the specific item. There is no structural assessment of the effects of a particular measure.
1: ad hoc basis	The work is mainly ad hoc. Awareness of the need for an adequate approach is growing, but is not yet structured or standardized. The approach that exists revolves more around people than systems.
2: structured approach	The development of an approach for this item and its structural evaluation is initiated in a structured way. The planning is under development, but has not yet been implemented. ('plan')
3: defined	A planning around this topic is in place. It is standardized, documented, communicated and applied. ('do')
4: controlled system	The approach is periodically evaluated and adjusted internally. A 'living' adequate and effective system of planning and evaluation for this topic can be discussed. ('check & act')
5: Optimized	The planning and evaluation of this topic are constantly being optimised through benchmarking and the obtaining of quality certificates or external evaluations. ("PDCA")

The score given must be regarded as indicative of the specific item being scored. It is not the intention that individual scores are mathematically proportional to the overall evaluation or the evaluation of structural elements of the management agreement.

If there are points in this self-evaluation that have recently been discussed in other evaluations, reviews, etc., it suffices to refer to them and to attach the necessary documents.

This self-assessment does not preclude you from providing a general descriptive evaluation in addition to this document. If necessary, you can also refer to the appropriate pages of this descriptive evaluation in the present document.

When this document was drawn up, the management agreement was gone through from a to z, so the items are dealt with in that order. For the quality assurance section, however, we would like to ask you to group the answers under point 2. *Policy plan and quality assurance*. In addition to the items covered in the management agreement, we have added a point 3, in which we gauge the existence of a personnel policy plan.

1. CORE TASKS OF THE IOB

Within the framework of this agreement, IOB's core mission is to provide post-initial education, carry out scientific research and provide scientific services on the economic, political and social aspects of development policy and management, including the preparation of doctoral dissertations with a view to obtaining a doctoral degree at a Flemish or foreign university.

1.0 LOOKING BACK

For the 'IOB Core Contract' section, give a retrospective view of the period of the current management agreement. Please also indicate what happened to the recommendations of the previous evaluation in so far as they relate to this section.

The content and quality of our education programmes have been further developed and consolidated for the core task of **'education'**. Taking into account the recommendations of the previous evaluation, a strong effort was made to strengthen our international networking, in particular through the internationalisation of educational cooperation in the experimental "IOB Going Global" programme and through the deepening of alumni work. Within IOB Going Global, South-South-North exchange was made possible around the Philippine Community Based Monitoring System approach. In addition, IOB organised short specific educational initiatives, which are more widely articulated with the alumni and partner organisations than in the past. In line with the tradition of cooperation with South partners and interactive cooperation with students and alumni, a future with a less North-centred, 'de-colonialised' global IOB is being built. In this way, education is also explicitly seen as a lever of our outreach strategy.

An updated policy plan 2017-2022 has been drawn up for the core task of **'research'**. This builds on the earlier reform of tight thematic groups towards looser research lines, which was evaluated as very positive. It confirmed and explained the committed mission and policy-oriented, multi-level and mixed-method approach of IOB research in the context of complex political arenas of development. The emphasis was also on the substantive renewal of IOB's research focus. Here too, in line with the recommendations of the previous evaluation (and the external research audit of the UAntwerp), efforts were made for further internationalisation, mainly through 'cooperation and benefit sharing with South Partners' and through active participation in the reformed Central Africa policy platform CRE-AC. Internationalisation is also reflected in increased funding from non-traditional international sources, also as a consortium with our southern partners. In this context, the AAP policy was also adapted, particularly with regard to filling vacancies (research lines) and guaranteeing clear guidance.

In line with the recommendations, a great deal of attention was also paid to our **social impact**:

- The policy-oriented character of the IOB research is assumed to be essential;
- publications and initiatives for a non-academic audience are encouraged;
- investments were made in a review by IDS Sussex, and in a day of reflection (in cooperation with CERES, Amsterdam) as the first steps towards a more strategic approach;
- a communications officer was recruited;
- our academic collaboration with partners was confirmed;
- Our option for policy research/consultancy for development actors was confirmed;
- the social impact through our education was underlined and expanded (through alumni, teaching contributions at the University of Antwerp - supported by the 'Global Minds' programme (including the offer of the 'Global Justice' basket subject under IOB responsibility as one of the eight courses from the compulsory package for all UAntwerp bachelor's students).

Recently, additional steps have been taken to further clarify the (individual and institutional) outreach strategies, for example by means of a detailed matrix of outreach criteria and an attempt to describe generic impact processes per outreach category.

Finally, the above also increasingly took into account the **workability** of the individual assignments for the IOB employees in the form of a policy of **'sustainable excellence'**. The institutional option for quality over quantity

was recently translated into adapted individual evaluation matrices for research and outreach. The possibility was also created to propose a temporary reduction of the assignment in a flexible way and the possibility of offering mini sabbaticals is being investigated. Within the new AAP policy, we hope to achieve an active anti-stress policy thanks to clearer expectations and agreements (e.g. on the content and supervision of the doctorate).

1.1 GENERAL

1.1.1 INTERACTION

The IOB will seek a demonstrable interaction between its three core tasks. (BO, 2.1)

- *Describe the interaction between the three core tasks.*
- *How does the IOB take into account the interaction between the three core tasks in its assignment and mission?*

Explanation

As in the past, IOB education has focused on the formation of 'better development frameworks' and is largely based on relevant policy-oriented research in the context of the complex political arenas of development. The research agenda (including PhDs) is regularly updated in function of new questions and needs, detected by ZAP and/or signalled when surveying our students and alumni. The research underpins and/or in some cases is directly linked to scientific services (policy support and advice, evaluation and monitoring, public debate, teaching and animation at UAntwerp, partner action, support for spin-off, etc.). Part of the scientific research is carried out in collaboration with South partners, almost always linked to concrete policy themes or development interventions. Within the framework of the 'IOB Going Global' programme, these **research partners are now also becoming education partners**, via

- (joint) IOB education in the South,
- student mobility in which IOB students participate in ongoing research with the partners or carry out their own thesis research, often through twinning with local students,
- South participation in the IOB-Masters in Antwerp (guest lecturers).

The interaction between education, research and outreach will be further enhanced through increased cooperation with the **alumni**. The fund for the valorisation of excellent dissertations by means of joint publications promoter/student remains an incentive here. Through the alumni network and even more through the recent support of specific initiatives (e.g. evaluation workshops), we not only strengthen the careers of our former students, but we also increase the social impact that we help to achieve through our alumni network. Alumni and especially alumni from our academic South partners are also an important target group for IOB PhDs (whether or not linked to jointly acquired research funding). In addition, our strengthened educational embedding at UAntwerp also ensures a greater social impact of the IOB expertise through the formation of bachelor and master students.

This triad of education-policy oriented research-societal outreach was strengthened by making the **mission statement** of IOB more explicit: With all its activities, IOB wants to contribute to a 'just and sustainable world' within the complex political arenas of development. In view of the inevitable political nature of this objective, there are of course divergent opinions on this subject within IOB, but within the framework of a 'multidisciplinary-mixed methods' institute, this precisely strengthens the quality of the academic work and debate.

In the further simplified management structure, this coherence is monitored by the Council, the OWC, the OZC and the Doctoral Committee via the recruitment policy and via monitoring and evaluation. The Agency translates the institutional policy into the annual target discussions with the staff. At the decree-determined times or following promotions, the ZAP is also evaluated by the Institutional Evaluation Commission (IEC) and/or the Commission for Academic Promotion (CAP).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- Draftnota "Outreach Principles & Action Plan" (map 3.3.)
- Evaluation criteria ZAP (ZAP Job profile IOB and evaluation grid approved 18 January 2013) (map 5.1.2.)
- AAP Policy Note "2018.12.14_IOB AAP Policy_na_Council" (folder 5.2.1.)
- Procedure for the valorisation of theses (Art. 5 Appendix to the Organic Regulations) (folder 4.1.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry/PhD Committee (M. Verpoorten)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

1.2 EDUCATION

1.2.1 EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMES - FOLLOWING DECREES

In the education offered, IOB follows the provisions of the Higher Education Code, which have been declared applicable to the Institute. IOB explicates and justifies possible deviations in the policy plans and/or annual reports. (BO 2.2.1)

- Does the IOB deviate from the decree provisions in its educational programmes?
- If so, what are the reasons for this?

Explanation

In Flanders, higher education is regulated by the so-called **Higher Education Codex** (in full: "Decree of the Flemish Government to codify the decree provisions concerning higher education"). It consists of 6 parts and contains the binding decrees to which UAntwerp and therefore also IOB are subject. IOB is in line with all provisions.

IOB also follows the Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER) of the UAntwerp. Sometimes IOB deviates from the standard rules within UAntwerp, but it always remains within the framework of the decree. For example, IOB starts with an introductory week that precedes the official start of the academic year of UAntwerp.

The language of instruction is English, which is permitted by Chapter 3, Art. 51 of the 'Decree on the Integration of Academic Higher Education Courses in the Universities'. The registration fee remains below the maximum allowed amount of 5,400 euros (Art. II. 2013 §3 Higher Education Codex).

IOB therefore follows in its education the provisions of the decrees declared applicable to the Institute. IOB has a thoroughly developed system of quality control of education that meets the UAntwerp conditions. The Department of Education of UAntwerp is monitoring this in a six-year quality assurance cycle (see detailed below, points 2.2.1. and 2.2.3.).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER) of UAntwerpen (folder 1.1.1.)
- Codex Higher Education (<https://data-onderwijs.vlaanderen.be/edulex/document.aspx?docid=14650>)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Department of Education UAntwerp (B. Roseaux)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

1.2.2 NUMBER OF BENEFITS

The UA undertakes, on average over a period of five years, to provide the following services on an annual basis:

- Issue at least 45 graduation diplomas in the programmes that the IOB is entitled to offer within the UA,
 - Have at least two new students start their doctoral work at IOB with a view to further developing the knowledge and expertise of IOB as laid down in its policy plan, or partly at another university with the same perspective. (BO, 2.2.2)
- *Will the IOB achieve its intended performance?*
– *If not, what is the cause of this?*

Explanation

IOB achieves the desired performance on both counts.

- Over the past five years (2014 to 2018), it delivered an average of 61 final diplomas on an annual basis in the 3 Masters.
- On 1 January 2019, IOB had 33 PhD students, 23 of whom had an international profile (including 15 from the 'Globale Zuiden'). Over the past five years (2014-2018), an average of 5.2 new students started their doctoral work on an annual basis and an average of 4.8 PhDs were successfully completed. The annual outflow of PhD students is limited to 2 per year (10 in total, of which 1 due to lack of funding, 5 for personal reasons and 4 due to their failure in the compulsory doctoral study programme).

The outflow and educational returns are also part of the **NVAO accreditation**.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Number of degrees awarded and PhD tracks started: see Annual Reports IOB (map 6.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Educational achievements: chairman Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Master programmes: programme director Master programmes (S. Vandeginste)
- Doctoral studies achievements: Chairman of the Doctoral Commission (M. Verpoorten)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach

- ☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

1.2.3 ADDED VALUE AND COOPERATION

In its education, IOB strives for Flemish, Belgian and international added value and cooperation, as well as demonstrable interaction with research and services. (BO, 2.2.2)

- *How does the IOB achieve Flemish, Belgian and international added value in the field of education?*

Explanation

IOB continues to succeed in creating added value both nationally and internationally through its educational offering. Since the last major revision of the curriculum, the three IOB advanced Master programmes have focused strongly on the **nexus of education-research-outreach/service provision**. The thematic modules II and III and, of course, the master dissertation (module IV) are closely linked to the research carried out at IOB. Students who delivered an excellent thesis can appeal to the encouragement fund to turn their thesis into a publication. To date, this has led to 15 peer-reviewed publications.

The modular approach to education in which "subjects" consist of different units and sub-units makes it possible to implement changes in the programme without having to set heavy administrative processes in motion. This makes it possible to respond to **important international trends** and to ensure that education is **properly linked to the current research/services** and to create lasting added value. Over the years, **new topics** have been added to the programme, such as

- unit 'Culture, Agency and Development' binnen het vak 'Theories of Development';
- unit 'Analysing Text and Discourse in Development' binnen 'Research Methods II';
- units 'Global Environment-Development Nexus' en 'Global Organisation of Production: Value Chains and Labour' binnen de module 'Globalization';
- unit 'Community Based Monitoring' binnen de module 'Local Institutions and Poverty Reduction' en
- unit 'Sustainable Development, Climate Finance and Greening of Aid' binnen de module 'National Institutions, Poverty Reduction Strategies and Aid'.

Furthermore, since the 2018-2019 academic year, the "Evaluating Development Effectiveness" module has been experimenting with **action labs** in which students can apply specific evaluation methods in cases (and critically reflect on them), which increases the link with the professional field.

