



Network for Education
in International Health

Minutes of tropEd General Assembly Meeting
Online GA 08 and 09 October 2020
Via ZOOM

Participants registered:

1. Lisa Hoffaeller (session 1, 2, 3, 4)
2. Hans-Friedemann Kinkel (session 1, 3, 4)
3. Dewi Ismajani (Jani) Puradiredja (session 1, 2, 3, 4)
4. Kafuruki Mwigirwa Shubis (sessions 1,2,3,4, did not attend)
5. Bernadette Peterhans (sessions 1,2,3,4)
6. Bruno Broucker (sessions 1,2,3,4)
7. Anne Fabricius (session 1,2,3,4)
8. Carola Eyber (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
9. Mubasysyir Hasanbasri (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
10. Raja Benkirane (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
11. Govert van Heusden (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
12. Bente E. Moen (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
13. Nandita Rothermund-Bucher (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
14. Carlos Linares (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
15. Francisco Galvan (session 2)
16. Guenter Froeschl (sessions 1,2,3,4)
17. Alberto Matteelli (sessions 1,2,3,4)
18. Giulia Gardini (sessions 1,2,3,4)
19. Beatrice Formenti (sessions 1,2,3,4)

20. Michael Galatsch (Session 1,2)
21. Ralf Weigel (Session 3,4)
22. Núria Casamitjana (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
23. Soorej Jose Puthooppambal (session 1,3)
24. Linda Karin Forshaw (sessions 2,3,4)
25. Maaïke Flinkenflogel (session 1,2,3,4)
26. Rodney Reynolds (session 1,2,3,4)
27. Marie Lindkvist (session 1,2,3,4)
28. Maria do Rosario (session 1,2,3,4)
29. Axel Hoffmann (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
30. Eva Mertens (sessions 1, 2, 3, 4)
31. Seydou Doumbia (sessions 3, did not attend)

Thursday, 08 October 2020

Session 1, 11:00 – 13:00 (CEST), Audio-Recording

Chair: Guenter Froeschl

Welcome and Introduction to Agenda

Guenter Froeschl

See Annex Agenda

See Annex TropEd Office

GA composition: 13 Full Members, 3 Coll Members, 2 Indiv Members.

Opening Remarks

Francesco Castelli

power point presentation on university of Brescia and master course (Annex Castelli)

Q&A:

GvH: Brescia became home institution in 2019, how are things working? => AM: not much changed, all elements of the master were functional also beforehand.

CE: student numbers? => AM: 20-25, quite stable

RR: student demographics? => AM: younger, 90% Italian; some lessons are in Italian.

MF: composition of student groups? COVID-Impact? Exams in times of COVID? =>

AM: 1-3 troped students/ year. COVID changed teaching and learning experiences.

Exams online, verifications by use of camera.

NC: some students want interaction with faculty, how important in your view? => AM:

yes, important, online not same as presence.

RR: did institutional perception of online teaching change? Student perception of

online learning? => AM: institutional acceptance improved, students not as used to it as e.g. in UK.

Round of Introduction

All GA participants state name, institution, COVID situation, expectations.

Acceptance of Minutes plus Annexes of tropEd Online GA June 2020

Maria do Rosario Martins missing as participant. Change immediately executed.

Minutes and Annexes accepted per doodle poll by 13/13 Full Members.

Business since last GA

Financial issues: lawyer died, law office still signs responsible, will find replacement.

Transfer of legal entity tropEd to Munich including bank account not yet done.

Student Representatives

In Basel and Barcelona there were several stud reps. Now responsive only Miriam Müller, but she couldn't make it to participate in GA.

CE: EC needs to take responsibility to affront the weak representation.

RR: create incentives for students

JP: suggests breakout sessions at GA for students

GvH: suggests system of rotating home institutions' responsibility for supporting stud reps

GF: will be put on EC telco agenda

Course Accreditation

5 accreditation groups, results see Annex Course Accreditation.

GF: there were problems to find reviewers.

NC: assign all GA participants to reviews.

CE: move course submission deadline earlier to have more time. Course representative has to be present at the accreditation group telco.

MF: suggests to allow GA participation of non-tropEd course representatives to respond directly to questions.

