

trust
participation and consultation
societal engagement
career development
adequate funding

The university is a community of academics, students and supporting staff who all contribute to its core tasks: education, research and societal engagement. In the execution of those core tasks what is needed is trust, collaboration and a dash of pragmatism.

The people when rightly and fully trusted will return the trust.

(Abraham Lincoln)

We believe that in its current procedures our university too frequently starts from distrust. That is something we want to change. We want Ghent University to be a university which confers trust to its staff and students. Not a 'blind trust', but a culture of trust allied with responsibility. A culture in which UGhentians dare to accept challenges but also want to take up responsibility for those challenges, without having to be afraid of exaggerated penalisation when something is not successful. Even the greatest geniuses have learnt from their mistakes so as to perform better a next time.

Dare to think

Dare to do

We want a dynamic university in which staff and students do not only dare to think, but also learn to dare and are allowed to dare.

Ghent University is deeply rooted in the City of Ghent and profiles itself, just like the Ghent Moose Bearers, as a little bit rebellious and wayward. With attention for pluralism, care, respect for human rights and fact checking. And, we shouldn't forget, topped up with a dose of West Flemish common sense and entrepreneurship.

'Dare to Think' is our creed.

We would like to add: 'Dare to Do'.

In the remainder of this text we will formulate some reactions to questions that have been asked by the group of AAP/WP (assistants and other researchers) with respect to the coming elections of rector and vicerector. Our complete programme can be found at <http://rikenmieke.ugent.be/en/programme>. We feel it is important to mention this, so that the reader of this document can check that our reactions didn't start from the question "What should we write to please the group of AAP/WP?". Formulating campaign promises is one thing, actually meaning what you promise can sometimes be another... When writing this reaction we started from our vision for the future of Ghent University as it has been available for quite some time at our website. We have also taken excerpts from our opinion pieces and interviews that have been published on a larger scale via newspapers, magazines and social media. Our reactions certainly are sincere.

Suppose UGent would get an unexpected injection of financial means, where would you spend those on in the first place?

If a substantial cut of the financial means of UGent would be required, where do you see possibilities to economize?

Members of staff and students spend a lot of time on the Ghent University properties. **It is, therefore, evident that the university should ensure a comfortable working and learning environment.** Unfortunately, numerous Ghent University buildings are deteriorating and unappealing. Some (parts of) Ghent University buildings have simply become unsuitable for teaching or conducting research although those activities are still happening there to this day. We advocate drawing up a realistic action and investment plan that identifies the fundamental needs and proposes solutions. In order to manage and administer this plan, the university needs to apply for government funds. At the same time, Ghent University can take other initiatives and could investigate whether it is possible to for instance issue bonds for this purpose.

'Some (parts of) Ghent University buildings have simply become unsuitable for teaching or conducting research.'

But infrastructure is more than physical buildings only. We need a global vision and a corresponding plan of action to establish high-performance network and data services at Ghent University. Several of the faculties' and directories' needs concerning ICT need to be addressed. This is something many students and members of staff wish for. The personnel and financial resources that are currently at the disposal of the ICT Department would only make a university-wide Wi-Fi coverage possible in ... 10 to 15 years. This is totally unacceptable.

Furthermore, there is a need to optimise data management, overall data access and archiving at Ghent University. Too many staff members need to find solutions of their own when they for instance want to make safe backups of their data. Moreover, modern data management entails the possibility to scan paper documents and to afterwards be able to consult them electronically.

Our aim is to give the necessary resources to the ICT Department to make Ghent University an institution that is progressive and attractive in this digital age. Students have asked us to make the teaching activities more interactive and some teachers would like to be able to invest in new learning and teaching practices. Unfortunately, they often lack the necessary infrastructure or support which is essential to make such projects a success. We want to make Ghent University an institution that is bold enough to make clear choices and priorities and to then give its staff and students the necessary resources to realise their goals

and aims within a reasonable time span. This is an undertaking which does not only involve the ICT Department, but also the supporting departments and the faculties.

It is crystal clear to us that a discussion about the (un-)availability of sufficient financial resources is a discussion that needs to be held not only within the walls of our own university but also in dialogue with the other Flemish universities. In this respect we would like to point to our plea for a rise in the core funding of the universities, concomitant with a commitment for collaboration across university boundaries. In other words: a plea for both the government and the universities to be made accountable.