Since the previous visitation/evaluation, the focus on **internationalisation** has been even stronger (see also 1.5.2.) and especially the **alumni effect** has been further explored, which highlights the **added value of IOB** even more and also provides extra links with **research & services**.

The section on **internationalisation** is further explored through the **incremental funding project** (see also 1.5.2) and gives, for example, IOB students the opportunity to do fieldwork for their thesis at partner institutions in the south or to apply research methods in the field (**'mobility window'**) **within the framework** of the subject 'Research Methods II'. Both forms of **student mobility focus on the nexus education-research-services**.

Since the previous review, **alumni work** has also been deepened (see also 1.2.7 and 2.2.3) and here too, the focus is on nexus education-research-service provision:

- IOB alumni appear to play an important role in the internationalisation of IOB research. In 2018, for example, 44% of IOB's publications were with a southern author with an alumnus/a.
- In 2018 the **alumni barometer impact research** was started. This multi-year study (2018-2021) studies the impact of IOB educational programmes on knowledge, skills, attitudes and networks and the pathways through which this can or cannot be achieved. The research is done **together with alumni teams from 5 different countries** (Philippines, Nicaragua, Uganda, Tanzania, Vietnam). The research will not only provide input to keep our programmes further up to date, but will also **refresh the research/evaluation skills of the alumni** (capacity building), strengthen the links between IOB and the alumni and provide tools for alumni policy of the institutions where some of the alumni are employed (in all country teams there are alumni who are connected to an academic institution).
- In order to increase the link with the field of work, since the 2017-2018 academic year, investments have also been made in a package of **'Life after IOB' activities**. The package consists of a number of skill workshops to facilitate the valorisation of what they learned (*workshop "how to write a policy letter"*, *workshop "how to make a video"*) and a number of workshops to facilitate the transition to the professional field (such as individual CV screening sessions, visit to European development Days, Dive into PhD information session) as well as an offer to *broker* between IOB students and possible internships, both in the North and the South.

- **Different communication channels** with the alumni community also allow the sharing of IOB research (both by IOB researchers and alumni), to inform alumni, to stay in touch with them and also to stimulate networks among alumni. The various communication channels include: an alumni magazine 'Exchange to change' that appears three times a year and in which there is plenty of room for IOB (alumni) research, Facebook alumni groups (per batch and for the entire alumni community), IOB website, electronic newsletter, Facebook page, LinkedIn and Twitter. These channels are used to inform alumni and a wider audience about events, share news and opportunities linked to IOB or other related initiatives.
- IOB organises various types of **alumni activities**, focusing on exchanges between staff, alumni and even other development actors. Since the previous visit, several **alumni seminars** have been organised in the South, respectively in Uganda (2014 and 2017), Tanzania (2017 & 2018 at Mzumbe University) and the Philippines (2018 with De La Salle University (DLSU)). During an alumni seminar the work of both alumni and IOB staff is often presented, which offers the opportunity for alumni, IOB staff and other (Belgian) development partners to get to know each other's work better and thus to stimulate possible synergies between the different actors. Sometimes 'refresher' workshops are also offered as a result of these seminars. In addition to the more substantive alumni seminars, several more informal **meet and greet sessions** are organised in different countries in the South (Nicaragua, Burundi, Rwanda, Peru, Vietnam). IOB also organises one or more **'Alumni in action' lectures** each year, in which an alumnus/a is invited to share his/her expertise and experience in the field with current IOB students. Finally, IOB 2018 closed with its fifth edition of the **IOB Alumni Impact seminar**. During this seminar, three alumni were awarded the 'IOB impact award' for their contribution to development. The laureates were selected from around thirty candidates following an open call among all IOB alumni. The laureates presented their work to IOB staff, students and other alumni (livestream) while nine other selected alumni presented their work at a poster reception. One of the laureates also presented his work (in the Bolivian delegation to the United Nations Security Council) at the celebration of 20 years of VLIR university development cooperation.
- Since the previous visit, IOB has also invested in the start-up of **local alumni chapters** in a number of 'alumni core countries' such as Tanzania, Nicaragua, Uganda, the Philippines and Ethiopia.

In addition to the IOB Master's programmes, IOB also continues to actively invest in **additional educational initiatives**, in cooperation with national and international partners. These initiatives are situated at different levels:

- IOB provides substantial input into the **UAntwerpen range of education**, further strengthening the ties with the UA and faculties, and making IOB better known to the average UAntwerp student. Several **IOB staff members teach courses at faculties** such as **FSW, BE, Biology/IMDO** (e.g. Topics in Development Studies, International Finance, Political Economy of Development, Sustainable Development) or in **inter-university masters** (e.g. Master Gender and Diversity, Master Global Health) or **short-term programmes** (ITP Sustainable Development and Global Justice). As of the academic year 2019-2020, IOB will also offer the only English-language subject ("Global Justice") in the compulsory **UAntwerp basket of broader subjects** open to all UAntwerp students and will be involved in the optional subject on sustainable development. Within this same framework, IOB (together with USOS) also organises the **Debating Development** elective, a series of debates that are followed annually by an average of 80 UA students, with an average of 300 to 500 UA students attending at least one debate.
- Based on the specific expertise of IOB and within the framework of the **IOB Going Global initiative** (see above and below under 1.5.2), education is also provided in **various local master's programmes and other programmes**, including those in DR Congo, Tanzania, Nicaragua and Uganda.
- Each year, IOB also provides a course and thesis guidance (with fieldwork) in the **European Microfinance Program** in Brussels, linked to the expertise of IOB and its Nicaraguan partner institution with regard to rural microfinance from the Fondo de Desarrollo Local;
- IOB staff also provides lessons on a regular basis in the PhD program CSG (Research in Social Science and Management)-Lisbon and the Master of Science in Sustainable Development (KUL);
- In 2018 and 2019, the **Special Evaluation Service** of the Belgian Development Cooperation (IOB) is jointly organising an **Evaluation Capacity Building seminar** in which 20 evaluators (from partner countries) exchange information intensively over a period of 2 weeks and are trained in evaluation methods, evaluation systems and elements of organisational development. Through this initiative, IOB also maintains the link with the evaluation community both in Belgium and internationally.

In Flanders, the IOB **doctoral training** in multidisciplinary development studies is unique. In an international perspective, the doctoral degree programme has a clear added value due to its strict adherence to our specific research agenda (e.g. Central Africa, impact of liberalisation on poverty, the aid debate, social and environmental sustainability and local institutions) and the long-term institutional partnerships of IOB (e.g. in Nicaragua, DR Congo). The doctorates always show thorough and thorough empirical research, usually with extensive field research in the South.

An important added value is undoubtedly the high number of successful **PhD students from the South** (despite the difficulty of finding suitable funding).
The IOB PhD has also succeeded in building up a **high quality** reputation in the short term, not only through the general UAntwerp quality assurance guidelines, but also through specific IOB requirements such as

- the compulsory study programme during the first year (a priori quality check),
- the need for publication of at least one international peer-reviewed article, and
- the presentation of the research in a doctoral seminar.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- IOB Going Global (Folder 1.1.7)
- Alumni policy (folder 1.3.)
- Evaluatie Debating Development (map 1.1.8.)
- Evaluatie seminarie Evaluation Capacity Building (map 1.1.9.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Doctoral Commission (M. Verpoorten)
- AAP representative Doctoral committee (C. Vet)
- Staff member Alumni/UFOO (S. Dewachter)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

1.2.4 QUALITY ASSURANCE

The UA, together with the IOB, ensures the quality control of education, according to a system that is adapted to the mission of the IOB but allows for domestic and international comparison. (BO, 2.2.2)

- *How is the quality of education monitored?*
- *Is there (international) benchmarking with other, similar courses?*
- *What are the concrete results of quality assurance?*

The answer to this question may be included under point "2. Policy plan and quality assurance".

1.2.5 QUALITY OF STUDENT INTAKE

IOB monitors the quality of the student intake itself and determines the selection criteria and the way in which it will carry out the selection. Any professional experience, skills, previous education and motivation of the students are important selection criteria. The share of foreign students must be at least 50% of the total. (BO, 2.2.3)

- *What are the selection criteria used by the IOB and how are candidate students selected?*
- *Are the guiding selection criteria respected?*
- *Does the student population consist of at least 50% foreign students?*
- *If the proportion of foreign students is not reached, what is the reason for this? What action is being taken to achieve this?*

Explanation

The selection of candidates is based on **5 selection criteria**:

1. background certificate (discipline),

2. the results obtained and the quality of the studies,
3. professional experience,
4. motivation and
5. matching (the extent to which the candidate's expectations correspond to the content of the Master's programme).

Files are assessed according to the assessment sheet by a **committee composed of the academic staff involved in the chosen Master and track**. The selection criteria are described in detail in the evaluation sheet with a corresponding evaluation score. A briefing on the selection criteria will be organised for new members of staff. When selecting the fellows, the results of the individual selections of candidate fellows are compiled and discussed collectively in selection groups per track; this annual process contributes to a uniform interpretation and application of the criteria.

Until the 2018-2019 academic year, an equal weighting was given to the 5 aforementioned criteria. However, in 2018, a quantitative analysis of past dossiers showed that some criteria are more strongly correlated with students' chances of success than others (see also appendix DPAC analysis). As a result, a variable weighting was given to the 5 criteria for the selection for the academic year 2019-2020:

- Background certificate: 10%.
- Results achieved and quality of studies: 25%.
- professional experience: 20%
- motivation: 20%
- matching: 20%

Since 2019, the submission of applications has been completely online.

Candidates with an English test score that is too low, but at least acceptable, can be admitted to the Master's programme if they successfully follow an **intensive English course** (offered by IOB via Linguapolis) prior to the start of the Master's programme. During Module I, additional English language lessons are offered to students who did not score enough on the obligatory English language test that students have to take at the beginning of the academic year.

The **proportion of foreign students has averaged 94% on an annual basis** over the past five years. In recent years, IOB has made an effort to attract relatively more Belgian (and European) students (e.g. by opting for a mobility window at our South partners and for more promotion at sister faculties); for the time being, this has not been a clear success. For the time being, IOB has succeeded in safeguarding access for students from the least developed countries and at the same time in attracting a larger group of non-scholarship students from the South.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Selection procedure (document 'Selection of applicants 2019-2020') and profile of IOB Master students (folder 1.1.3.)
- Reports IOB Education Committee (OWC) (folder 1.1.10.)
- DPAC: analysis of the experiment (map 1.1.3.)

Contact person

- Staff member student secretariat (G. Annaert)
- Programme Director (S. Vandeginste)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☐ 3: defined
- ☐ 4: controlled system
- ☒ 5: Optimized

1.2.6 APPROVAL OF NON-MASTERS

Post-initial education is primarily open to people who already have a Master's degree. Persons who do not have a Master's degree can be admitted, if the application file shows that the university studies followed, the

duration and results obtained, the nature of the professional experience and the motivation of the student offer guarantees for successful participation. (BO, 2.2.3)

- *How does the IOB check in the application file that the student can successfully participate in the programme? Has a procedure been developed for this?*

Explanation

We refer to the **extensive selection criteria and selection procedure as discussed in section 1.2.5.**

Candidates must hold a Master's degree in development studies or in a similar discipline. Candidates with at least a 4-year Bachelor's degree are not automatically excluded, but they must demonstrate on the basis of the curriculum of their Bachelor's programme that they have followed sufficient research-related subjects and/or have attended relevant additional courses or programmes and/or have highly relevant work experience.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Selection procedure (document 'Selection of applicants 2019-2020') and profile of IOB Master students (folder 1.1.3.)

Contacts:

- Staff member student secretariat (G. Annaert)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☐ 3: defined
- ☒ 4: controlled system
- ☐ 5: Optimized

1.2.7 REGULATIONS

IOB lays down the organisation of education in general and course-specific regulations. These regulations include at least:

- the training programme
- the education and examination regulations, including an internal appeal procedure
- the size and final attainment levels of the course units
- the eligibility conditions and selection criteria
- the cost
- the types of education, work and examination used
- the diplomas and certificates awarded.

IOB provides these internal regulations as information to the candidate students. (BO, 2.2.4)

- *Are these regulations available to (candidate) students? How are they made available?*
- *How are these regulations drawn up? Is there a participation of students?*
- *Have there been any changes to these regulations in the past?*

Explanation

Information on the programme, costs and diplomas is provided to applicants through the **brochures** and the IOB website.

The **Education and Examination Regulations** (OER), including an internal appeal procedure, are laid down annually in the UAntwerp Education Council, in which the UAntwerp students are also represented. There is an English translation of the Education and Examination Regulations (OER). As far as IOB is concerned, the participation of students takes place indirectly via the feedback that students give via the calibrated evaluation instruments that are at the disposal of the students (surveys and focus group discussions), via the

representation of the students in the Education Committee and the IOB Council and via the alumni surveys (see below and further in points 1.2.8 and 2.2.3.).