NC and GvH: sometimes GA hosting institutions were inviting technical course representatives, but this was at times problematic as not familiar with tropEd and defensive.

Membership Issues

Martina Manhart Individual Membership: MM presented herself to GA, see also Annex Application Indiv Member Martina Manhart. Doodle poll: 10 FM for, 0 FM against, 1 FM abstains [Info mail with official letter of acceptance sent to MM]

Other membership issues: see Annex tropEd Office.

Session 2, 14:30 – 16:00 (CEST), Audio-Recording

Chair: Bruno Broucker

Website

Demo of website by Francisco Galvan. See Annex Website

Key points:

- Appearance
- Advanced Search Function
- Contents, structure and functions can be adapted by tropEd secretariat directly
- WordPress! Platform

Q&A

GF: map interactive? => no, but possible. Overview numbers generated automatically? => yes. Structure of website changeable by us? => yes, easily.

MF: search by mode of delivery? => yes, e.g. in advanced search

HFK: date search by months instead by day? => possible

GvH: historical database? => possible => general discussion: as course contents are only updated and not always inserted as new course historical database difficult. But possible: easy down- and up-load of excel exportation, this way each course update (e.g. re-accreditation) could be copy-pasted as new course in excel and uploaded.

Important: avoid double accounting.

RR: website visitor analysis possible? => yes, e.g. google analytics

MF: who bears image copyright? => GvH: we agreed that images should be without copyrights or referral of institutions.

Scientific Session: Quality Culture

Bruno Broucker, see Annex Broucker

Q&A:

ML: problem of how to get inspirations on improving quality across to those involved.

CE: alignment of different frameworks challenging, also individual perspectives.

GF: institutions could be assigned a quality culture position in the way they currently behave.

RR: quality notion also in relations within the network.

BP: tropEd did a publication on peer-reviewed quality assurance.

BB: would quality assurance as per institution (system accreditation) be a way forward?

CE: tropEd would still want to see what quality assurance means at institutions.
Dialogue is key.

JP: For BNITM learning on quality from other institutions is key within tropEd.

GF: tropEd does already system accreditation through membership procedure.
Practical implication of tropEd accreditation: facilitates student, staff and credit mobility.

Friday, 09 October 2020

Session 3, 11:00 – 13:00 (CEST), Audio-Recording

Chair: Govert van Heusden, power point presentation, see Annex van Heusden

Q&A:

RW: what does reference role as network mean? => to be recognized as an entity that gives added value in a certain field.

Breakout Rooms

See Annex Breakout Groups

Group 1: Membership

Chair and minutes: Guenter Froeschl; Bernadette Peterhans, Alberto Matteelli, Beatrice Formenti, Giulia Gardini, Jani Puradireja, Bente Moen

GF: suggests: fees by DAC list and national income level: HIC vs LMIC, and full voting right for all institutional members (not individual members).

BP: historic development in tropEd on concern regarding contribution of institutions to network.

BM: is pro inclusiveness!

BP: tropEd wanted since beginning to be global, but was difficult to attract institutions from outside Europe.

JP: could BNITM ever be home-institution? => GF: no, as not degree-awarding

AM: institutions should contribute at least one course. Would favour to keep obligation to participate at GAs.

GF: would allow keeping members that turn passive.

AM: prefers smaller but active network

BM: doesn't mind that Bergen is non-home-institution, that there is division between home- and non-home-institutions.

BP: tropEd as teaching community needs to be stricter as responsiveness is important for student mobility. As learning community we can be more flexible.

JP: suggests separate entity like “friends of tropEd” for passive institutions.

AM: would you give voting right to inactive members? => GF: voting happens within GAs, so to execute voting right is inherently limited to active members.

BM: would like to remain generous with members. Why change a winning horse, tropEd runs well?

BP: underlying issue: tropEd always depends on active individuals. If they leave institutions, things change.

BM&JP&BP&GF: keep statutes on member requirements as they are but practice them generously and soft.

Unanimous Agreement:

- No more Full and Collaborative Members
- Re-structure fees: € 1500,- for HIC, € 500,- for LMIC
- Full Voting Right to all member institutions.
- For Individual Members all stays as it is.

