

CvB stukken voor agenda Universiteitsraad

Overlegvergadering d.d. : 07/11/18
Commissievergadering : 24/10/18
Agendapunt : Strategie instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg (ITK)
Bijgevoegde stukken : Theme analysis institutional audit 270918
Strategy institutional audit 021018

Betrokken dienst: S&B
Secretaris: Wichman
Portefeuillehouder: Palstra

paraaf: 
paraaf: 
paraaf: 

1. Status agendapunt:

Rol URaad:

- Ter informatie (theme analysis)
- Ter advisering (strategy)

2. Eerder behandeld in:

Naam gremium: CvB

Datum behandeling: 08/10/18

Naam agendapunt: Strategie instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg (ITK)

Conclusie toen:

Het College van Bestuur neemt kennis van de analyse gemaakt ten aanzien van de relevante thema's in de voorbereiding richting ITK en besluit de theme analysis ter informatie aan de UR te zenden.

Het CvB onderschrijft de keuzes voorgelegd in de accreditatiestrategie en verzoekt de UR te adviseren aangaande de nadere precisering van de clusters alsmede een vertegenwoordiger voor de UR voor personeel en een voor studenten voor te dragen in aanvulling van de adviesgroep.

3. Toelichting/samenvatting:

De huidige ITK is geldig tot 1 mei 2020. Om deze te verlengen zal een nieuwe beoordeling worden aangevraagd. Bezoeken worden verwacht in de periode oktober/ november 2019. Ter voorbereiding dient de UT een zelfevaluatie aan te leveren (zomer 2019). Het NVAO-accreditatiekader is relatief vormvrij en geeft de instelling ruimte hier eigen accenten in te leggen. Normaliter wordt een geschreven zelfevaluatie van circa 50 pagina's aangeleverd, waarbij een aantal essentiële documenten wordt meegezonden. De NVAO vraagt de instellingen hierin terughoudendheid te betrachten.

Het document theme analysis is een analyse waarbij vanuit verschillende perspectieven naar de komende ITK gekeken wordt:

- Uitkomsten van de ITK in 2013
- Resultaten van opleidingsvisitaties sinds de vorige ITK
- Accenten die in de 2^e ronde bij andere universiteiten zijn gelegd

Vanuit deze perspectieven is een aantal thema's gedestilleerd waarvoor inhoudelijke voorbereiding nodig is in aanloop naar de ITK. Hierbij gaat het om beschrijven huidige stand van zaken, reflectie op eigen sterkte/ zwakte, dossiervorming.

In de accreditatiestrategie is een aantal keuzes met betrekking tot de voorbereiding en inrichting van de ITK beschreven. Een strategische keuze daarbij is om op het niveau van de thema's die uit het instellingsportret voortkomen veelal de stand van zaken te beschrijven en hier kritisch op te reflecteren. Uitgaande van de kwaliteit die bij de vorige ITK en de opleidingsaccreditaties is aangetoond, is de verwachting dat de NVAO met gerechtvaardigd vertrouwen naar de UT zal kijken. Sterk inzetten op een paper-trail en ad hoc verbetermaatregelen lijkt op de meeste thema's niet nodig. De zelfevaluatie heeft daarmee als doel een spiegel te zijn van de organisatie. De stuurgroep ITK vindt het van belang dat deze snel in conceptstadium gereed is om een interne dialoog te faciliteren.

Echter op een aantal thema's is noodzakelijk dat gesignaleerde ontwikkelpunten en reeds in gang gezette verbeteringen in het lopende academisch jaar worden afgerond. Bij thema's die een relatief hoog risicoprofiel hebben, wordt voorgesteld deze verbetertrajecten onder de regie van de stuurgroep ITK te doen uitvoeren. In de clusters (accreditatiestrategie pagina 4) is globaal beschreven wat er gerealiseerd dient te worden.

Met de NVAO is reeds afgestemd dat de kwaliteitsafspraken als trail binnen de ITK beoordeeld zullen worden. Dit zal bij de formele aanvraag van de ITK opnieuw bevestigd worden. Op korte termijn zullen ook wensen ten aanzien van de panelsamenstelling moeten worden doorgegeven, zodat de planning van de bezoeken tijdig kan worden gemaakt.