At the start of the academic year, IOB students receive information on general and course-specific elements via the **Academic Survival Guide (ASG)**. The ASG bundles information about the educational programmes, academic research, library, rules for citation and referral, the master's thesis, exams, student participation, code of conduct and IOB staff. This document is updated annually before the start of the academic year on the basis of input/feedback collected throughout the academic year.

The ASG will also be supplemented by course information sheets in which **detailed information** is provided for each subject regarding the training programme, the intended learning outcomes, education, work and examination forms. These are available before the start of the course and also via BlackBoard. The course information sheets are drawn up by the team of teachers who are responsible for a course (and under the supervision of the course coordinator). They are updated annually on the basis of the **feedback sheets** compiled by the CIKO (quality assurance officer for education), in which all evaluative input is bundled (information from the written student evaluations, from focus group interviews), supplemented by the instructor's own experience. Via the feedback sheets, the **input/feedback of the students is integrated**, and the students also have a representation in the IOB **Education Committee** and in the IOB Council. In order to further increase the input of the students, it was decided at the end of the academic year 2018-2019 to also invite the student representatives to the "small OWC" (= consultation of educational staff in preparation of the Education Committee).

Another important source of input are the **alumni surveys**. Every 4 to 5 years (2010-2014-2019) a comprehensive alumni survey is carried out in which all alumni (since 2000) are questioned about the IOB training, in particular the quality, relevance to the professional career of alumni and the provision of alumni services. In the survey, the alumni indicate to what extent they have built up new knowledge, skills, attitudes and networks during their IOB study, as well as to what extent they have indeed acquired the 'learning competences' proposed by IOB. As of 2019, **recent graduates will** also be questioned about nine months after graduation, while the **employers** of the graduates will also be questioned. By **triangulating these three evaluation instruments**, we aim to gain a sufficient insight into which knowledge, skills, networks and attitudes our IOB students acquire and whether they are still relevant in the professional development sector.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Brochure Masterprogrammes IOB 2019-2020 (Folder 1.1.4.)
- Academic Survival Guide (map 1.1.2.)
- Course information sheets (folder 1.1.6.)
- Website IOB:
 - www.uantwerpen.be/en/about-uantwerp/faculties/institute-of-development-policy/development-studies/master-development-studies/
 - www.uantwerpen.be/en/study/education-and-training/master-development-evaluation/profile/
 - www.uantwerpen.be/en/study/education-and-training/master-globalisation-development/profile/
 - www.uantwerpen.be/en/study/education-and-training/master-governance-development/profile/
- Website design:
 - Education and Examination Regulations (OER): www.uantwerpen.be/nl/studeren/voorbereiding-advies-studiekeuze/studieloopbaan/onderwijs-examenreglement/

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Quality of education officer (CIKO, M. Scheldeman)
- Programme Director (S. Vandeginste)
- Staff member Student Secretariat (G. Annaert)
- Alumni/UFOO (S. Dewachter) Staff member

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach

- ☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

1.2.8 LEGAL STATUS REGULATION

IOB applies the legal status regulations for UAntwerp students, which set out the mutual rights and obligations of the board and the students and the consequences of non-compliance. IOB also draws up internal regulations for the way in which students participate in the policy. (BO, 2.2.4)

- Have these regulations been drawn up?
- Are they regularly evaluated?
- Will the results of such an evaluation be taken into account?
- How does the process of student participation work?

Explanation

With regard to the rights and obligations of students and the internal **appeal procedures**, IOB follows the provisions of the Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER) of UAntwerp. In implementation of these regulations, the IOB determines who the **ombudspersons** are at the start of the academic year and notifies the students of this decision.

The OER are **evaluated** annually at UAntwerp level. With regard to the participation of students, we refer to the previous point 1.2.7. and to the IOB Organic Regulations, which lay down the representation of students within the official bodies. The students are also **represented** by two votes **in the IOB Council and in the Education Committee**.

The **student committee** is elected during the kick-off weekend in October. A week and a half before this teambuilding weekend, students can submit their candidacy for the various positions of the student committee (chairman, class representative, secretary, student representatives). During the kick-off weekend they will campaign and at the end of this weekend the various functions will be filled in via voting (with forms).

Students are informed of all regulations and rights and obligations through the **Academic Survival Guide** and the **Code of Conduct** (see 1.2.7). Based on the observation that communication in a very diverse group of students poses many challenges, a working group on "**everyday diplomacy**" was set up about two years ago. This led to the development of an 'intercultural awareness' trajectory, consisting of a.o. a workshop 'everyday diplomacy' during/just after the kick-off weekend, the drawing up of a **charter** (kind of mini code of conduct) and a number of sessions throughout the year. The drawing up of the charter is a **participatory process** that will be **repeated** every academic year with a new group of students.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER) of UAntwerpen (folder 1.1.1.)
- Academic Survival Guide (map 1.1.2.)
- Code of Conduct (Chapter 13 of the ASG + charter) (Folder 1.1.2.)
- Organic Regulations IOB (folder 4.1.)

Contacts:

- Staff member student secretariat (G. Annaert)
- Quality of education officer/CIKO (M. Scheldeman)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

1.2.9 STUDENT MIRRORS

The UA takes measures to ensure that the level of registration fees does not constitute a threshold for students from less well-off socio-economic groups. The UA provides scholarships or student loans if necessary. (BO, 2.2.5)

- *What measures is the UA taking to ensure that the level of tuition fees does not constitute a threshold for students from financially weaker socio-economic groups?*

Explanation

The **registration fee** amounts to **1,550 euros** (€ 350 + € 20/ECTS).

Students from OECD-DAC Least Developed Countries, Low Income Countries and Lower Middle Income Countries living in their country of origin at the time of application receive a **reduction and pay €830** (€350 + €8/ECTS). VLIR-UOS and BTC/Enabel fell into the latter category but their enrolment fee was covered by the scholarship.

Other scholarships pay 5,000 euros, but they can get a reduction if there is an agreement between IOB and the scholarship provider.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Website IOB: www.uantwerpen.be/en/about-uantwerp/faculties/institute-of-development-policy/development-studies/master-development-studies/application/
- Reports IOB Education Committee (folder 1.1.10.)
- Reported Board IOB (Folder 4.5.)

Contact person:

- Staff member student secretariat (G. Annaert)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

1.3 RESEARCH

1.3.1 POLICY PLAN

IOB records the themes and disciplines of its research in its policy plan. (BO, 2.3)

- *How is research policy formulated?*
- *How are decisions made about research lines?*
- *How is the achievement of the objectives monitored?*
- *How is research integrated into the workload of staff?*

Explanation

IOB uses external evaluations to develop and adjust its **research policy**. The current cycle is based on the evaluation for the Flemish government in June 2015 and the research audit for UAntwerp in June 2016. On this basis, a specific research policy plan was drawn up through a participatory process and approved in June 2017 ("*Research Strategy 2017-22. Development Processes, Actors and Policies*").

This plan has already been **evaluated** (*Short-term follow-up Research Evaluation. Faculty of Business and Economics and the Institute of Development Policy (IOB)*) and approved by the UAntwerp Research Council in May 2019.

After an initial **benchmark study** realised in January 2015, IOB made a new benchmark study in 2018 in which the publication output for the period 2013-17 is compared with 10 similar European institutes.

The **research lines** were reduced from four to three lines:

- (1) Environment and Sustainable Development;
- (2) Global Governance and Inclusive Development;
- (3) State Formation and Resilient Societies.

The research lines still function as functional, not administrative platforms. They offer their members the opportunity to exchange ideas on research and provide input for the formulation of vacancies and the selection of candidates. Grouping the IOB research under three main headings also simplifies the external communication about our research.

The transition from the former thematic groups to research lines was consistently evaluated positively, mainly because it stimulated more interaction between all the members of the 'IOB House'. In this perspective, the recent policy plan also abolished the function of 'research line coordinator'. Since then, the coordination of the various lines of investigation has been centralised with (the chairman of) the Research Committee, which guarantees the necessary overview and institutional articulation. As pointed out in the previous audit, there was a painful point with the reform that a number of young researchers initially found their way into the 'IOB house' more difficult. To remedy this, IOB changed its **AAP recruitment policy** in December 2018, namely by linking AAP to the research agenda of a ZAP from the moment it is recruited.

Over the past 4.5 years, **4 ZAP positions** have been filled and a **50% TT-ZAPBOF mandate** has been opened. The ZAP framework thus grew from 10 FTE ZAP in January 2016 to 12.5 FTE ZAP in September 2019; from 1 October 2019, this will even be 13 FTE ZAP (incl. 50% TT-ZAPBOF). The three research lines were strengthened (instead of introducing new themes) and the multidisciplinary character of the institute grew, with the recruitment of ZAP with a basic diploma in Law, Anthropology, History and Economics.

IOB has an internationally composed **Scientific Advisory Board** that meets once a year. Based on the annual report or specific (draft) policy texts, it discusses the scientific policy and output and advises IOB on follow-up and adjustment.

The **research policy plan** "*Development Processes, Actors and Policies*" contains very precise indicators of the scientific production expected from the different categories of personnel. These are also reflected in the matrix of ZAP evaluation criteria (which is in the final phase of adaptation). In this way, the **realisation of the objectives** is monitored.

For each staff member, the percentage spent on education, research and services is fixed. For the ZAP the standard **percentage for research** is 40%, but based on the intake interview and/or the target interviews with ZAP members, individual variations are possible. The report of these target interviews also forms the basis for subsequent evaluation (every five years, on a permanent basis or on promotion).

In order to support researchers in communicating research results, a 'communication and outreach employee' was recruited in June 2018. In the context of the research and outreach strategy that is yet to be finalised (see point 1.4.1.), this employee advises and supports researchers in strengthening their research impact as well. (e.g. how to propose them when recruiting research funds, how and where to disseminate research in order to achieve maximum real impact).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- "Short-term follow-up Research Evaluation. Faculty of Business and Economics and the Institute of Development Policy (IOB)" (mei 2019) (map 2.3.)
- Benchmark study: "Publication output in Development Studies Institutes 2013-2017", mei 2018 (map 2.2.2.)
- Record target calls to individual ZAP members (folder 5.1.4.)
- Vacancy texts ZAP-vacancies (folder 5.1.3.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

1.3.2 FLEMISH AND INTERNATIONAL ADDED VALUE

In its research, IOB aims for Flemish and international added value, based on quality, relevance and specificity. Where relevant and possible, IOB cooperates with the Flemish universities and international institutions. (BO 2.3)

- What is the added value, both Flemish and international, of IOB's research activities?

Explanation

The **international** (and *a fortiori* Flemish) added value is evident from the publications in the leading journals with high impact factors and the average H index of the IOB researchers.

The **benchmark study** is another strong indicator of international relevance and competitiveness. This study ("Publication output in Development Studies Institutes 2013-2017", May 2019) compares the output and impact of IOB's research publications for the period between 2013 and 2017 with those of ten comparable European institutes. This sample is wider than the sample used for the benchmark study we carried out in 2014. The main conclusion is that IOB performs excellently in terms of output, but slightly less in terms of impact. This is the case for both WoS-papers and Google Scholar-papers. While an average researcher at IOB publishes more than 150% of the sector average Google scientific publications and 100% of the sector average WoS papers, the impact we achieve with them is only 50% - 60% of the sector averages.

At the **Flemish level**, too, the study shows IOB's relevance, as evidenced by its broad participation in the public debate by means of opinion pieces, vulgarizing activities and services to governmental and non-governmental bodies (see IOB's annual reports).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- "Short-term follow-up Research Evaluation. Faculty of Business and Economics and the Institute of Development Policy (IOB)" (mei 2019) (map 2.3.)
- Benchmark study: "Publication output in Development Studies Institutes 2013-2017", mei 2018 (map 2.2.2.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Library staff member (H. De Backer)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

1.3.3 QUALITY ASSURANCE

The UA, together with the IOB, ensures the quality control of the research, according to a system that is adapted to its mission but allows for domestic and international comparison. (BO 2.3)

- *How is the quality of the research monitored?*
- *How is it ensured that the output and impact of the research is comparable to that of the Flemish universities and similar foreign institutions?*

The answer to this question may be included under point "2. Policy plan and quality assurance".