In the 1990s the funding of (fundamental) scientific research increased for a while, but in the last few years it has stagnated again. The core funding of the Flemish universities (the so-called “first flow of funds”) has long been insufficient to be able to do scientific research at an acceptable level. Acquiring competitive funding (the “second flow of funds” from public funding and scholarships for basic research + the “third flow of funds” for applied research) is absolutely necessary for nearly all researchers. **Competition can be stimulating and is therefore necessary, also in the world of research. But when this results in an exaggerated competitiveness it becomes contra-productive. It is the responsibility of the government and of the university boards to do something about this untenable situation.**

Last year, applications for a pre-doctoral research assistant position from the National Research Fund – Flanders (FWO-Vlaanderen) had a success rate of 20.4%; applications for a post-doctoral research position had a 25% success rate; applications for non-personal research projects had an even lower success rate of 16.5%. It is clear that such low success rates are problematic.

This problematic situation is caused by the fact that the number of applications for research funding has increased faster than the available resources. This is partially due to the current career development programme of professors who are forced to apply for as much research funding as possible. The funding model for the Flemish universities also plays a role in this: people are rewarded when they succeed to acquire externally financed research projects, because this way they can increase the publication output and the number of finished PhDs – two important parameters in the funding model. **The question arises as to whether we have not gone too far in output-driven funding of the universities.**

More diversity with respect to research is desirable and needs to be actively encouraged. It is necessary to aim for a balance between fundamental, strategic basic research and question driven and applied research. Fundamental research in particular deserves to receive more attention than it does now. ‘Development of knowledge for the sake of development of knowledge’, and stimulating high-risk research of which the results are barely or not at all predictable belong to the most important responsibilities of professors and their collaborators. But they can only fulfil that task when they have the necessary resources at their disposal.

In this respect we would like to point out that today's fundamental research forms the basis of tomorrow's question driven and applied research. Recent, strong pleas for more entrepreneurship and/or more research and development (in companies) should therefore be understood as implicit, but equally strong pleas for more fundamental research.

Because of all of this we urge the government to increase the core funding of the universities and funding bodies such as the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO). An increase of the financial resources of the universities could be linked to a stimulation of collaboration between the universities. The way in which the Flemish government encourages interuniversity cooperation via multi-annual management agreements with its Strategic Research Centres, such as the VIB (the Flemish Institute for Biotechnology), can undoubtedly be inspirational: through these management agreements universities and researchers are encouraged to partially align their research agendas with each other; moreover they are stimulated to set up research activities across research domain boundaries.

Is there room for budget cuts? Yes, on the condition that those cuts do not result in the reduction of our core activities. Hence, we would prefer to advocate the 'optimisation of our resources' rather than budget cuts and we are convinced that through such optimisation it will be possible to free up financial resources (which hopefully do not need to be refunded but can be used for the fortification of our core activities).

Especially in the area of infrastructure and equipment such optimisation is possible. Now every university or university college has its own set of demands for the government. We believe that it is necessary to think about this at a higher, more overarching level. **Why would it not be possible for Ghent University, University College Ghent, Artevelde University College Ghent, and the Ghent educational institutes that are part of the KU Leuven Association to share auditoriums or laboratories?** This is definitely not something for the distant future: for our bachelors and masters in engineering technology we have already rented rooms at the HoGent campus since their integration in 2013. That is working fine, so a lot more seems possible across institutional boundaries and – why not?- across association boundaries.

Another example of an excellent collaboration that has led to a more optimised use of resources is the successful expansion of the Strategic Research Centres. We should be proud of institutes like IMEC, VITO, VIB and Flanders Make, where the Flemish universities have joined forces and are carrying out ground-breaking scientific research. These collaborations could act as examples. **We think that it is possible to forge useful interuniversity alliances about today's grand societal challenges, such as sustainable development and workable employment, where the humanities are expected to play a very important role as well.**

Important improvements have been made with regard to “permanent” contracts for ATP. However, similar situations exist for WP. Some ideas have already been launched to tackle this problem. What is your vision on permanent contracts/career management for WP, problems and solutions?

We agree that the policy of permanent contracts needs to be linked to a policy of correct recruitment. With the current situation for ATP however, the recruitment procedure takes too much time, often jeopardizing research and scientific service. Do you see a solution?