4. (Voorgenomen) besluit CvB:

- Het College van Bestuur onderschrijft de algemene aanpak beschreven in de accreditatiestrategie en het hierin benoemde onderscheid tussen thema's (beschrijven zoals het is) en clusters (kortcyclisch verbeteren).
- Het College van Bestuur verzoekt de projectleider ITK in samenspraak met de Secretaris van de Universiteit tot een nadere uitwerking hiervan te komen en hierbij advisering van de UR omtrent de scope van de clusters mee te nemen.
- Wat betreft specifieke wensen ten aanzien van de panelsamenstelling, neemt het CvB het door de stuurgroep ITK geformuleerde advies over. Het CvB verzoekt de projectleider ITK deze wensen met de NVAO af te stemmen in de ambtelijke voorbereiding van het accreditatiebezoek.

GRIFFIE URaad: (door griffie UR in te vullen)

Eerder in URaad aan de orde geweest?

- Nee.
- Ja, op

Conclusie toen:

Nadere toelichting: (Voor als presidium/griffier vindt dat één van bovengenoemde punten nadere toelichting behoeft)

.....
.....

Theme analysis institutional audit

AUTHOR

R.E. van Luijk

DEPARTMENT

Strategy & Policy

TELEPHONE

1130

E-MAIL

r.e.vanluijk@utwente.nl

STATUS

Established by steering committee

DOCUMENT HISTORY

VERSION	DATE	AUTHOR(S)	REMARKS
0.1	08/09/18	Van Luijk	Abbreviated version of institutional portrait

APPROVAL

VERSION	DATE	ROLE
1.0	26/09/18	Steering committee

Preamble

The assessment that will be carried out during the institutional audit focuses on a framework, that can be summarized in four standards:

- Standard 1: Philosophy and policy : Are the institution's vision and policy concerning the quality of the education it provides widely supported and sufficiently coordinated, both externally and internally?
- Standard 2: Implementation : How does the institution realize this vision of quality?"
- Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring How does the institution monitor that its vision of quality is realized?
- Standard 4: Development: How does the institution work on improvement?

In short these standards describe the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle of educational quality assurance, and the university should be able to provide proof of being in control on all aspects of this cycle on themes that are essential to educational quality.

The theme analysis will help the content driven preparation for the institutional audit (ITK). Where the project plan only gives a global answer to the planning of the steps to be taken, it does not provide an answer to exactly what needs to be done in order to be "ITK-ready" in time. The purpose of the theme analysis is to identify the themes and underlying topics relevant to the ITK. Several approaches were combined in order to make this assessment:

- First of all, an inventory was made of the points that the panel has identified as points for improvement in the institutional review in 2013.
- Subsequently, the outcomes of programme assessments carried out since the previous ITK were examined, so that overarching points for attention are identified.
- Finally, an overview the strengths and weaknesses (generalizable to UT) was made on the basis of the self-evaluations and panel reports from 4 institutions that have already completed a second round institutional audit.

In the conclusion all themes that are identified as relevant are listed. For each theme several pointers are mentioned that are relevant in further preparation. This document is intended to support further preparation, as an indication towards the focus of approach of each theme for the coming months.

Synthesis analysis on recommendations first institutional audit

In the first institutional audit of 2013 several points of improvement and overarching recommendations have been made by the panel. These points are compared with the current framework for the institutional audit. Below the summary of the findings, the full analysis is available as [Appendix 1](#).