1.4 SERVICES

1.4.1 AGREEMENTS AND ASSIGNMENTS

IOB provides scientific and social services in the field of development policy and management. To this end, it may conclude agreements with, and accept assignments from, Flemish, Belgian and international authorities, non-governmental organisations, and companies. (BO, 2.4)

- *Describe the services provided by IOB.*
- *Have agreements been concluded or contracts accepted from the above institutions?*

Explanation

IOB continued to be very active in various fields of scientific and social services, and took steps towards the further clarification and more strategic management of the variety of activities. As input for this process, we organised a joint external study day with the CERES network on social impact and an internal study day/consultancy with the communication experts of IDS-Sussex. Especially with the recommendations of IDS we went to work:

- (1) mission, vision and research focus (including Central Africa) were further clarified in the new research policy and communicated in a modified external name (Institute of Development Policy/Institute for Development Policy);
 - (2) The outreach dimension of education was more explicitly recognised and steered (deepening alumni policy, broader strategic cooperation with the UAntwerp in the Global Minds programme);
 - (3) we invested in strengthening our communication capacity (recruitment of communication staff); and
 - (4) We strengthened relations with parliamentarians (renewed CREAC North-South platform).
- The further recommendations for strengthening the communication and outreach strategy are a 'work in progress':

Previously, this was a long list of various initiatives. Currently, the activities of scientific and social services are **grouped into seven coherent outreach/service delivery categories:**

- (1) Participation in public debate;
- (2) external expertise to specialised development agencies;
- (3) Embedded expertise North partners;
- (4) Visibility contributions IOB;
- (5) Cooperation and capacity building South partners;
- (6) Cooperation with UAntwerpen;
- (7) Establishment and/or active involvement in development spin-offs.

For each of these categories, a **generic 'impact pathway'** is being finalised, which will each time form the starting point for the individual reporting in the target interviews and the periodic evaluations. (With this in mind, this list was also included in the updated evaluation matrix and supplemented by a manual setting out the principles for quantifying efforts in this area. The seven categories are also the subject of **further clarification and/or strengthening of institutional policy.**

For some categories, there is already a greater degree of explication and policy guidance, such as for cooperation with Southern partners (including IOB Going Global, cooperation agreements) and with UAntwerp (e.g. in the context of the Global Minds programme, in particular of the Global Justice basket, via specialised lessons, via the 'Debating Development' elective course and via support for training and partnership with USOS in DR Congo and Nicaragua).

For the time being, this is less explicit or less institutional in other categories. In the short term, it will be clarified which categories require further clarification and/or a more institutional approach, and in any case

further work will be done with the communication officer on strengthening the communication strategy and, in this case, also the commitment of the employee himself.

IOB employees participate in the Board of Directors of ENABEL (executive organisation of the Belgian Development Cooperation) and Oxfam Belgium, in the Advisory Board of Broederlijk Delen, ...

Consultancy is generally carried out if it can supplement or reinforce the own research agenda or that of its partner programmes, but not just as a means to ensure income.

The **externally funded research assignments of policy support** were carried out in 2015-2019 for a broad group of clients, such as: Flemish Interuniversity Council for Development Cooperation (VLIR-UOS, University of Namur, Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Netherlands), Unicef, Imperial College of Science, Technology and Medicine, University of Wageningen (Netherlands), Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (FWO), UNU-CRIS, European Centre for Development Policy Management (ECDPM), International Growth Centre (IGC), Partnership for Economic Policy, United Nations University (UNUWIDER, Helsinki), Deutsches Evaluierungsinstitut der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (DEVAL), Fonds Fonds de Entwicklungszusammenarbeit (DEVAL).

Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (FWO), Belgian Reference Centre for the Expertise on Central Africa (ECA/CRE-AC), EU Horizon 2020 (Marie Curie), Overseas Development Institute (ODI), UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), Wereldbankgroep, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, Universiteit Leiden, London School of Economics, het Ministerie voor Buitenlandse Zaken Zweden, International Crisis Group, Knowledge Platform Security & Rule of Law (KPSRL), International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), London School of Economics en Intergovernmental Group of Twenty-Four (G-24).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- Draftnota "Outreach Principles & Action Plan" (map 3.3.)
- Evaluation criteria ZAP (ZAP Job profile IOB and evaluation grid approved 18 January 2013) (map 5.1.2.)
- IDS-rapport "Developing the Institute of Development Policy and Management's (IOB) strategic approach to strengthening institutional profile and research uptake for impact" (map 3.3.)
- Global Minds documents (folder 4.7.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Staff member Outreach & Communication (M. Domen)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☒ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

1.5 COOPERATION WITHIN AND OUTSIDE FLANDERS

1.5.1 INCREASE IN EXPERTISE THROUGH COOPERATION

IOB strives to increase its expertise and the effectiveness of its operations through collaboration with other universities and research institutes, including in developing countries. The cooperation should bring added value to the own training, research and/or services. (BO, 2.5)

- *How intensive is the cooperation of IOB with the other Flemish universities and foreign universities and research institutes? What about institutions in developing countries?*
- *Have national and international exchanges been increased by government resources?*
- *What criteria are used for the selection of partners?*
- *Does the collaboration provide added value?*

Explanation

IOB cooperates with several Flemish and foreign universities in the **global North**. The intensity of the cooperation depends on its content.

As far as **research is concerned**, there are various forms of stable or changing cooperation with centres in the North, such as LICOS, CES, HIVA and CRPD (KU Leuven), EU studies and Conflict Research Group (Ghent University), Cerami (ULB-UMons), UCL and UNamur, University Lancaster, Deval (Germany), Université du Québec and Outaouais (Canada), Cornell University, Georgetown University, University of Waikato (USA), University of Oxford, University of Essex, City University (UK), European Commission, World Bank and IFPRI.

As far as **doctorates** are concerned, IOB functions within the framework of the doctoral training of CERES and is committed to joint doctorates (KU Leuven, UGent, UCL, Maastricht, UNamur). IOB staff also regularly participates in juries of doctorates at other universities in the Netherlands and abroad. There is also **educational cooperation** with various institutions (see 1.2.3).

IOB organised **international conferences**, including

- 50 years of Development Studies in Antwerp (24-26 June 2015);
- Governance, peace and development in Burundi (5-7 July 2018), Third conference of the Burundi Research Network,
- Development Policies and Practices in the Democratic Republic of Congo (5 - 7 November 2018)
- Centre Bilembo, Kinshasa-Gombe)

IOB staff members stayed at Columbia University, United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (UNRESCWA, Lebanon), etc.). IOB is also an active member of EADI and Nadia Molenaers represents the Belgian development institutes in EADI's EXCO. IOB does not have any priority institutional partners here; the choice for cooperation is based on the **extensive international network** of IOB employees and the specific opportunities or needs that present themselves. Thanks to years of intensive cooperation, there were a few de facto centres of gravity, such as LICOS.

This extensive and varied cooperation with all kinds of institutions in the North provides obvious added value in various areas. It contributes directly to the quantity and quality of the publication output, the acquisition of relevant (international) funding, the dissemination of the research results to various target audiences and also increases the international reputation of the IOB. These collaborations come about spontaneously from individual initiatives of IOB staff.

IOB also has a long tradition and a solid package of **institutional partnerships in the global South**. Here the focus is further on a limited number of institutions, in particular also through the IOB Going Global (VLIR ICP Incremental Funding) initiative (see also 1.5.2.). In this context, IOB is currently working intensively to very intensively with institutions in the DR Congo (UCB-Bukavu), Ecuador (Cuenca), the Philippines (De La Salle University Manila), Nicaragua (UCA-Nitlapan) and Tanzania (Mzumbe University). In addition, there are various institutions with which we cooperate on a more **individual basis** in the DR Congo (Université de Kisangani, Université Catholique du Congo), Colombia (Universidad de Antioquia, Medellín), Uganda (Gulu, MUST), Peru (Universidad Nacional des Altiplano, Puno) and South Africa (UCT).

IOB also coordinates the **VLIR-IUS** programme with the University of Burundi. This is a programme of long-term institutional support for the University Library, involving UAntwerp, KU Leuven and VUB. In this context, the creation of an *Ecole doctoral degree* at the University Library was supported, among other things. The cooperation with South partners is essential to (continue to) conduct research, outreach and education in the field of development studies in a responsible and sustainable manner, also in the future (see also the explanation to IOB Going Global in 1.5.2). The selection of these partners is based, on the one hand, on historical collaborations and, on the other hand, on an estimation of the potential of the collaboration for the academic output of IOB in collaboration with the partner institution (also dependent on the presence of promising alumni, the presence of long-term collaborative programmes (VLIR IUS), etc.).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- IOB Going Global (Folder 1.1.7.)
- Draftnota "Outreach Principles & Action Plan" (map 3.3.)

- Evaluation criteria ZAP (ZAP Job profile IOB and evaluation grid approved 18 January 2013) (map 5.1.2.)
- Conferences (folder 3.4.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☒ 1: ad hoc basis (cooperation Global North)
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system (Global South)
☐ 5: Optimized

1.5.2 JOINT RESEARCH PROJECTS AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

IOB pursues international cooperation in the field of education and research in the form of joint research projects, the joint organisation of educational activities, and the exchange of students, with the possible perspective of bi-diplomacy or joint diplomacy. (BO, 2.5)

– *Is bi-diplomacy or joint diplomacy effective?*

Explanation

Since **the academic year 2017-2018, international cooperation in the field of education** has taken place in the most concrete and structured way within the framework of the VLIR-UOS ICP Incremental Funding project (IOB Going Global), in which the South component of the master's programmes is further explored. The partners are Université Catholique de Bukavu, DR (Congo), De la Salle University (Philippines), Universidad Centroamericana UCA (Nicaragua), Mzumbe University (Tanzania). The **educational activities** that are organized together include ...:

- **student mobility:** mobility window during "Research Methods II" and fieldwork for the master's thesis (this strengthens the nexus education-research-service provision, see also 1.2.3).
- **staff mobility** in two directions: various IOB staff members regularly visit the partner institutions and staff members of the partner institutions as guest lecturers at IOB.
- **winter schools & workshops:** methodological workshops (e.g. refresher courses of certain evaluation methods), training in data collection (nexus educational research) and winter schools on specific themes (Governance of Natural Resources) were organised at various partner institutions.
- input in the development of **master programmes:** both in Nicaragua and Tanzania input is given in the development of the master programmes. To date, this has not led to bi-diplomacy or joint diplomacy. Certificates will be issued during training and workshops. The most advanced process in the process of offering a joint master's programme was cooperation with UCA (Nicaragua), but the preparations for this have unfortunately been greatly delayed by internal reforms and (especially) the political crisis in the country. For the time being, the ambition to offer a Central American version of our master's programmes in Managua (with one module in Antwerp, and bi-diplomacy) has therefore been put away. The aim remains to offer an adapted but equivalent third module 'Local Institutions and Poverty Reduction' in Managua by 2020. This can then be taken up by students who follow the masters in Antwerp. This offers the de facto possibility to complete our masters with only 6 months of presence in Antwerp (i.e. module III and thesis in Managua). Experience in Nicaragua also taught us that bi-diplomacy and joint diplomacy are complex and risky, albeit not impossible, processes.

In addition to the cooperation within the framework of the ICP Incremental Funding project, several IOB staff members also teach at universities with which they have participated in **individual education/research cooperation** (e.g. Gulu Uganda).

IOB is involved in various forms of international cooperation in **research**. A first form are projects with our **institutional partners in the South**. VLIR-IUS (DR Congo, Burundi) and other VLIR initiatives in Nicaragua, Uganda and Tanzania are the most important of these, supplemented by various other sources of external financing (such as ODI, International Growth Centre (IGC), DFID, World Bank, FWO, NORFACE-Belmont Forum, IDS, etc.). Research by IOB FWO mandate holders in DR Congo, Rwanda and Uganda is also partly carried out in collaboration with **local partners**.

Another form of international research collaboration takes place through **ad hoc research consortia**. Some are recurrent (cooperation with LASDEL-Niger), others are occasional (e.g. ESPA project with Imperial College-London, Wageningen, Duke University, UABarcelona, Rutgers University, & University du Quebec, NORFACE-Belmont consortium project (with Nitlapan-UCA and AgroParisTech, France), CBMS-network (Philippines, Nicaragua),...).

As far as **doctorates** are concerned, there is a structured cooperation within the Dutch-Flemish doctoral school CERES (for the training of some of our candidates) and increasingly joint doctorates (with UGent, KU Leuven, UCLouvain) are being set up and completed. There are 3 ongoing joint PhDs of which 1 with UGent (Mathias De Roeck, start 2014) and 1 with KUL (Carmen Collado, start 2018). 1 joint PhD with Maastricht started in 2013 and is still running (Jesenia Verdezoto, start 2013).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- ICP incremental foundation/ IOB Going Global documents (Folder 1.1.7.)
- 2015 UFOO project proposal (map 1.1.11.)
- Proposal UFOO project 2018-20 & report UFOO report 2018 and plans 2019 (map 1.1.11.)
- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- "Short-term follow-up Research Evaluation. Faculty of Business and Economics and the Institute of Development Policy (IOB)" (mei 2019) (map 2.3.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Chairman of the Doctoral Commission (M. Verpoorten)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☒ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

2. POLICY PLAN AND QUALITY ASSURANCE

Together with the University of Amsterdam, IOB will draw up a strategic policy plan by 1 January 2017 in which it outlines its policy on education, research and services for the duration of the current agreement. In its strategic policy plan, IOB also indicates how it will implement the recommendations of the evaluation of the previous management contract.