Group 2: Recognition Policy

Participants: Carola Eyber (Chair), Govert van Heusden (minutes), Nuria Casamitjana, Mubasysyir Hasanbasri, Soorej Jose Puthoopparambil, Linda Karin Forshaw, Maria do Rosario

All participants are reminded on the process and criteria used for tropEd recognition.

Recognition is an extension of external quality assurance to the level of an individual student's master track.

In previous GA (“Hamburg”) opinions were voiced on:

- Importance of the recognition process: going from central to irrelevant
- The fact that so far only home institutions were concerned

- That criteria were experienced as too restrictive
- About the extent to which recognition was linked to QA?
- Whether it should appear in the tropEd vision?

Recognition is considered a further level of external QA as it checks mobility, work experience, external supervision and e.g. time-span for graduation. But, less and less students apply for recognition. It seems less accessible to students.

The value of tropEd recognition is as perceived by employers. There are indications that tropEd recognition has helped graduates in their careers (job, further studies).

However, looking at the criteria for granting tropEd recognition it is thought that it is based on a curriculum structure which might not be that relevant anymore.

Review of the recognition criteria:

Work experience: We now define low and middle income “settings” (see core course LO’s) instead of countries or societies. And in many institutions we see students becoming more diverse and have on average less experience and also in more diverse settings. It is proposed to change the criterion to:

“have at least one year of professional experience of which at least 6 months should be work experience or internship (as exposure) in a low or middle income setting or with vulnerable population groups (e.g. migrants)”

Presence of an external examiner/supervisor: compliance with this criterion depends on the policies of the home institution. Can be very different amongst partners (in case they would be home institution). It is proposed to change the criterion to:

“involvement of a person external to the home institution in the master thesis process (can be jury, thesis supervision, co-supervision, oversight...)”

Max. time span of 5 yrs within which to complete a master degree: this is difficult for a many students and should not be so strict. But if the amount of work experience is reduced it is expected to become more easy to comply with this criterion. It is proposed to change the criterion to:

“ Graduation within 5 yrs after the start date of the core course, but extension of this period can be granted if requested and motivated by the student and home institution. An extension will be endorsed by the GA on a case-by-case basis.”

Mobility and study track: some members consider that any student, also from non-home institutions should get recognition for having been mobile in the tropEd network. For the moment there are numbers of credits defined: for outside country of home institution (min. 10) or for online credits (max. 10). The question is raised if all credits must be from tropEd accredited courses? And even whether the structure 20 core, 20-25 advanced and thesis 15-20 has to be maintained. Alternative could be to assess the LO's of the followed programme without imposing a credit structure in 3 phases.

It is proposed to further and more broadly discuss this aspect.

A follow-up meeting will be planned by CE with the break-out session group (and others if interested) to discuss:

- The need for all 60 credits to be tropEd accredited
- The limitation on 10 ECTS max for online courses
- The fact that other credits need to be taken outside of home country
- The number of credits to be taken at other tropEd member institutions

Group 3: Quality Assurance and Culture

Chair and minutes: Bruno Broucker

(present: Maria, Ralf, Anne, Maaïke & Bruno)

1. How do you experience the current course accreditation?
2. How do you perceive QA in TropEd?
3. Do we miss something? Is it fit for every institution? If going for a new vision, which way would you like tropEd to evolve?

Former situation

- Before Bologna process – there was no ECTS – QA was very different; The system tropEd has, was logic in the past – for standardization; I'm not sure whether it makes sense at this moment – especially for EU countries; Not sure if we still have to maintain this. So, something must change.
- There is a large diversity in institutions. Course accreditation doesn't add necessarily something. The question is what we could do for non-EU courses. However, there is still quite some differences in quality. For students it can make sense to have the standards, but reality is quite different as well.
- Because of accreditation, tropEd puts things on paper, but in reality it all depends on the course coordinator.
- In Europe there is already a lot of energy in QA.
- The essence is that we want to give students a good quality course. But: is course accreditation leading to that? Not really sure. It looks as a too standardized procedure.
- For non-european countries the ECTS are not always in the mind/culture of the courses, and it doesn't necessarily always make the case. Difference between theory and reality. How can we assure quality, and be sure of quality? But, if we don't do it, we could still have quality.
- What does the literature say? There is some evidence for a good learning. tropEd should share some quality values. Are we assessing quality from just students? How? We should have some agreements on what institutions want. Institutions who join, they want to learn and provide good quality. We need to define what quality values are. This is already a bit in our handbook. BUT: what is the quality for the student? And what is the quality for the teacher? Not necessarily the same.
- Is the course accreditation still the best way?
- We could evolve more to trust. We accept institution, and we trust the quality will be good. Afterwards we can see via surveys whether students were happy with the course. Feedback of students is crucial, and that we are lacking a bit at the