Standard 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Full vision on education (integrated) needs to be more explicitly formulated• Work field committees and institutionalized contacts professional field• Profile Human Touch• Policy on internationalization• Long term perspective educational policy
Standard 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Implementation assessment policy• Indicators staff professionalization• Work-load monitoring• Policy regarding students with a functional impairment
Standard 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Quality assurance policy on institutional level• Monitoring financial milestones TEM• Complexity of governance and consultation structures, functioning of platforms, mandates• Adequate and harmonized instruments for quality assurance for all programmes, faculties and service centers• Systematic involvement of work field on evaluation and monitoring• Set up MISUT
Standard 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TEM evaluation• Formal structures quality assurance policy• Structural PDCA-loop on all levels• Transparency on results programme educational-renewal since institutional audit 2013• Positioning and task-setting of examination boards

Synthesis programme portrait

Since the application for the first institutional audit many programmes underwent an audit (limited programme assessments). In the preparation for the institutional audit, information on the follow-up on points of improvement noted by the panel during these limited programme assessments should be made readily available. The NVAO will probably make use of the findings of the programme visitations in preparation for the institutional audit. This analysis is therefore not meant to note programme specific risks and points of improvement, but rather to note where specific strong points or weaknesses were noted for several programmes and therefore would benefit from being addressed at institutional level in the preparation for the institutional level. This can be useful in highlighting several strong aspects and addressing certain shortcomings. The full institutional portrait can be found as [Appendix 2](#).

Strong points mentioned for numerous programmes:

- T-shaped professional, TEM-model
- Multidisciplinary approach
- Staff: quality, dedication and commitment
- Community feeling, approachable staff, direct follow up
- Study guidance
- Facilities (learning environment)

Improvement points mentioned for numerous programmes:

- More explicit learning outcomes
- Attention to workload of staff
- Grading procedures final thesis
- Structural workfield and alumni involvement
- Internationalization (goals and language policy)
- Functioning of examination boards and programme committees

Synthesis findings second institutional audit other universities

From the experiences of other universities that have already undergone a second institutional audit, it is possible to determine per standard which aspects have been designated as good practices for the evaluating panel. Although this specifically concerns (recent) assessments of other institutions that do not have to be translated 1 to 1 to the UT, it does provide insight into the aspects that need to be addressed in the preparation. For each standard the aspects that were regarded as positive are listed, as well as the aspects that raised questions with the panels. A more complete overview of the findings can be found in [Appendix 3](#)

Standard	Positive appraisal	Concerns raised
1: Philosophy and policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly articulated vision and identity Core values well propagated, consistent with organizational goals Key focuspoints selected throughout reflection Involvement and support stakeholders in process drawing up vision and strategy Balance between autonomy and management Principles governance are coherent whole with vision and identity Strategic & annual cycle are connected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No strategic answer to previously raised questions in formal evaluations Governance principles and policy cycle unclear to panel Not harmonized or transparent responsibilities and mandates Insufficiently broad consultation when drawing up vision of education
2: Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear practical examples of educational quality on different policy domains Student and staff participation well positioned External stakeholders systematically involved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of effectiveness in internal process of follow-up measures Insufficient attention towards functioning programme committees, examination boards, university council Too complex or not transparent allocation of responsibilities
3: Evaluation and monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management information systematically generated, Transparent system of regular reports Balance between hard & soft controls Programme committee and other bodies well positioned Quality culture Clear connection quality assurance on programme level and on institutional level Developmental perspective, continuous improvement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involvement of advisory boards, committees and councils insufficiently stated Stakeholders insufficiently involved in communication on improvement measures Lack of peer reviews / mid-term audits Programme committees, faculty and university council not in position (lack of facilities or training)
4: Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures that secure follow up evaluations Pro-active approach to signals, strong mechanisms to recover and improve Connection formal - informal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systems to combine data not optimized Funneling back information to higher level insufficient Mechanisms to transfer from improvement initiative to standardization could be better

All-in all can be concluded that, alongside the actual focus points mentioned in the standards, panels are on the lookout for:

- Internal consistency (vision -> strategy -> educational vision -> people and resources -> processes)
- Way of improving and securing (consistent PDCA cycle on strategic, tactical and operational level and well organized and demonstrable effective communication between those layers)
- Transparent and well-functioning governance (decision structure, forms of consultation, formal / informal, manner of dealing with professional autonomy and diversity between programmes/faculties)
- Structural and demonstrable involvement of stakeholders (e.g. student and staff participation, programme committees, work field)

Conclusion: themes for each standard

Based on the synthesis above and the information in the appendices, themes can be identified as being essential towards the content driven preparation for the institutional audit. Per theme the aspects that are important to pay attention to are also noted.