2.0 LOOKING BACK

For the 'Policy Plan and Quality Assurance' section, give a retrospective view of the period of the current management agreement. Please also indicate what happened to the recommendations of the previous evaluation in so far as they relate to this section.

For the substantive aspects of the core tasks of the policy plan (see general review under point 1).

Although the workload caused by internal processes and current assignments on the IOB remains very high (and forms a constraint for any additional activity), serious attention was paid to the recommendation to focus more on the **external dimensions** (and a number of existential questions) at the IOB. A name change (Institute of Development Policy -without 'and Management'), a communication officer was hired and deployed on the 'globalisation' of IOB education (IOB Going Global, alumni), the research agenda was updated, steps were taken to clarify the 'societal outreach' strategy (including more publications/activities for the non-academic public, strengthening interaction with the UAntwerp, consolidating policy support for (inter)national development actors and 'spin-offs', capacity building in the South). For outreach, there is still a need for more strategic guidance and more effective institutional support, particularly from the communications officer.

As regards **quality assurance in education**, in the broader context of decentralised quality control within NVAO, the transition was made from external quality control by means of a direct NVAO review to a UAntwerpdriven process of institutional review (validated as such by NVAO). After the good results of the last external NVAO review, the first interim internal UAntwerpen review gave us excellent points for the documentation and management of our educational programmes. Different IOB practices were identified as 'best practices' for the entire UAntwerp. Within three years we expect a first thorough and substantive review of our master's programmes from UAntwerp.

With regard to **quality assurance in research and services**, we have adjusted the substantive output criteria for research and have carefully defined the categories of external scientific services, as well as the way in which we want to 'measure' the efforts in this area. These changes also translate our concern for workability (pressure of work) and the associated institutional choice for quality over mere quantity in the perspective of 'sustainable excellence'.

2.1 POLICY PLAN

2.1.1 FUTURE VISION AND NEXT POLICY PLAN

Together with the University of Amsterdam, IOB will draw up a strategic policy plan by 1 January 2017 in which it outlines its policy on education, research and services for the duration of the current agreement. In its strategic policy plan, IOB also indicates how it will implement the recommendations of the evaluation of the previous management contract.

By 14 October 2020 at the latest, IOB will draw up a new strategic policy plan in which it will explain the IOB's vision for the future and in which all the elements mentioned above will be fully worked out. Indeed, this Policy Plan 2021-2025 will form the basis for and form an integral part of a future management agreement. (BO 3.1)

- *Has the IOB already made the future vision of the institute explicit?*
- *Has the IOB already started drawing up the new policy plan for 2021-2025?*

Explanation

IOB has not yet started to draw up a new policy plan; for this purpose it is also waiting for the input of this **audit** and the anticipated reflection on the results of this audit with our Scientific Advisory Council (**WRA**). Taking into account this input, IOB will prepare the new Policy Plan during a **Policy Day** on 12 February 2020; specific preparatory meetings coordinated by the Agency will be necessary in advance.

Of course, the new policy plan will build on the ongoing processes, in particular the completion of our policy text on outreach and the interim (for some initiatives also external) evaluations of the innovative initiatives (IOB Going Global and VLIR ICP programmes, alumni-working, deeper cooperation between UAntwerp via Global Minds).

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Draftnota "Outreach Principles & Action Plan" (map 3.3.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

2.2 QUALITY ASSURANCE AND ACCREDITATION

2.2.1 INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE

The UA, together with the IOB, is responsible for the internal and external quality assurance of the research and teaching activities in accordance with the provisions of Article II. 121 and II. 122 of the Higher Education Codex. The external assessments are carried out on the basis of a validated protocol of quality assurance. (BO 3.2)

- *What are the main conclusions of the reviews during the term of the management agreement?*
- *How did the IOB deal with the results of the visits? Have the results been taken into account in the policy?*
- *Has internal quality assurance improved the quality of research, education and services so far?*

Explanation

At the end of the **2015 NVAO educational visitation**, the Education Committee was given a clear view of the strengths and points for improvement of the programmes. The panel identified the following **strengths**: relevant and clear learning objectives, quality of education (methodologies, teaching skills, expertise, student-centred learning, competence-driven approach...) and complimented IOB on its various forms of evaluation. The Review Committee also made a number of **recommendations**. IOB was encouraged to **differentiate more strongly** between the three master programmes. It was also suggested that the creation of **regional hubs** would enable the institute to further **globalise** its training and to **involve the Global South more closely** (e.g. guest lecturers from the South, expertise of employees from the South in the development of learning objectives, exploring internship opportunities, etc.). In addition, the IOB Review Committee recommended attracting **more Western students** and **initiating cooperation with Western organisations**. On the basis of the 2016 assessment report, IOB wrote a follow-up plan (2016b Follow-up plan for the IOB 2015 visit) in which the institute indicated how it would integrate the formulated challenges into its operations. In the meantime, **all the recommendations have been actively addressed**. Some concrete **suggestions have been translated directly into practice**, such as **differentiating the three master's programmes** by reformulating the learning objectives, adding an extra subject in the first module that responds to the demand **for critical thinking frameworks**, giving students access to their feedback forms, etc. In addition, initiatives have also been started to **intensify the internationalisation of the master's programmes** (mobility window, initiating regional hubs, building up joint teaching modules, inviting guest lecturers from the South, more international staff (especially under AAP), setting up an intercultural communication trajectory, etc.). Finally, a number of initiatives have also been set up with regard to the **North Sea activities**. For example, we try to facilitate an internship for graduate students at a (inter)national development actor (e.g. at UNITAR, UNESCO, IOM), we look for new promotion channels (e.g. promotion within UA Antwerpen by IOB-AAP to master students of sister faculties), we organise guest lectures by staff from other universities and organisations and we visit actors such as OECD/DAC, UNESCO and DEVCO (see also the Follow-up Plan on Visitation and Education Development Plan).

At the beginning of 2016, after the suspension of the system of NVAO external reviews, the UAntwerp started the development of a new training assessment to guarantee the quality of its courses. The **UAntwerp** has opted for a **six-year quality assurance cycle** (20160304 Scenario for Education Committees), within which the existing quality assurance processes have been adopted. The six-year cycle consists of three parts that build on each other:

- Systematic care for educational development (continuous internal quality assurance throughout the cycle) (see also 2.2.3);
- **Internal process monitoring and control** (in year 3 of the cycle);
- Self-reflection with peer review (in year 6 of the cycle).

As a result of the six-year cycle, IOB, with the support of the Department of Education, has developed a **digital education portfolio on Pintra** since 2016. This portfolio is systematically supplemented and can be consulted by the evaluation committee. The education portfolio is an important tool for IOB to **make the underlying processes of internal quality assurance and good practices visible**. The portfolio is a business card of IOB and bundles the output of the systematic care for educational development in the form of reports from educational committees, policy plans, quality measurements, curriculum revisions, etc. Continuous internal quality control and systematic care for educational development is further described in section 2.2.3.

IOB is in year three of the six-year cycle. In March 2019, the Department of Education and the President of the Education Council of the University of Antwerp analysed IOB's educational portfolio during the Internal Process Monitoring and Control (IPS). The Department of Education analyses whether the systematic care for educational development is qualitative and sufficient. During the feedback meeting in May 2019, the Department of Education spoke **full of praise for the qualitative and sound development of the education portfolio and the accompanying documents**.

Several **good practices** (relevant for the entire UAntwerp) were highlighted in the report: student centred vision, innovative forms of quality assurance cf. feedback sheets that facilitate the integration of feedback into the educational offer of the following academic year, mobility window within internationalisation, follow-up of results of the master's thesis, organisation of policy day(s), detailed assessment sheets within the testing policy.

The team also offered some **manageable recommendations**. First of all, IOB needs to emphasise its intercultural context more strongly. For IOB it is a self-evident strength that is contained in its DNA, but for external parties it is not sufficiently explicitly formulated in the context of the strategic policy objective of internationalisation. A second recommendation concerns a tip on the benchmark for the 2019-2020 theses. The Department of Education proposes to involve more external evaluators in the next benchmark so that consistency between external evaluators can also be considered. Finally, the IOB Education Department tips on rationalising quality assurance activities in order to reduce the workload in order to guarantee structural quality (1819_Report IPS_IOB_DEF, approved by the UAntwerp Education Council on 2 July 2019). **IOB takes into account the recommendations of the education department**: the multicultural context will be mentioned more explicitly where possible, with regard to rationalisation there will be less focus group discussions, the number of meetings of the education committee will be reduced from 5 to 4 and staff members from the international partners of IOB (involved in IOB Going Global) will be involved in the benchmarking exercise 2019-2020 (in concrete terms September 2020).

An external research visit took place in May 2016, commissioned by the Research Council (OzR) of the UAntwerp. IOB was rated as an 'internationally visible player' with research 'internationally competitive in the field of development studies'. According to the Audit Committee, the changes introduced by IOB in its research strategy had a positive impact on the overall performance of the research group in all four evaluation criteria (2016, p. 44). The panel also made some more detailed suggestions for improvement. These were included in the 2017 Strategic Research Policy Plan.

Overall, research at IOB was considered "good" (3/5), i.e. *"The research group is considered internationally visible and a national player"*. The OzR then defined a step-by-step plan. IOB responded by reforming its research policy ("Research at IOB 2017-22"). The first results of this reform were reflected in the IOB's **progress report** to the OzR in May 2019.

They are also visible in the "benchmark study publication-output" which was carried out on own initiative in May 2018.

Internal quality control is systematic

- for each of the three core tasks of education, research and services, by appropriate means (cf. 2.2.3., 2.2.4., 1.4.),
- in the evaluation of academic staff, and
- annual reporting on the activities in IOB's annual reports, which are also submitted to the IOB Scientific Advisory Board and to the Board of Governors of the UAntwerp.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Research:
 - Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- "Short-term follow-up Research Evaluation. Faculty of Business and Economics and the Institute of Development Policy (IOB)" (mei 2019) (map 2.3.)
 - Benchmark study: "Publication output in Development Studies Institutes 2013-2017", mei 2018 (map 2.2.2.)
- Education:
 - 20160304 Rotation manual Educational commissions (folder 1.1.12.)
 - 1819_Report IPS_IOB_DEF (Folder 1.1.12.)
 - Follow-up plan visitation IOB (folder 1.1.12.)
 - Education development plan (map 1.1.5.)
- Internal quality control:
 - Evaluation criteria ZAP (ZAP Job profile IOB and evaluation grid approved 18 January 2013) (map 5.1.2.)
- Annual reports IOB (folder 6)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Quality assurance officer / CIKO (M. Scheldeman)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

2.2.2 ACCREDITATION

The UAntwerp can only grant a master's degree to a student who has successfully completed a programme of study that has been accredited in accordance with the procedure laid down in articles II.135 et seq. of the Dutch Higher Education Code (Codex Hoger Onderwijs). (BO 3.3)

- *Are all master's programmes accredited?*
- *Were there any negative evaluations during the term of the management contract? In such cases, was an improvement programme set up?*

Explanation

All IOB Master's programmes are **accredited** (on the basis of visitation 2007). In **2015**, the IOB master's programmes were re-visited in the NVAO-Visitation Round of Political Sciences and re-accredited after a positive evaluation. On the basis of the visit, a follow-up plan was drawn up and implemented (see 2.2.1). Since the 2016-2017 academic year, IOB has also been following the new 6-year cycle for quality assurance, which is led by the UA's central Education Department. IOB has just completed the **Internal Process Monitoring and Control** (after 3 years) and this was **completed in a very positive way** (see 2.2.1). Over the next three years, IOB will continue to carry out quality assurance in the same way, after which the self-reflection with **peer review** will take place in year 6 (autumn 2022).

There were no negative evaluations during the term of the management contract.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Report on Education Visitation Political Sciences 2015 (map 1.1.12.)
- Follow-up plan and implementation (folder 1.1.12.)
- 1819_Report IPS_IOB_DEF (Folder 1.1.12.)