moment. However, this is really important to know if the quality is good. Dimensions of engagement are also important. And maybe tropEd should put the learning in the centre. What can students expect in each institution? This will allow some discussion on quality as well, because every institution looks differently at quality and learning. In every institution students can expect different learning.

- And the differences between institutions are fine, and students appreciate different things. So, this as well has some impact on quality.
- There needs to be a balance between learning of students and satisfaction of students.

Group 4: Becoming Learning Community

Participants: Rodney (Chair), Marie (minutes), Friedemann, Nandita, Eva, Lisa, Raja, Axel

Rodney and Marie started the discussion with the following questions:

- What is it that we share in terms of learning?
- Who are we sharing with?
- How can the added value of tropEd be useful in our own departments/institutions?

Comments on sharing and the present status:

Difficult to understand exactly what we mean with a learning community, probably this means different things to all of us.

We need to define what a learning community is to us

tropEd accreditation is a quality assurance for courses

tropEd is a platform for good learning directed to both ourselves and the students

tropEd promotes quality in higher education tropEd makes it possible to compare your own education with others

Sharing experiences and learn from each other

Sharing a sense of standard

Share the same vision, same values and philosophy behind learning and teaching

We share teaching approaches

We share practises, ideas, openness, and awareness

We also share outside the network

We share relationships between people, and we are acting as ambassadors for our departments/institutions

Questions

Are we mostly a teaching community?

To whom is the learning directed?

How do we grow?

Is this only about departments/institutions? Can students be involved? Stakeholders?

What do we produce?

Should we have some training teaching approaches, produce materials?

Comments on added value and the future

Define what we share, more focus on didactics and learning approaches.

Discuss contemporary questions, what should be taught in Global Health today?

Our subject and knowledge are very much needed in the world today, balance between saving lives and the cost for society. How to deal with vulnerable populations in time of crises e.g. Covid-19.

We could use alumni much more; they are motivated to help and can give a lot to this learning community.

Visions for the future

We could step forward and be a “think tank” for Global Health.

Now is the time for Global Health, everyone knows what an epidemiologist is 😊 (at least in Europe)

Arrange a conference?

Goals for tropEd’s visions:

- Collaborative Learning
- Mobility for Students and Faculty
- Network with Diversity of Members
- Enabling Exchange
- Developing tropEd into a teaching and learning community – what does that mean/entail?

Entails:

1. Assisting members to provide high quality education
2. Delivering high quality education

To help determine the nature of what a Learning Community is, we should ask:

- What do we share? What do we produce?
- How do we share it? Dissemination beyond the membership
- Is there a need/strategy to use social media channels more?
- What are the constraints?

How can we bring added value to TropEd back into our institutions?

- What do we share?
- Who do we share with?

HF - Learning Community (LC) means what?

- What are we (the membership) learning?
- o A LC addresses tropEd members and deals with us and is directed at us (rather than at non-network members)

How should we grow?

- Learning/ Assessment
- Share our experiences with learning and assessment more regularly and formally

NANDITA - Is a LC mostly about institutions? The Students? Or is it about integrating the two?

- o Is it just membership of TropEd or does it include our students?

EVA – LC is based in sharing of experiences

- o Producing educational contents to students
- o Learning from one another

LISA- Munich new coordinator responsible for the Masters and diploma in tropical health as well as their online courses

- o A LC should confirm quality as that seems to be the needs of students and institutions she works with
- o Share a sense of standards
- o LC directed towards students and ourselves as members
- o Perhaps as an LC we could train the teachers/ produce materials for teachers
- Raja
- o LC will share the same vision

- o LC will promote quality culture
- o LC will share materials related to accreditation; and demonstrate how to create quality
- Axel

LC will...