Alongside the 4 standards from the NVAO framework another category is added for overall transparency. These are not formal standards as such, but will be part of the institutional audit by choice. This institution specific category contains the quality agreements, this will be addressed as a trail during the site visits. Also the key focus points from the strategic ambitions of the university are included. The analysis from other institutions shows it is good practice and well appreciated by panels to make the explicit translation from elements of the institutional identity / strategy, to the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle that is essential to the NVAO standards.

Standard 1: Philosophy & policy

Theme	Attention to be paid to
Profile & Vision	Profile of the university Core values; Historical setting of UT (developmental perspective); Challenges for the future ;
Strategy	Vision 2020; Evaluation of realization of previous goals / targets; Long term perspective educational policy; Process new strategy (involvement stakeholders, decision making, etc);
Educational vision	Complete chain: Twente Academy-bachelor-master-Twente Graduate School – Life Long Learning; Coherence TEM model – Master education; HTHT profile T-shaped professional, multidisciplinary approach Student driven learning; Guidelines for specification Intended Learning Outcomes programmes; How is broad consultation for developing new vision organized (process)
Governance	Relationship of governance principles and core values; Formal structures, roles, transparent allocation of responsibilities, mandates; Vision on involvement external stakeholders Management philosophy including vision on promoting quality culture; Consultation structure, functioning platforms; Address issue of autonomy vs centralization; Address concern of complexity governance and consultation structures Address concern of "administrative pressure";

Standard 2: Development

Theme	Attention to be paid to
Assessment policy	Implementation assessment policy in faculties / programmes; Do all programmes / faculties have adequate developed policy in assessment; Grading procedures final thesis; Responsibilities examination boards; Plan and execution SQE;
Human Resources	Quality, dedication and commitment of staff, how to protect and assure this asset; Work load; Language policy staff; Performance indicators staff at institutional level; Expertise development (CELT, UTQ, STQ, SQE)
Study guidance and policy for students with functional impairment	Student wellbeing ; Diversity (for instance internationalization, functional impairment); Implementation professional qualification study guidance; Study information, SKC and matching activities; Career guidance;
Educational environment and facilities	Learning environment (small scale, community based); Digital learning environment; Study facilities; Campus development;
Partnerships	Intertwining education and (international) professional field;

Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring

Theme	Attention to be paid to
Quality assurance policy institution	Systematical closing of PDCA; Formal structures improvement policy; Informal structures improvement policy; Balance between hard & soft controls; Enhancing quality culture; Coordinating principles for interlocking quality circles for the faculty / service organization; Assuring funneling back information to “higher level” Governing principles quality assurance faculties; Ensuring systematic feedback to and involvement of stakeholders; Address policy on organizing / stimulating peer-reviews (mid-term audits)
Quality assurance policy faculties and service centres	Systematical closing of PDCA; Formal structures improvement policy; Informal structures improvement policy; Balance between hard & soft controls; Coordinating principles for interlocking quality circles faculty – programme – educational unit; Assuring funneling back information to “higher level” Ensuring systematic feedback to and involvement of stakeholders;
Evaluation of education	Process of evaluation; Involvement of stakeholders; Position of council, programme committee Special attention to TEM, Honours, RESTS
Instruments	Overview internal instruments used; Overview external instrument used; Harmonization of instruments for all programmes, faculties and service centres;
Results and systems	Publication of results, transparant system of regular reports; Overview of main results realized Ability to produce more detailed evaluation results when asked for in trails Systematic generation of management information; Set-up and development of MISUT;

Standard 4: Development

Theme	Attention to be paid to
Work field involvement	Presence work field committees / advisory boards; Systematic involvement of alumni;
Examination boards	Task setting: legal obligations and specific mandates; Guarantees for proper (and pro-active) functioning; Responsibilities regarding fraud, plagiarism and individual contribution in group assignments; Assurance of expertise (SQE, advisory group examination boards); Internal positioning ;
Programme committees, faculty and university council	Task setting: legal obligations and specific mandates; Guarantees for proper (and pro-active) functioning; Assurance of expertise; Internal positioning;
Follow up and further developments evaluations and programme assessments	Formal and informal structures and procedures in follow up and development; Address issue of direct follow up (pro-active; without paper trail); Specific measures TEM development, including financial milestones and work-load staff; Follow up improvement points first institutional audit; Structural PDCA-loop on all levels; Systematical follow up programme assessments, recovery mechanisms; System for follow up evaluation and monitoring;