Contact person:

- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Quality assurance officer / CIKO (M. Scheldeman)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☐ 3: defined
- ☐ 4: controlled system
- ☒ 5: Optimized

2.2.3 QUALITY ASSURANCE EDUCATION

The UA, together with the IOB, ensures the quality control of education, according to a system that is adapted to the mission of the IOB but allows for domestic and international comparison. (BO, 2.2.2)

- *How is the quality of education monitored?*
- *Is there (international) benchmarking with other, similar courses?*
- *What are the concrete results of quality assurance?*

Explanation

IOB has a thoroughly developed **system of quality control of education** that meets the UAntwerp conditions. At the beginning of 2016, after the suspension of the external reviews, UAntwerp started with the development of a new training assessment to guarantee the quality of its courses. UAntwerp has opted for a six-year quality assurance cycle (20160304 'Draaiboek Onderwijscommissies'), within which the already existing quality assurance processes have been adopted. The six-year cycle consists of three parts that build on each other:

- **Systematic care for educational development (continuous internal quality assurance throughout the cycle)**
- Internal process monitoring and control (in year 3 of the cycle) (see also 2.2.1)
- Self-reflection with peer review (in year 6 of the cycle)

Every year, various components return within the **systematic care for educational development** and are prepared and implemented by the CIKO staff member, so that their quality is guaranteed. An overview is given below:

- Monitoring and feedback of the results of quality measurements of programmes and course units (standard questionnaires, quickVIPs, focus group interviews, point reports and inflow, through-flow and outflow analyses, etc.);
- In order to ensure that feedback from students is taken into account, a system of **feedback sheets** has been developed. This system was selected by the UAntwerp education department as good practice in the context of the Internal Process Management (1819_Report IPS_IOB_DEF). These feedback sheets summarise the most important output from student feedback and are used to determine the course content of the next academic year (full PDCA cycle);
- Subject-specific **course content**: IOB uses correspondence tables that provide an overview of the intended learning outcomes, the translation into subject content, teaching, work and examination forms (and criteria). These correspondence tables are discussed and approved annually by the Education Committee.
- Through **alumni-surveys and sounding board group meetings** with **alumni** and their **employers** in the South, IOB also takes into account the evaluation and suggestions from the professional field. It also gives the opportunity to follow where alumni end up professionally and what they experience as strengths and weaknesses in the IOB courses. Moreover, the output of employers helps IOB to continue to professionalise and stay up to date with current developments in evolving agendas within international cooperation;
- In 2018 the **alumni barometer impact research** was started. The insights on the impact of IOB educational programmes on knowledge, skills, attitudes and networks and the pathways through which

this is done will also provide useful input for keeping the programmes up to date and updating them where necessary (see also 1.2.3).

- IOB conducted an international **benchmark exercise** on the quality and assessment of the master's theses in 2014. The UA recommends to do such an exercise every 8 years. IOB is planning a next **benchmark exercise in the academic year 2019-2020** (September 2020). The recommendations of the IPS will be taken into account. The aim is to involve various international partners of IOB in the IOB Going Global programme. In this way we meet the criticism of the IPS (i.e. only one external reviewer was involved in the benchmark exercise of 2014, which did not benefit the validity of the exercise (see infra. 1819_Report IPS_IOB_DEF). At the same time it offers the possibility to exchange with our partners about our system of thesis assessment (e.g. checking whether there is a *cultural bias*) and their system.

Since 2016, with the support of the Education Department, IOB has been developing a **digital education portfolio** on Pintra. The education portfolio is an important tool for IOB to make the underlying processes of internal quality assurance and good practices visible. The portfolio acts as a business card as it combines the output of systematic internal quality assurance for education and development. It is therefore systematically supplemented and updated. The system, the benchmarking and the results of quality assurance were discussed in detail in "20160304 Roadmap for Educational Committees". The education portfolio can be consulted by the evaluation committee.

As far as doctoral training is concerned, IOB follows the general principles of quality control of the **Antwerp Doctoral School (ADS)**, of which the doctoral training is a part. This implies, among other things

- minimum requirements for doctoral training based on seven competences,
- intensive supervision by one or more supervisors and an individual doctoral committee with at least one external member
- annual evaluation of the progress of each candidate
- strict requirements with regard to the composition of the jury (at least two external members in addition to the IDC) and the procedure for the defence and pre-defence of the PhD.

In addition to these generic rules, **IOB** also has a number of specific principles of quality control:

- PhD at IOB is only possible for themes that are in line with the IOB research agenda and expertise;
- themes and promoters are part of the research lines;
- candidates are only accepted if there are sufficient financial and logistical guarantees (usually scholarship and/or institutional support).

As an additional quality control, IOB obliges all candidates to follow a **study programme** during the first year (12 credits advanced courses). As a compulsory part of the doctoral programme, IOB also requires all students to obtain a minimum of 30 credits spread over 4 different competences, to produce an international peer-reviewed **publication** and to **present** a doctoral seminar at IOB.

The IOB Doctoral Commission meets at the relevant times and ensures the follow-up of the rules of the game, on which it systematically reports to the Council, which validates its decisions.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- 20160304 Rotation manual Educational commissions (folder 1.1.12.)
- 1819_Report IPS_IOB_DEF (Folder 1.1.12.)
- International quality theses benchmarking exercise: see "External Benchmark Master's Dissertations 2014" and ZER Master's programmes IOB 2014-15 (map 1.1.12.).
- Quality assurance doctoral programme: IOB doctoral regulations and UAntwerp doctoral regulations (folder 1.2.1.)

Contacts:

- Quality assurance education (masters and short term):
 - Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
 - Quality assurance officer / CIKO (M. Scheldeman)
 - If desired, you can also contact I. Verachtert and M. Roelen of the Department of Education of UAntwerp.
- Alumni survey and impact research:
 - Staff member (S. Dewachter)
- Quality assurance doctoral training:
 - Chairman of the Doctoral Commission (M. Verpoorten)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☒ 5: Optimized

2.2.4 QUALITY ASSURANCE RESEARCH

The UA, together with the IOB, ensures the quality control of the research, according to a system that is adapted to its mission but allows for domestic and international comparison. (BO 2.3)

- *How is the quality of the research monitored?*
- *How is it ensured that the output and impact of the research is comparable to that of the Flemish universities and similar foreign institutions?*

Explanation

IOB supervises the quality of the research. As mentioned earlier, IOB has defined precise minimum output parameters for all sections of the AP.

These parameters are used for each assessment, i.e. for renewal of AAP mandates, the granting of post-doc bridging mandates, the assessment of ZAP after a trial period, in the promotion application and in the decree evaluation. Where necessary, a remediation process is agreed with less performing staff members.

Collectively, IOB systematically monitors the quantity and quality of institute-wide output, in the preparation of evaluations, the drafting of policy plans and through continuous benchmarking.

How is it ensured that the output and impact of the research is comparable to that of the Flemish universities and similar foreign institutions?

As there are no similar institutes in Flanders, IOB compares itself to other European institutes. This is done through the **benchmark studies** mentioned above.

In 2019, IOB introduced a revision of the **ZAP evaluation criteria** for publication output and external funding, with a view to creating '**sustainable excellence**'. As far as publications are concerned, there is a shift from quantity to quality. This shift should allow the researcher to focus on slower but better science, which should also improve the research profile of IOB researchers, thus contributing to their ability to attract more interesting (international) external funding.

In terms of external financing, and in line with the same policy, we have reduced the high quantitative targets for obtaining external financing (compared to our sister faculties). This should allow ZAP to focus on quality, but also to focus more on funding for and a strong involvement with our (by our standards often "academic weaker") partners in the South.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit**Documents:**

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- "Short-term follow-up Research Evaluation. Faculty of Business and Economics and the Institute of Development Policy (IOB)" (mei 2019) (map 2.3.)
- Benchmark study: "Publication output in Development Studies Institutes 2013-2017", mei 2018 (map 2.2.2.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Library staff member (H. De Backer)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent

- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☐ 3: defined
- ☐ 4: controlled system
- ☒ 5: Optimized

3. PERSONNEL POLICY

IOB pursues a transparent personnel policy that strives for the highest possible quality at all levels.

3.0 LOOKING BACK

For the 'Personnel Policy' section, give a retrospective view of the period of the current management agreement. Please also indicate what happened to the recommendations of the previous evaluation in so far as they relate to this section.

During the past policy period, the renewal/addition of the structural quota of 12 ZAP was completed and the post-doc policy aimed at renewal and internationalisation, financed by the earmarked funds, was continued. Via central research funds, an additional research professor was also recruited (shared with the faculty of Law). The AAP policy was renewed, among other things in order to deal with the difficulties reported in the previous audit following the unification of the research group. A new point of attention was the workload on IOB. In this context, several measures were taken to reduce the institutional burden on ZAP and to clarify the scope and content of the tasks and the guidance of the AAP. In the case of the ATP, this point is included in a planned external audit.

3.1 POLICY PLAN

Although, strictly speaking, the management contract does not include any obligation to draw up a staff policy plan, having such a policy vision is an implicit condition for being able to work on the punctual items that the management contract imposes.

3.1.1 PERSONNEL POLICY PLAN - VISION OF PERSONNEL POLICY

- Does the IOB have a global vision of its personnel policy?
- Was this vision translated into an approved policy plan?

Explanation

Within the limits of the planned structural funding of IOB, the staff policy plan today foresees a basic staffing level of 12 ZAP, 10 AAP and 7.7 ATP.

During the past policy period, the renewal of the **ZAP content** was completed with the appointment of a total of **6 new ZAP**. In line with the new research lines, these appointments have helped to shape the 'identity transition' of IOB (in particular attention to environmental issues, consolidation/renewal of Central Africa focus (state and peace building, mining, forests), migration). In addition, an **additional research professor** 'Sustainable development and ecological justice' was recently appointed for 5 years (renewable, after 5 years to be appointed as a ZAP). This position is shared (50%-50%) with the Faculty of Law and the first 10 years are financed from the central research budget. (It is possible that in the next round of 2020-2025 there may be an additional half or full position, although this is still uncertain).

A **new policy paper** was drawn up for **AAP**, also because the general AAP status at the UAntwerp was amended. Under the new policy, individual ZAP members will be given more powers/responsibilities to publish the vacancy and to follow up (only!) the research and the doctorate. This reform was necessary in order to address the problem of lack of clarity in AAP with regard to doctorate and guidance, as identified in the

previous audit, also because in the meantime the position of research line coordinator has been abolished. However, new vacancies are now subject to stricter checks by the OZC to ensure that they are consistent with the IOB research policy. However, the management of the AAP's education and services remains collective (e.g. through detailed a priori working arrangements in consultation with the chairperson of the OWC and the OZC). In line with the general AAP statute, the quantification of the relative time commitment for PhD, IOB research, education and services was also specified. In addition, a procedure was developed for the rotating filling in of the 10 AAP by the 12.5 ZAP.

There have been no major changes (or difficulties) in **ATP policy** during the past policy period, with the exception of the recruitment of an additional ATP member for communication. Because ATP was also gradually receiving timid signals of a possible overload, we recently decided to have an external audit of the ATP carried out with a view to rationalising and optimising the work organisation and the deployment of staff members (also because funding has been promised for such an audit by the personnel department of the UAntwerp).

In addition to the structural personnel framework, IOB has an increasing number of paid **BAP members** (from 11.4 FTE in 2014 to 16.15 FTE in 2018), largely in function of steadily growing external funding. A half-time ZAP and some additional postdoc BAP members are directly financed by the institute from the designated funds in function of innovative research impulses and internationalisation of the staff (50% ZAP; bridging to external postdoc financing for excellent IOB PhD's, external international postdocs with perspectives on self-financing on IOB). One postdoc position here is also financed by the Global Minds programme in return for the strong growth in services provided by IOB to the UAntwerp in this context.

A new dimension of the personnel policy is the explicit attention to the **workload and experience**, in the broader context of the UAntwerp policy. Complementary to the university's generic anti-stress measures, we have developed a number of new measures at IOB within the framework of a policy for 'sustainable excellence', in the first place for the ZAP. This includes a.o. attention to the workability of the tasks at IOB (discourse, attention with excessive ambitions and competition); a redefinition of evaluation criteria for research in order to align them more closely with the criteria of the sister faculties (correction to the often substantially stricter IOB criteria); an explicit and certain degree of quantification of the outreach tasks. In addition, the possibility was created to apply for a temporary work reduction; it was also agreed in principle to make mini sabbaticals possible for ZAP in the near future and to expand postdoc support for future chairpersons (now one half-time for 12 months out of 3 years). To this end, within the limits of the budgetary possibilities of the funds allocated, we will adapt the post-doc policy. For the AAP, the main focus was on clearer and clearer guidance and demarcation of tasks. For the ATP, this theme will certainly be included in the forthcoming review of the range of tasks.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- AAP Policy Note "2018.12.14_IOB AAP Policy_na_Council" (folder 5.2.1.)
- Note on career policy AAP and OP2 (2018) (map 5.2.1.)
- Workload distribution AAP (folder 5.2.5.)
- Policy plan 2017-2020 (map 4.6.)
- Post-doc policy (folder 5.4.1.)
- Draftnota "Outreach Principles & Action Plan" (map 3.3.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

3.1.2 STAFF POLICY PLAN - RECRUITMENT AND ESTABLISHMENT PLAN

- What is the IOB's vision on recruitment, promotion, evaluation, training, exchange and remuneration of personnel?
- How does the IOB translate this into an annual establishment plan?

Explanation

As regards remuneration systems, monitoring and evaluation tools, IOB's personnel policy follows **UAntwerp's personnel policy**. All personnel in operation are followed up in a cycle of target and evaluation interviews. BAP staff on external funding are monitored by their respective promoters.

ZAP members use **evaluation grids** that ensure a balanced distribution of teaching, research and service tasks per staff member and between different staff members. The determination of educational use also refers to educational use by partners in the South.