- o Share the same vision
- o Share values
- o Share weaknesses
- o Be open to outside stakeholders
- o - How do we maintain our memory of change?
- o People and Institutions not in the networks also matter and we often have access to them through our personal networks and through alumni. These could include
 - ☞ Other kinds of institutions ie not universities
 - ☞ Other consortia
 - ☞ Consultancies that also share similar ideas, activities and practices
 - ☞ It is critical that we recognize what we offer
- Marie - What do we want to do? How do we become a better learning community?
 - o Have the same visions of others
 - o Have an overview of alignment
 - o Pedagogical Discussions Around
 - ☞ How to do things in a good way

- o How can we do it?
- o Being Contemporary
- o What kind of things should we be teaching to always be contemporary?
- HF - Need to discuss what we should do
- o Didactics - How do we do it
- o Different learning and teaching topics techniques
- o Contemporary Contents
- o Critique of post colonial / diversity; think tank
- o We are in the midst of it all?
- o [We should produce things/quality theory]
- NANDITA - Using alumni more
- o Buddy program for alumni; relates to AXEL's ideas about recognizing our value and incorporating outside non-academic stakeholders. The idea of the buddy program generated a lot of excitement.

Marie - Now epidemiology is known, we should take advantage of the moment

HF - Nanditas idea is great about the buddy system

- A conference perhaps is a good idea
- TropEd should have a conference like in the society for international global

Eva - How can we use the alumni effectively?

Plenary

Feedback Group 1:

Issue on philosophy and texture of network, ongoing discourse, that will continue as a dynamic

Suggestion: Re-structure fees (see above)

Suggestion: voting right for all institutions

Feedback Group 2:

Recognition less accessible for students

Value? => probably yes, e.g. when applying with MSF or for scholarships

Recognition Criteria:

Working experience: difficult to comply, reduce to 1 year of which 6 months in LMIC setting

External Examiner: involvement of external person in master project, thesis enough

5-year-limit: to keep and re-evaluate later, but allow for well-explained exceptions.

Mobility: allow also students from non-home-institutions? Allow (more) credits from courses outside tropEd?

BB: Will this increase recognition request? => NC: believes so

BB: is there added benefit that is understood by students or employers?

BP: more students at Swiss TPH would want recognition.

RR: will reduced requirements also lower value of recognition for employers?

Students at UCL had problems with recognition requirements, as these do not match UCL admission requirements.

Group 3: Quality Assurance and Culture

Is our quality assurance old fashioned, is it measuring quality? A lot of effort. Not assessed: student and lecturer perspective. Suggestion to invite institutions to

present their quality assurance, and to look more at QA in admission of new members. Course accreditation too technical and detailed?

Q&A:

RR: quality in the network itself => BB: that would serve students to move around the network.

Group 4: Becoming a Learning Community

Things to share on values, vision and procedures, within network and to outside.

Development of teaching didactics, defining topics relevant for Intl Global Health.

Suggestion: buddy system between students and alumni

ML: right now with COVID good moment to become visible

Conclusion: chairs of groups send minutes in writing to GvH and GF, Working Group Strategic Vision will prepare next steps.

Session 4, 14:30 – 16:00 (CEST), no recording

Social Activity Brescia

Tour Guide Giovanna Bellandi, see Annex Brescia Tour

Networks and Events

Nuria Casamitjana, see Annex Casamitjana

BM: ECTMIH in 09-2021 will be virtual

NC: we could submit an abstract to ECTMIH on tropEd and COVID/ Network Transformation

EUGLOH: ask someone from LMU Munich to present EUGLOH at next GA? => GF: will prepare

CUGH: invite them to self-present at future GA?

ASPPH Global Network: tropEd filled in membership form, contact persons NC and GF

Upcoming Dates

Guenter Froeschl

Now planned Basel 11-13 Feb 2021; Ifakara 17-19 Jun 2021; Bergen 23-26 Sep 2021.

Suggestion: to have a sure and safe 25th anniversary, move Basel-GA to June, and ask Ifakara to host in 2022.

EC will discuss, and ask all members for their opinion.

End of GA at 16:00

EC Telco right after end of GA

Brescia, 10.10.2020, Guenter Froeschl