Institution specific

Vignettes of quality agreements and focus points¹ throughout self-evaluation

Pay attention to:

- Plan: policy on this focus point, specific goals, involvement and support within organization and stakeholders,
- Do: way of working, actual organization on this focus point
- Check: System of evaluation and monitoring, results obtained;
- Act: development over the years, measures taken, look ahead based on results & strategy 2030;

Theme	Attention to be paid to
Quality agreements	Plan: Process to reach QA; Do : Method of implementation; Check: Way of progress monitoring progress; Act: procedures and mechanisms to adapt and develop
Societal impact	Making a real difference / Engineering approach to societal changes;
Synergy	Excellence in combinations / Cross-disciplinary way of working;
Entrepreneurial	The best in Europe / Entrepreneurial mindset; Student activism
Internationalization	Tomorrow's global citizen / Global awareness; Clarify goals Pay attention to language policy of programmes (procedure choice of language, language requirements staff, realized level language in thesis)

¹ Currently wording is taken from corporate story / vision 2020;

Appendix 1 – Analysis on recommendations per standard

- The outcomes of the institutional audit 2013 have been compared with the full description of the standard from the current NVAO framework (the assessment framework has been adjusted since 2016, creating differences in emphasis).
- The formal, overarching recommendations of the panel in 2013 are organized according to the current classification of the standards
- The state of affairs regarding the points for improvement and formal recommendations mentioned by the panel has been indicated.

Standard 1: Philosophy and policy

Key question: “Are the institution’s vision and policy concerning the quality of the education it provides widely supported and sufficiently coordinated, both externally and internally?”

Panel report on the 2013 audit

SIGNIFIER FROM CURRENT FRAMEWORK	OUTCOME AUDIT 2013
The institution holds a well-defined view of good education which is shared in all its departments.	+ clear picture HTHT, T-shaped professional, 3 O’s, + consistency vision with RoUTE ‘14 en 14+ + well propagated - long term perspective on educational policy yet to be developed
Teachers and students support this philosophy, and develop it in mutual consultation and in concert with external stakeholders.	+ broad support for educational philosophy - coordination with and propagation towards external stakeholders underdeveloped (-> standard 3)
Periodical coordination with the relevant (changing) environment ensures the topicality of this philosophy	+ advisory boards attest to value of educational vision - profile Human Touch underdeveloped
The educational philosophy has been translated into explicit points of departure for quality assurance.	+ focus on professional autonomy - more systematic development framework internationalization needed - more structural development of work field relations necessary - local variance in used instruments (-> standard 3)
In accordance with the ESG, the educational philosophy is student oriented (student-centered learning).	+ vision is in accordance with ESG + small scale and open contact with staff appreciated by students + value of student orientation is endorsed by teaching staff

Formal recommendations institutional audit 2013:

- The panel recommends a systematic, institution-wide elaboration of (...) the internationalization policy and relationship between education and the (international) professional field. *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: De commissie adviseert een verdergaande systematische, instellingsbrede uitwerking te geven aan (...) het internationaliseringsbeleid en de verwevenheid tussen onderwijs en het (internationale) beroepenveld en vakgebied.]*
- While boards of advice or work field committees provide meaningful input from the professional field in many programmes, they are not yet formed everywhere. The panel recommends that such contacts with professional practice be institutionalized in all programs. *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: Terwijl raden van advies of werkveldcommissies bij veel opleidingen voor een zinvolle voeding vanuit het werkveld zorgen, zijn zij nog niet overal gevormd. De commissie beveelt aan dergelijke contacten met de beroepspraktijk in alle opleidingen te institutionaliseren.]*

Standard 2: Implementation

Key question: "How does the institution realize this vision of quality?"