For AAP members, the balanced deployment in education, research and service provision is monitored by a system of time administration in agreement with the chairman of the OWC.

The **recruitment of ZAP** is aimed at **international excellence**; there is always broad international advertising and internationalisation is always an explicit objective. Vacancies are determined according to educational needs and the research agenda (by the Council). Selection committees are composed according to the UAntwerpen rules, with at least one member of the UAntwerp ZAP external to IOB and at least two external experts. Candidate lists are always screened in advance by the IOB librarian for their publication output. (The IOB minimum criterion of 1 AB publication per year is the cut-off criterion). Despite our internationalisation intention, this method results in the selection of an excellent, but also completely blank, too Belgian and strongly IOB-connected ZAP quota. As far as possible, we try to compensate for this by focusing on cooperation with Southern partners and academics from the South and by internationalising the BAP (which is more successful).

The method for **selection of AAP** and IOB-funded **post-docs** is similar, but succeeds much better in internationalising the staff. **BAP** funded on external projects are selected by individual promoters, often following an external vacancy (e.g. at DOCPRO, FWO).

The percentage of international researchers has risen slightly again in the last 10 years after a decline in 2011-2014. (See Annual Administrative Report IOB 2018).

The annual establishment plan is established on the basis of the annual budget (for the structural component of currently 12 SPS, 10 APS and 7.7 APS, and for the current SPS under the earmarked funds) and the available external funding.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- AAP Policy Note "2018.12.14_IOB AAP Policy_na_Council" (folder 5.2.1.)
- Note on career policy AAP and OP2 (2018) (map 5.2.1.)
- Administrative Annual Report 2018, p. 25. (Folder 6.)
- ATP status (folder 5.3.4.)
- ZAP status (folder 5.1.1.)
- Organic Regulations IOB (folder 4.1.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☐ 3: defined
- ☒ 4: controlled system
- ☐ 5: Optimized

4. MANAGEMENT AND POLICY

The IOB pursues a coherent policy that is communicated systematically and transparently to internal and external stakeholders.

4.0 LOOKING BACK

For the 'Management and policy' section, give a retrospective view of the period of the current management agreement. Please also indicate what happened to the recommendations of the previous evaluation in so far as they relate to this section.

In terms of the management of the institute, the new, **simplified** structure, which had produced very positive results, was retained and further consolidated, in particular by abolishing the position of research line coordinator and entrusting the coordination task exclusively to the chairman of the Centre for Scientific Research. The responsibility for the supervision of AAP for PhDs has also been clarified. (see explanatory note to point 3.1.1.)

The cooperation with and integration in the UAntwerp has been further deepened; IOB is now recognised and present in all kinds of central policy bodies (College deans, Education and Research Council, Service Council, etc.). Interaction with the central services is excellent (also thanks to the work of our institute's coordinator) and provides us with extra support in the ATP audit, among other things. (Sometimes IOB functions as a kind of exercise for a broader policy.) The chairman of IOB was able to participate in the residential course for deans that was set up by UAntwerp.

IOB's financial policy remains sound.

4.1 OBJECTIVES AND RISKS

4.1.1 MISSION AND VISION

IOB has a clear mission and vision that is aligned with the vision of the relevant stakeholders.

- *Is the mission and vision clearly and powerfully written down?*
- *Does it reflect the raison d'être of the IOB?*
- *Is this one tuned in?*
- *Has this been communicated?*

Explanation

IOB has a clearly written **vision text** that states that IOB wants to make a meaningful contribution to a just and sustainable world. This requires high-quality research and education, but also a permanent concern for the South and strategic engagement in political decision-making processes from the local to the global level.

This vision is also operationalized in our academic '**mixed methods**' principles and practice in which we cultivate - both internally and externally - scientific approaches that seek to involve 'a variety of philosophical paradigms, theoretical assumptions, methodological traditions, data collection and analysis techniques, personal understanding and value judgements' (Green, 2007). We prefer this approach because it allows us to understand the development process as a mediation between different 'mental models' of relevant stakeholders; an insight that requires a modest and relational vision of our academic activity in which - as expressed in a Ghanaian (Ewe) saying - 'wisdom is like a baobab: one individual is not able to embrace it'.

This objective is clearly communicated on the homepage of our **website**, while the operationalisation in our mixed methods principles and practice is explained on our research pages. Our **policy plans** also start with a reference to the vision and mission, and the objectives.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Policy plan 2017-2020 (map 4.6.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

4.1.2 VISION - OBJECTIVES

IOB has translated its vision into objectives.

- *Have the organisation's objectives been written out?*
- *Were these carried out and realised? (To what extent)*
- *Have these been translated into the different levels of the organisation?*

Explanation

The objectives of IOB are set out in the General Policy Plan 2017-2020 and are further specified and elaborated in specific thematic policy plans for education (e.g. IOB Going Global, Succession Plan for Visiting and Education Development Plan, Alumni Policy, UFOO Project Documents, Global Minds) and research (Research Policy Plan 2017-2022).

An update for the different dimensions of the outreach policy is being prepared.

The objectives for IOB's core tasks have been clearly translated and operationalised at all relevant levels and, in particular, they have been achieved to a large extent.

Innovative policies are at different stages of definition and implementation, as is the extent to which the objectives have been achieved.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Policy plan 2017-2020 (map 4.6.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)

- IOB Going Global documents (folder 1.1.7.)
- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- Alumni policy (folder 1.3.)
- Evaluatie Debating Development (map 1.1.8.)
- Evaluatie seminarie Evaluation Capacity Building (map 1.1.9.)
- Follow-up plan visitation IOB (folder 1.1.12.)
- Education development plan (map 1.1.5.)
- Draftnota "Outreach Principles & Action Plan" (map 3.3.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

4.1.3 RISKS

The IOB mapped out its risks and formulated a strategy for dealing with them.

- *Was a SWOT analysis carried out on the basis of the objectives and processes?*
- *Have the risks within the various organisational units and processes been mapped out?*
- *Have measures been formulated to deal with the risks?*

Explanation

In preparation for this self-assessment report, a short SWOT analysis was developed during an ad hoc meeting with the IOB ZAP in June. In this exercise, the following risks were identified;

Paradoxically, the first risk has to do with the success and high quality of the current IOB education offer. This not only gave us very positive evaluations, but also a package of 36 **scholarships** (for our three masters) via the competitive VLIR ICP funding. This package guarantees us a sufficient number of students from our target group of poor countries for another three years. Although the - by a separate grant financed (excl. scholarships) - IOB master's programmes have a *sui generis* character compared to the competing master's programmes (which usually do not have a grant for operating costs, nor a specific development assignment), there is no specific treatment for our masters. This implies that, according to the current rules, we can in principle only get the same package of 36 scholarships once more and then, in principle, fall back on no scholarships. It is possible that one or more of our masters may no longer be eligible for these scholarships at the next competitive round. (After all, increasing competition is to be expected, also from new programmes from the UAntwerp.)

This would mean that the number of **students from poor countries** could fall sharply within 3 or 8 years; after all, the current self-financing students (about 50%) come mainly from middle-income countries. Aware of these risks, IOB is already focusing more than ever on **self-financing students**, also from Europe (with slightly less intensity and success for the time being). An alternative would be to look for **alternative sources of funding** for student scholarships focused on students from poor countries.

A second risk relates to our strategy of internationalisation (and decolonisation) of our education and research activities, which in itself is certainly a fundamental necessity in order to continue to develop a development institute such as IOB in a responsible manner. Especially in our experimental IOB Going Global programme of educational cooperation (where we want and have to meet strict quality requirements), we have been confronted with (partially unexpected) **institutional weaknesses of some partners** as well as the **unpredictability of the political crisis context** in countries like DC Congo and Nicaragua. We will have to follow these evolutions closely and see how we can take further steps in a creative and flexible way within the intrinsically clearly fruitful and promising educational cooperation.

A third risk concerns **IOB staff** who perform very well (as shown by individual and collective evaluations), but who clearly run into the limits of the sustainable workability of the current levels of deployment. The strong results-based management with its extensive and detailed evaluation criteria and the (perhaps unjustified) competitive pressure from the university and the wider academic world seems to lead to a culture of over-performance and high ambitions (beyond the explicitly stipulated requirements). A dimension of this culture is also that there is sometimes too much focus on individual rather than institutional agendas and tasks (which can be deduced from, among other things, a reduced willingness to take on public tasks). With the policy of '**sustainable excellence**', IOB wants to give an institutional signal that some gas may have to be taken back, not least in order to safeguard the quality and sustainability of the work of the IOB staff members in the future. It also tries to strengthen a culture of cooperation rather than competition.

A final risk is created by the recent focus on the **risks of travelling to areas at risk** and the possible liability of universities in the event of problems. At VLIR level, an interuniversity policy has been agreed that, among other things, creates a 'Committee on Risk Destinations'. This committee will have to determine whether staff members and students can still travel to risk areas and under what conditions. In the event of an extremely restrictive policy, this could mean that much of the current IOB research in e.g. DR Congo, Nicaragua, Northern Uganda will be made impossible. While the Commission can be expected to be reasonable, a restrictive policy on student exchange may well be possible. This could in the short term have very negative consequences for the globalisation initiatives of the IOB education.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- SWOT analysis: see Appendix to this document (and folder 4.9.)
- Documents ZAP stress action plan (folder 5.1.6.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☒ 3: defined
☐ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

4.2 MONITORING AND REPORTING

4.2.1 MONITORING

The IOB has a system that allows it to monitor the execution of its assignments (monitoring).

- *Is there a monitoring system within the various parts of the organisation?*
- *Does this system make it possible to make timely adjustments?*

Explanation

For almost all parts of the organisation there is a developed system and a systematic practice of transparent monitoring and evaluation.

For **education**: (see also extended reporting under points 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3).

- student evaluations and focus groups of Master programme courses, feedback sheets, alumni-surveys, monitoring selection procedure, participation of students in the IOB education committees where there is room for direct feedback, ...
- annual evaluations of short training programmes, specific courses (Debating Development, USOS master class, courses at South partners, Capacity Building Evaluation, etc.).

For **research**: (see also extended reporting under points 1.3.1. and 1.3.2.)

- monthly reporting of publications to the Council;
- periodic publication-output measurement via benchmark study;
- (for doctoral research) annual progress reports.

For **scientific services and societal impact**, the monitoring and evaluation takes place via the individual target interviews and reporting during evaluations. The operation with South Partners is subject to internal or external monitoring and evaluation, for example within the framework of IOB Going Global. The same is true for the cooperation with the UAntwerp in the framework of Global Minds (in this case managed by the University's Working Group on Development Cooperation).

For the monitoring and evaluation of the **academic and administrative staff**, IOB closely follows the working method and guidelines of the UAntwerp, i.e. annual target interviews and periodic (decretal) evaluations or evaluations of promotion dossiers. Here, education, research and services are also monitored and discussed individually each year.

In addition, the regular **(self-)evaluations in the** context of internal or external general, educational or research audits are important moments of monitoring and evaluation. The preparation and discussion of the **annual report** is also always a moment of monitoring and evaluation of the entire operation; it is also always linked back to external reflection with the WRA.

For more details, see the sections on quality control in education, research, social work, human resources and financial policy.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

See points 2.2, 1.3, 1.4 and 3.1.2.

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☐ 3: defined
- ☒ 4: controlled system
- ☐ 5: Optimized

4.2.2 REPORTING

IOB reports on the execution of its assignments.

- *How are the measurement results of the monitoring system reported to the various stakeholders (Board of Directors, government, partners, ...)?*
- *Does this reporting give a true and fair view of the performance based on relevant information?*

Explanation

Almost all M&E instruments mentioned in 4.2.1. are reported externally:

- The results of the **evaluation of academic staff** are dealt with by specific committees, with the presence of external evaluators in the case of ZAP members, and discussed by the IOB Council. The results of the monitoring of all personnel are also reported to the Executive Council of the UAntwerp for AP and ATP, and to the Executive Board in connection with the promotion of ZAP. Teacher files also contain student evaluations.
Reporting tools are standardised (UAntwerp templates for AAP evaluation, ATP, e-curriculum ZAP) and comprehensive, objective IOB-specific evaluation criteria are defined in detail (cf. Evaluation and excellence criteria AAP & PhD students, Evaluation criteria ZAP). Evaluations are based on verified data (official student evaluations, academic bibliography of the library, PhD grades, project funding data of the financial service, etc.) which are additionally checked by the institute coordinator and the library staff member.
- The monitoring of **educational activities** and **research and service activities** is reported and discussed in the Education and Research Committees, which report to the IOB Council. Other activities (e.g. debating evenings, partnership, etc.) and elements of general policy are under discussion in the IOB Council, whether or not prepared in the EWC or SSC. The reports of the IOB Board are in turn reported to the UA Executive Board and to the UA Board of Directors.
- **Self-evaluation reports** for education and research were provided to the external evaluation committees, but also to the UA-Educational Council and the Research Council respectively, which ensure further follow-up via follow-up reports (OwR) and progress reports (OzR). IOB also has a practice of making other evaluation documents (partner work, benchmarking study, etc.) available to the public via the website as much as possible.
- All of IOB's activities and business operations are reported annually in the form of an **annual report** in English and an annual administrative report in Dutch.
 - to the Scientific Advisory Board, consisting of several external members from the broad field of development studies and development actors;
 - the Governing Council and Government Commissioner of UAntwerp;
 - the Flemish Government;
 - the public through the website.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)
- Education: Leaflet "Educational visitation" (folder 1.1.12.)
- Research: Folder "Research audits 2011 and 2016" (map 2.1.)
- Reports of the IOB Committee of Inquiry (map 2.2.3.)
- Reports IOB Education Committee (folder 1.1.10.)
- Reports of the Scientific Advisory Board (WRA) (map 4.3.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

4.3 MANAGEMENT OF THE IOB

4.3.1 ORGANISATIONAL STRUCTURE

The IOB has an organisational structure that is geared to achieving its objectives.