A very important issue is addressed here, i.e. the fact that in Flanders not enough/hardly any attention is paid to the sometimes precarious circumstances in which young knowledge workers find themselves. From what follows it should become clear that we really take this issue to heart.

In Flanders, in the last two decades, the number of researchers has risen sharply: from about 9000 in 1999 to about 16000 in 2014. The largest part of these researchers, affiliated to universities, university colleges and other research institutes, are young women and men. These people who are in their twenties and thirties focus on fundamental research, strategic basic research and question driven research. The increase in highly educated knowledge workers at pre- or postdoctoral level is obviously good news for the economic potential of our country, which to a large extent is based on brain power. The way in which the careers of this younger generation of researchers are being developed is clearly outdated though.

Usually a person first works for four to six years to finish a PhD. Afterwards a number of the recently graduated PhDs can obtain a postdoctoral position, which usually lasts about for three years and which for some is renewable. Others will go to temporary research projects. Those who aim for an academic career, frequently move from one temporary position to the next. Those who do finally obtain a position as “Zelfstandig Academisch personeel – ZAP” (professor), will normally get a five-year tenure-track position and will only afterwards get full tenure at the university.

This means that most young researchers find themselves in all kinds of temporary and precarious positions for years, and basically compete with each other for every step: this means that each time a large part of the population does not make it to the next step. Some researchers move to a university abroad, others join the private sector or the civil service, sometimes, but not always, in positions where their PhD is an added value.

Is this model adequately designed for the current need for knowledge creation or for societal needs in general? Should we not ask the question whether the creed ‘more is better’ is by definition right when talking about PhDs? **The large increase in the number of PhD degrees which have been awarded every year by the Flemish universities is to a large extent caused by the logic of the Flemish financing model for the universities, which is very much geared towards the ‘production’ of PhDs. This logic is based on the fact that ‘more PhDs’ will automatically lead to ‘more scientific knowledge’. But is that really the case?**

In the last two decades the number of PhD students has risen more sharply than the number of professors: from 2.3 PhD students per professor in 2000 to 3.2 in 2014. The younger professors are being pushed to supervise more and more PhD students and acquire more and more research projects. The more researchers obtain a PhD degree under their supervision, the faster they themselves will be promoted to the highest academic ranks (of (senior) full professor). The quantitative increase of the number of PhDs has resulted in a heavier work load for the professors. This does not always result in a qualitatively better supervision and coaching of the young researchers.

A recent study has shown that ca. 30% of PhD students often struggle with feelings of anxiety. The frequent combination of a relatively lonely existence, hard work in a very competitive context and insecurity about the future will certainly be one of the causes. Most researchers have a strong intrinsic motivation, due to their passion for science, their curiosity to find answers to (research) questions that can be quite complex, working in a stimulating environment, getting the opportunity to make international contacts, etc. At the same time we need to acknowledge that motivation can suffer from job insecurity, which is psychologically one of the worst stress factors people can experience.

In line with this we need to dare to think whether the question of an even sharper increase in the number of PhDs in every research domain is necessary or desirable. Would it not be more sensible to sometimes reserve fewer financial resources for new PhDs, but to allot the money that will then be made available to more postdoctoral positions? This would not only result in a tangible rise in the job opportunities for recent PhD graduates, but it would also lead to a more substantial valorisation of the scientific knowledge that has been built in the frame of PhD research. Because, let us call a spade a spade: today a lot of the research results just gather dust because recent PhD graduates need to leave the academic world and because of new professional activities they no longer possess the time, motivation and scientific support to publish (or more generally valorise) their research results. Both from a scientific and a societal perspective it would be better to allow a more tailor-made approach and to not evaluate the universities unilaterally on the number of PhDs obtained.

Let us also look more critically at our doctoral school programmes and allow for more differentiation in the pre-doctoral trajectories. PhD graduates will finally end up in different sectors such as academia, the government, the non-profit sector or trade and industry. It could be worth considering to set up pre-doctoral trajectories that explicitly prepare for that. In certain research domains it might be possible to let PhD students take a more generic pre-doctoral trajectory in the first 2 to 3 years and to then let them choose between a pre-doctoral trajectory with an academic finality ('I really want to become a professor') or a pre-doctoral trajectory with another finality ('I will probably leave academia but I would really like to be able to valorise my knowledge and expertise elsewhere').