Panel report on the 2013 audit:

SIGNIFIER FROM CURRENT FRAMEWORK	OUTCOME AUDIT 2013
The institution realizes its educational philosophy in an effective manner	+ adequate operationalization of TEM vision + clear elaboration educational philosophy in ATLAS and excellence programmes ++ attunement with secondary education, Twente Academy, - educational policy largely focused on TEM, translation into master philosophy needs to be done - attention needs to be paid to increased work load / study pressure
Demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes, relating to staff	+ sufficient attention paid to developing staff skills related to TEM education + attention for education in tenure track policy - low ambitions regarding UTQ
Demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes, relating to student assessment	No explicit mention in institutional audit 2013
Demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes, relating to services and facilities	+ improvements realized on level of facilities with regard to TEM (buildings, management information, scheduling) + policy memorandum and administrative agenda are set annually + Supervisory Board keeps close eye on finances
Demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes, relating to students with a functional impairment	+ customized approach + good student satisfaction scores - coherent policy at institutional level is absent
The philosophy has been appropriately translated into concrete policy actions and processes.	+ translation educational philosophy in concrete policy has been done in deductive fashion + adequate policy for consolidated attachment research
Processes in place for the design, recognition, and quality assurance of its programmes in keeping with the European Standards and Guidelines. Effectiveness and application of such processes demonstrated by means of a track record	No explicit mention in institutional audit 2013. In second institutional audit more explicitly addressed by in depth trail "past performance" on follow up programme visitations.
Students and staff co-own the policy and contribute to its realization on the basis of the shared philosophy. This commitment demonstrates how the institution realizes its intended quality culture	+ strong quality culture + great commitment to change + approachable and informal + positive student and staff involvement

Formal recommendations institutional audit 2013:

- The panel recommends a systematic, institution-wide elaboration of the policy for studying with a disability (...). *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: De commissie adviseert een verdergaande systematische, instellingsbrede uitwerking te geven aan het beleid voor studeren met een functiebeperking (...)]*
- The panel recommends to closely monitor the actual workload of employees and to take measures to make the workload manageable during the multi-year transition. *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: De commissie adviseert om nauwlettend de reële werkdruk van medewerkers te monitoren en maatregelen te treffen om die ook tijdens de meerjarige transitie beheersbaar te maken.]*

Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring

Key question: “ How does the institution monitor that its vision of quality is realised?”

Panel report on the 2013 audit:

SIGNIFIER FROM CURRENT FRAMEWORK	OUTCOME AUDIT 2013
The institution systematically evaluates whether the intended policy objectives relating to educational quality are achieved.	- multiplicity of internal and external instruments
Relevant stakeholders are involved in this process.	+ animated web of discussions and consultations
The institution organizes effective feedback that supports the realization of its policy. To that end, it initiates appropriate evaluation and measurement activities that are stably embedded in the institution.	+ system of internal and external evaluations works well
These tools provide insightful information that can be used for the formulation of desired quality development.	+ clear which indicators are being used + use of performance indicators and quality dashboards + no performance indicators assigned to educational evaluations (course-evaluations and NSE)
The tools comprise a transparent method for identifying and reporting risks, taking action where needed, with a focus on improvement.	- rapid improvement actions, sometimes even before official decision making, is part of the quality culture of the University of Twente
Reflection on the output forms part of the organizational model, and provides sufficient insight into the effectiveness of the policy implementation in all tiers of the organization and staff participation.	The system of evaluations has been fully implemented and has worked well before TEM and this. -- responsibilities of the different consultation structures are not always clear -- numerous consultation moments, it is unclear if informal consultation is always adequately backed up with formal consultation
Since the measurement and evaluation activities revolve around effectiveness, they do not need to be uniform across the entire institution.	- numerous instruments are used - Service centers have separate system to evaluate service level quality
Students, staff, alumni and experts from the professional field are actively involved in the evaluations.	+ quality awareness among students and teachers is high + conversations with lecturer on course evaluations are conducted(direct and in annual interviews) + students indicate that their evaluations are being taken into account + students are personally confronted in case of free riding or lack of sufficient effort - alumni and professional field are not systematically involved
The institution publishes accurate, up-to-date and accessible information regarding the evaluation results	- Aggregated information not yet available at the highest level.