- *What is the basis of the organisational structure?*
- *Are the necessary coordination mechanisms in place and compatible with each other?*
- *How does this structure provide the necessary flexibility to deal with changes?*

Explanation

Since the 2012 reform, the simplified basic structure of IOB consists of the **Council** (decision-making body), the **Education Committee** (OWC) and the **Research Committee** (OZC). Within the OZC, the **doctoral committee** (DC) also functions as a faculty policy entity of IOB within the whole of the Antwerp Doctoral School. In the OWC and OZC, all institutional policies relating to education and research/social impact are prepared, followed up and evaluated under the supervision of their chairmen. This committee also prepares all decisions of the Board in their area of competence. Within the facilitating institutional framework, the individual ZAP members (and to a certain extent also the post-docs and the AAP) are and remain the primary driving forces for concrete education, research and outreach initiatives.

The President of the Institute and the chairpersons of the OWC and the OSC, together with an elected representative of the AAP and the Institute Coordinator (ATP), form the **Bureau responsible for the** day-to-day management of IOB and for the preparation and follow-up of the Council's decisions. A (rotating) programme director is elected every two years under the ZAP to lead the operational management of the master's programmes (and the concrete management of the education administration).

The Council, OWC, OZC and DC are composed in a representative way. ZAP members are automatically members of the Council and of the OZC, and members of the OWC in function of their duties in education management. Representatives of AAP, ATP and students are appointed by periodic elections.

Informally, there has also been a 'small OWC' for some years now, in which those directly involved in education policy (chairperson, CIKO, student administration, alumni responsible person and students) come together to prepare policy issues for the OWC. The Office intends to examine the possibility of setting up a similar informal preparatory group for the SSC, particularly as the coordination of research and outreach by the SSC has become even more important (after the abolition of the research lines and research line coordinators).

It is also IOB's practice to prepare important policy points for policy days and/or during informal ad hoc meetings, so that important new policy is clarified and supported within IOB as much as possible before decisions are taken in the Board. In this context of important policy developments, our external **Scientific Advisory Board** also has an important role to play. This is because the latter is not only asked to give feedback on the annual report every year, but is also systematically consulted on new policy points in preparation.

Under the chairmanship of the chairman, there is also a regular informal consultation meeting with the **ATP** in which the administrative functioning is discussed and followed up.

There are also a number of committees with specific tasks, such as the Library Committee, the Social Committee and the ICT Committee.

As already mentioned in the previous evaluation, and confirmed by more years of experience, this simplified organisational structure offers more, rather than less, flexibility and effectiveness in terms of policy follow-up and renewal through its clear unified structure and the reduction of internal transaction costs.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Annual reports IOB (folder 6.)

- Organic Regulations (folder 4.1.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

4.3.2 VALUES AND STANDARDS

The IOB has an insight into the values and norms (organizational culture) that are important to enable it to achieve its objectives.

- *Does the IOB have a vision of its desired organisational culture?*
- *How was this one mapped out?*
- *Does the IOB have a vision of integrity?*
- *How does the IOB try to realise or strengthen this culture?*

Explanation

In the past, IOB only had a general mission statement, but in the meantime it also explicitised a value-driven vision and mission: "Our vision is of a just and sustainable world. As a development studies institute we cant to help build it through multidisciplinary academic research, education, partnerships and political engagement. "In this context, IOB will **give priority to the poorest countries** (which will include a permanent option for Central Africa) and the poorest groups within all countries. Moreover, this vision is also translated and operationalised in our academic 'mixed methods' practice (see point 4.1.1.). In line with these views, IOB has always been an open and learning organisation.

Historically, IOB has built up a strong **horizontal participatory organisational culture**, with a great respect for the autonomy of the individual staff members and a jointly developed and negotiated collective identity (e.g. the 'mixed methods' approach to development studies mentioned above). These principles can also be found in our strong student-oriented and activating education in which our often very experienced students are included more as partners than as students. IOB also strives for **transparency and objectivity** in hierarchical working relationships (ZAP-AAP, ZAP-ATP, staff-students) through a practice of explicit generic task descriptions, collective demarcation of tasks/workload, ombudspersons (students, PhDs) and a practice of systematic anonymous evaluation.

Partly inspired by the UAntwerp Ethics Committee (of which Prof. Titeca is a member), IOB is also devoting more and more attention to the **ethical dimensions** of our research, in particular field research in countries of the South. In the cooperation with our long-term partners, the issue of correct benefit sharing is a strong point of attention. Attention was also paid to this in training initiatives for PhD staff and during a recent Fruit for Thought session (27 June 2019) with researchers from UGent (authors of the manifesto 'New avenues for collaborative research'). IOB also pursues a strict zero tolerance policy against plagiarism as part of the academic integrity (awareness raising / training and systematic screening of students; follow-up of indications by staff members).

Within the framework of the **general travel and security policy** of the VLIR and the UAntwerp, IOB pays even more attention than in the past to the safety risks for its employees and students, especially during research in the South. For example, for countries with a negative travel advice, an explicit risk analysis and pro-active security measures are now systematically requested from the responsible staff members. Of course, we hope that an over-restrictive travel and security policy will not be a brake on the current IOB activities. (see also 4.1.3)

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Policy plan 2017-2020 (map 4.6.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- Academic survival guide (map 1.1.2.)
- 2019_UA_Leidraad Ethische Commissie SHW (map 2.2.5.)
- Manifesto 'new avenues for collaborative research' (UGent): www.gicnetwork.be/silent-voices-manifesto/
- Travel and security policy documents. (Folder 4.8.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)
- Travel policy: T. De Herdt

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
☐ 1: ad hoc basis
☐ 2: structured approach
☐ 3: defined
☒ 4: controlled system
☐ 5: Optimized

4.4 CHANGE MANAGEMENT

4.4.1 IMPLEMENTING CHANGES

The IOB implements change in a planned manner.

- *Is an analysis made of the departure situation?*
- *Is the change supported by the top of the organization?*
- *Is the desired situation clearly defined?*
- *Have the risks in the event of failure been identified and have they been addressed?*

Explanation

As a learning organisation, IOB is aware of the need for permanent change and adaptation of its various activities.

In terms of education, the modular structure of the master's programmes offers a wide range of possibilities within the fixed general modules to adjust the content and methodological approach of the specific courses, which, at the initiative of the module coordinator and the relevant teachers, and under the guidance of the OWC, also happened constantly. For the time being, there is no perceived need to fundamentally tinker with the generic design and the modular organisation of the master's programmes. (In that case, a formal curriculum renewal should be prepared via a curriculum committee). There are few risks associated with this approach.

In the field of research and scientific and social services, themes, priorities and organisational structures are continuously updated in the five-yearly policy plans and specific policy documents (as is now the case for the outreach policy). These innovations are discussed in a participatory manner with the research staff and coordinated by the Office (chairperson and chairperson of the OZC in particular). Here, too, the risks associated with the working method are limited.

In addition, specific innovation initiatives are constantly being worked on, which are usually prepared by specific task forces and then socialised in the institute. Recent examples of such innovations are the deepened alumni work, the IOB Going Global programme, (and within the broader UAntwerp dynamics) also the Global Minds programme. Some of these innovations are more ambitious and risky (in particular the IOB Going Global programme); however, as they do not jeopardise the core of current IOB assignments and are largely made possible by specific additional funding, these risks are manageable (possible loss of time and frustration, limited reputational damage, ...).

IOB has learned that changes can only be implemented successfully if they are sufficiently widely supported by a critical mass within the institute. Sufficient investment in thorough, participatory preparation and discussion of innovative policy is therefore necessary. In this respect, there is a tension between this objective/work method and the very strong workload of the current assignments of all (but especially ZAP) staff.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Education development plan (map 1.1.5.)
- ICP incremental foundation/ IOB Going Global documents (Folder 1.1.7.)
- 2015 UFOO project proposal (map 1.1.11.)
- Proposal UFOO project 2018-20 & report UFOO report 2018 and plans 2019 (map 1.1.11.)
- Global Minds documents (folder 4.7.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)
- Draftnota "Outreach Principles & Action Plan" (map 3.3.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☐ 3: defined
- ☒ 4: controlled system
- ☐ 5: Optimized

4.4.2 IMPLEMENTATION OF CHANGE

The IOB implements the change.

- *Is there a clear schedule with clear milestones?*
- *Is the management of the change process clear?*
- *Are the tasks and responsibilities clear?*
- *Are the different phases managed (on a project basis)?*
- *Has a communication strategy been implemented?*
- *How was the regular operation ensured during the change process?*

Explanation

The planning, monitoring and evaluation of the changes in terms of IOB's current education, research and service activities are carried out through the normal and detailed management processes.

Policy innovations in sub-domains (IOB Going Global, alumni working, Global Minds, ...) each have their own specific planning, responsible team, and agreements regarding monitoring and evaluation, usually also linked to obligations within the specific funding sources and projects (VLIR, UFOO) that make these innovations possible.

Relevant documents and/or persons we can talk about during the visit

Documents:

- Education development plan (map 1.1.5.)
- ICP incremental foundation/ IOB Going Global documents (Folder 1.1.7.)
- 2015 UFOO project proposal (map 1.1.11.)
- Proposal UFOO project 2018-20 & report UFOO report 2018 and plans 2019 (map 1.1.11.)
- Global Minds documents (folder 4.7.)
- Onderzoeksbeleidsplan "Development processes, actors and policies 2017-22" (map 2.2.1.)

Contacts:

- Chairman IOB (J. Bastiaensen)
- Chairman of the Education Committee (N. Holvoet)
- Chairman of the Committee of Inquiry (M. Verpoorten)
- Institute coordinator (V. Verlinden)

Score for this item

- ☐ 0: non-existent
- ☐ 1: ad hoc basis
- ☐ 2: structured approach
- ☒ 3: defined
- ☐ 4: controlled system
- ☐ 5: Optimized

ANNEX: SWOT analysis IOB 2019

BIJLAGE: SWOT-analyse 2019

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality and fully optimized master programs in Antwerp • Significant growth in quantity and (international) quality of output (PhDs, external finance, publications) • Clear integration of Great Lakes focus within broader IOB agenda. • Steps towards the internationalisation of master education with Southern partners • Advances in outreach to and support for alumni • Good integration and cooperation (with autonomy and a good reputation) in the University of Antwerp • Fully elaborated staff policies and procedures (incl. clear and coherent publication and outreach criteria, cycle of goal setting talks) • Stimulating & enabling work environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced, but still moderate institutional capacity for strategic management and guidance, leading to missed opportunities for strategic acting e.g. towards international funding opportunities, institutional outreach policy • Poor monitoring of educational environment (e.g. new competition) • Risk of underinvestment in activities with high societal impact • An almost all white IOB staff at ZAP and post doc level (despite efforts, internationalised AAP and extensive international cooperation with Southern academics)
Opportunities	Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing academic recognition of multi-disciplinary /mixed methods Development studies • Increasing need to mainstream development issues • Increasing attention to societal impact in research assessments • Great Lakes Region remains important part of the world development puzzle • Demand and opportunities for cooperation with faculties of University of Antwerp (Korf Verbredende vakken, research profs, new masters, ...) • Increasing (academic) strength of an increasing number of academics in Southern partner institutes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Medium term) High dependence on competitive time-bound VLIR ICP scholarships; • (Partially unexpected) Institutional weaknesses of Southern academic partners & strained political context in Central Africa and central America • Risk of unsustainable workload in view of self-imposed performance targets and ambitions as well as new demands on IOB (outreach, UAntwerp, ...) • Emphasis on quantity and individualized assessments might jeopardize efforts for the IOB commons and option for quality • University (anti-risk) policies for students and staff travel to 'hazardous countries' making collaboration with the South in general and Southern partners in particular very difficult or impossible