We therefore argue for better career perspectives for young researchers, both within and outside academia. PhDs students need to be given the assurance that the necessary financial means will be available to be able to finish their PhD within a reasonable amount of time and with decent wages. For scientific staff (financed via projects, funds, etc.), with or without a PhD, a contract of indefinite duration should be the norm, supplemented with a fair and realistic retirement plan – comparable to the new ‘ATP’ policy.

With respect to the ‘AAP’ and pre-doctoral bursaries, we would propose more concretely to thoroughly scrutinise their status within the Ghent University ‘POC’ (‘personnel negotiation committee’), also in light of the envisaged renewed ‘WP’-policy. Subsequently, interuniversity consultations need to be started up and the Department of Education needs to be contacted, since the prerequisites of these positions need to be spelled out in decrees.

With respect to the duration of the selection and recruitment procedures our point of view is very simple: it should be kept to a minimum and should not rise significantly compared to the current duration of these procedures. Moreover, here also excellence and content should prevail. Consequently, the supervisors/group leaders/etc. involved should keep a strong impact on the selection and recruitment procedures. The whole procedure should be at the service of our research and educational activities, and not vice versa.

What is your opinion on the establishment of permanent assisting staff (“vast middenkader”)?

- How do you see their role?

- How could this group of staff members be paid?

- only via ‘external funding’ (i.e. responsibility of promoters to guarantee external funding for a long period of time)?

- paid on “P-points” (choice of departments/faculties where they see specific needs)?

- or do you see a possibility to allocate (extra) central funding?

- Is the establishment of a permanent assisting staff something you want to commit to during your tenure?

We have already mentioned that we are in favour of the expansion of staff at post-doctoral level. However, that does not mean that we are in favour of a ‘middle management’ taken in its literal sense: a group of people who are to be situated between the more senior level (at ‘ZAP’ level) and the more junior level (at pre-doctoral/‘WP’ level). We think that it is necessary to create a **fully-fledged** post-doctoral level. **Hence, we are in favour of the creation of a permanent level of research coordinators, or rather still: the creation of a post-doctoral level of permanent research group supporting staff. The latter is important: we feel that we should not only look at research activities themselves.** It is perfectly possible that a research group (also) needs permanent post-doctoral support in the domain of education and/or services (societal engagement). We would like for the research groups to be able to freely choose the job design for these positions as they feel fit, taking into account the specificity of their own functioning (i.e., research domain, size of educational load, link to external organisations such as the Strategic Research Centres, etc.). Here also the principle of maximal flexibility is very important: no one-size-fits-all approach which has been put down in rigid rules and regulations.

In order to secure the financial means for these positions, in theory two paths are possible. **Research groups which have at their disposal the necessary means, can finance these positions via projects / funds / contract revenues. But the aim should always be to create permanent positions. That implies that the people involved should be offered a contract of indefinite duration, supplemented with a fair and realistic retirement plan (see previous question).** We argue that the research groups need to be made accountable for this, which is only possible when the faculties are held accountable. That means that we are in favour of urging the faculties to explicitly explain in their faculty policies how they will arrive at the creation of a permanent level of post-doctoral research group supporting staff, and how this will be financed, also – and maybe even in particular – when the financial means would come from contractual positions of indefinite duration.

In an ideal world the level of permanent postdoctoral staff should be financed via the so-called P-points. The university should dare to make choices: exclusively going for extra

ZAP-positions is not a good choice. Part of the available resources can (and as far as we are concerned must) be reserved for the creation of the desired post-doctoral positions. Since for this second path – and this is the path that we are in favour of – financing is envisaged via the P-points, the newly created post-doctoral positions will automatically be part of the faculty policies. But the university board will have to make sure that these positions are indeed created (and that the concomitant P-points do not disappear in the larger common pot of the faculties). Here also it will be necessary to remain vigilant with respect to the accountability of the faculties/research groups.

We know that for many years now people have been talking about the creation of a ‘middle management’ (or as far as we are concerned a fully-fledged post-doctoral level of permanent research group supporting staff). We feel that it is high time to operationalise these ideas. So yes, we want to commit ourselves to this. By the way, we have already taken up this point of view in the *Ghent University working group on Scientific Personnel*, of which we are both members and which is discussing exactly this issue.

Over the years, the number of PhD-students has increased significantly, but the number of ZAP-positions did not. Many doctors leave academia, but are – at least in some faculties - insufficiently prepared for that. How would you tackle the growing need for differentiation?

We have mentioned it before: **let us look more critically at our doctoral school programmes and allow for more differentiation in the pre-doctoral trajectories.** PhD graduates will finally end up in different sectors such as academia, the government, the non-profit sector or trade and industry. It could be worth considering to set up pre-doctoral trajectories that explicitly prepare for that. In certain research domains it might be possible to let PhD students take a more generic pre-doctoral trajectory in the first 2 to 3 years and to then let them choose between a pre-doctoral trajectory with an academic finality ('I really want to become a professor') or a pre-doctoral trajectory with another finality ('I will probably leave academia but I would really like to be able to valorise my knowledge and expertise elsewhere'). It is clear that more attention needs to be paid to the second finality than is the case now. And it is also clear that much more thought needs to go into this. Most importantly the latter needs to be done together with the group of AAP/WP staff. **The differentiated PhD policy that needs to be developed should be there for them, not vice versa.**

In terms of education, which strategic objective do you see as a priority?

Only a minority of academics can hope to achieve any real advance in their discipline, but all have the possibility of making an enduring 'impact' on the minds of their pupils. (Keith Thomas)

Teachers (everyone involved in education) have to be able to start their teaching assignments well-versed and they have to be able to freshen up on ideas. Teacher training and educational tips can offer them the right tools. We would like to emphasise the importance of these possibilities.

'Patronising teachers is not desirable'

Patronising teachers, however, is not desirable. Teachers should be able to teach their courses as *they* think they need to teach them. They are not only the experts in their fields, they also have a personality of their own and that personality can be reflected in their teaching. There is no such thing as 'the best way of teaching'. Different teachers have different teaching styles, and different teaching contents require different approaches. It is that variation of styles that makes a university such an interesting learning environment.

Evaluations

Il y a des coureurs qui ont l'air de voler, d'autres qui ont l'air de danser, d'autres paraissent défiler, certains semblent avancer comme assis sur leurs jambes. Il y en a qui ont juste l'air d'aller le plus vite possible où on vient de les appeler. Émile [Zatopek], rien de tout cela. (Jean Echenoz)

Evaluations are necessary. The current evaluation procedures, however, set out from too little trust in the university staff, and cause too much administrative overload. Activities have to be described beforehand and are afterwards evaluated by a good many councils and committees. We argue for more autonomy, where we drastically restrict the proliferation of evaluation processes. We also argue for a different approach to evaluations. Right now evaluations are too often used and/or experienced as a means to bring to light negative aspects, but evaluations can also be a means to acknowledge and explicitly clarify positive aspects. We argue for the latter: evaluations that are geared towards appreciation.

Priorities impose themselves: educational evaluations by students are definitely worth while; students' input has proven to be a very powerful catalyst for better and more professional teaching. But, it is not necessary to evaluate every teacher every year for every subject. Monitor where and when necessary and trust staff when everything runs smoothly. Obviously students should always get the chance to signal problematic situations so that

these can be dealt with adequately. **Energy and time spent on too frequent evaluations of things that run smoothly is energy and time not spent on solving réal problematic situations, that drag on too long because of it.**

For the record, we formally acknowledge the need for quality monitoring, not only with respect to teaching activities, but with respect to all other activities at our university. At the same time, we plead for a change in culture: for a quality monitoring that assumes trust, but, at the same time, thoroughly deals with problematic situations.

Diversity

*Toleration makes difference possible; difference makes toleration necessary.
(Michael Walzer)*

We consider diversity as an added-value to Ghent University (and other institutions or organisations), not as a 'problem'. At the same time it is clear that it will be necessary to develop strategies to achieve the desired diversity.

Diversity is not a 'problem', but an added value.

We recognise the importance of diversity which should be interpreted as a complex and comprehensive concept, i.e. we strive for diversity which not only includes gender, but also social and socio-economic background, migratory background (also with regard to second or third generation immigration), cultural-linguistic background, age, religion, sexual orientation and (functional) impairment. It is of the utmost importance to stimulate all forms of diversity starting from a comprehensive approach that is integrated in all aspects and departments of the university. We are convinced that the diversity policies which are in place at the moment need to gain momentum and that measures need to be developed to structurally embed the collaboration between the supporting departments (i.e. in the so-called central administration) and the faculties with respect to diversity.

Our vision on the inclusion of students with a migratory background, from cultural-linguistic minorities or with (functional) impairments is based on a **"diversity is the norm" vision**. But such a vision will only mean something when everyone at the university fully understands it and applies it in practice. The university needs to focus on developing inclusive policies, rather than implementing policies for certain target groups, needs to be aware of existing thresholds and needs to develop measures to eliminate those thresholds.

It has been suggested that the reason for a low influx of students from a cultural-linguistic minority or students with (functional) disabilities can be ascribed to policies in secondary education, and not in tertiary education. However, a disproportionate number of students who have such a background can be situated in Vocational Secondary Education. It is high time to search for and develop compensatory measures that allow those people who might have been advised to do vocational training but have the capacities to earn a university

degree to start at university, without lowering the bar for them or for any other student. **Some countries have developed a 'Foundation Year' to prepare students for a career at university. It is advisable that Ghent University explores whether such a programme would be viable and desirable at our institution.**

With respect to a successful flow-through of students we must dare to reflect about conceptual learning paths, informal networks, the organisation of writing centres with modules focusing on academic writing and individual coaching sessions, the organisation of study coaching, organising evaluations in a more flexible way, etc. Actions like this that call upon the autonomy of the student, are not remedial (and as such stigmatising) for one group of students or one individual student, but are conceptually present for all students. This again means that we should not lower the bar, it does mean that we should dare to think whether for instance a differentiated type of evaluation is possible and desirable (where we for instance let students choose between a group assignment or a multiple choice exam). We need more research to be able to gauge the effects of such measures (for some of them some seeds have already been planted at our university).

Language of instruction

A thorough Anglicisation of education (as is currently the case in The Netherlands) is not desirable for bachelor programmes. For master programmes English (or perhaps another language) as the language of instruction should only be considered when there is added value for the students and the related work field. Ghent University has an emancipatory function and language plays an important part in that.

Inflow

We argue for a compulsory, though non-binding placement test that takes into account the specificity of the starting competencies of the chosen trajectory. The purpose of such a test is to support students in assessing their own competencies, not to create obstacles at the start of their studies. If after the placement test it turns out that a student needs remediation, they must get the opportunity to do so. Therefore, we argue, not for a penalising placement test, but for a stimulating test. At the same time we should not mislead students who score very poorly on the placement test. In their own interest we should encourage them to make a different study choice and we will guide them in that too.

Furthermore, it is important to stimulate diversity in the inflow and to guarantee it in the flow-through. That should be done by means of supporting actions that are not stigmatising for one group. **Attracting more students to the university is not a goal per se. We want students who are in the right place and who can give the best of themselves.** Whether that is at our university or in a different tertiary education setting is of secondary importance. At

the level of the AUGent association (and even across association boundaries) we can do more with respect to trajectory coaching of students than we are doing now.

Reform of the academic year

A possible reform of the academic year is only possible in consultation with all stake-holders, foremost with students and teachers. We are not in favour of the most radical propositions of modular build-up of five-week teaching periods without any study period before the exams. A reform of the academic year that makes it possible to leave aside the courses during the winter break and comprises a real summer break for all students does seem desirable to us. It is clear that further consultation about this topic is needed and that we should not rush into rash decisions. The 'Standpunt Alternatieve Academische Kalender' note that was prepared by the Ghent Student Board (GSR) contains a number of very justified concerns.

We argue against a one-size-fits-all approach: modular education is only possible for those study programmes (or more specifically: those courses) for which it is suitable. Modular education is meant to promote the learning process of the students and cannot by any means become a hindrance. Therefore, we argue for a mixed educational offer, in which some study programmes/courses are modular and others are not.

'A study period is necessary to give students the opportunity to process the material globally.'

Whatever the duration of the future educational modules, it is desirable to let exam periods be preceded by a (short) study period. Such a study period is necessary to give students the chance to process the material globally and to make connections between the content of different courses. Furthermore, we argue for a preservation of a resit period in the same academic year.

The implementation of modular education only makes sense when appropriate teaching methods are being introduced. We look forward to the results of the working groups that have recently started to think about these issues, initiated by the Ghent University Department of Educational Affairs (DOWA).