Formal recommendations institutional audit 2013

- The University of Twente has a clear idea of which milestones are to be achieved with TEM, but has not yet linked these to the financial objectives of the educational renewal. The advice is therefore to include the financial milestones (in terms of costs and benefits) including the monitoring instrument in the Roadmap. *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: De commissie heeft geconstateerd dat de Universiteit Twente duidelijk voor ogen heeft langs welke inhoudelijke mijlpalen TOM volledig zal worden geïmplementeerd, maar tevens dat deze mijlpalen niet gekoppeld zijn aan de financiële doelstellingen van de onderwijsvernieuwing. Het advies is daarom om ook de financiële mijlpalen (in termen van kosten en baten) inclusief het monitoringsinstrument in de Roadmap op te nemen.]*
- The panel recommends to fine-tune the data-generating capacity of MISUT in order to enable aggregated information on all aspects of quality assurance. *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: De commissie beveelt de instelling aan om het datagenererend vermogen van MISUT verder op orde te brengen om geaggregeerde informatie over alle aspecten van de kwaliteitszorg mogelijk te maken.]*
- The governance structure and the dynamics of the transition trajectory have stimulated the growth of many formal and informal consultation structures, which can lead to unnecessary administrative pressure. The advice is to investigate these consultation structures critically on their added value and effectiveness in a consolidated situation in the foreseeable future. *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: De gematificeerde governancestructuur en de dynamiek van het transitietraject brengen met zich mee dat er veel formele en informele overlegstructuren zijn gegroeid, die tot onnodige bestuurlijke drukte kunnen leiden. Het advies is om op afzienbare termijn die overlegstructuren kritisch op hun toegevoegde waarde en effectiviteit in een geconsolideerde situatie te onderzoeken.]*

Standard 4: Development

Key question: "How does the institution work on improvement?"

Panel report on the 2013 audit:

SIGNIFIER FROM CURRENT FRAMEWORK	OUTCOME AUDIT 2013
Feedback and reflection on output constitute the basis for measures targeted at reinforcing, improving, or adjusting policy or its implementation.	+ transition TEM well prepared and implemented according to plan ++ TEM clearly makes use of outcomes of previous evaluations that have been systematically analyzed + informal structure has a positive effect on improvement policy at the level of the programmes
Following up on measures for improvement is embedded in the organizational structure.	+ active improvement policy at programme level, faculty level and institutional level + the use of pilots and evaluation of the results as part of TEM-implementation + rapid intervention -- insufficient formal guarantees towards full PDCA cycle (-> standard 3)
The development policy pursued by the institution encourages all the parties concerned to contribute to innovation and quality improvement.	+ demonstrable systematic work on improvement policy in the programmes + employees and students highly involved in the quality assurance of programmes - complex formal and informal consultation structure may cause unnecessary administrative pressure; - independent positioning and assignment of exam committees needs to be investigated
Internal and external stakeholders have been informed regarding the developments that are primed on the basis of the evaluation outcomes.	+ strong informal involvement - Multitude of used instruments (-> standard 3) - Work field involvement not systematized (-> standard 3)
The institution pursues continuous improvement, adapts to the (changing) circumstances, and conforms to the expectations of students and employers.	-- insufficient emphasis on developing formal organizational structure in improvement policy (-> standard 3) -- ensuring the systematic nature of the improvement policy is not visible enough (-> standard 3)

Formal recommendations institutional audit 2013

- The panel recommends the institution to revitalize the Expert Committee TEM or to set up a comparable independent committee of experts to monitor the implementation of TEM. *[DUTCH ORIGINAL TEXT: De commissie beveelt aan om de gedechargeerde Expertcommissie TOM te revitaliseren of een vergelijkbare onafhankelijke commissie van deskundigen in te stellen die de uitrol van TOM monitoren.]*

Appendix 2 – Programme portrait

Since the application for the first institutional audit many programmes underwent an audit (limited programme assessments). In the preparation for the institutional audit, information on the follow-up on points of improvement noted by the panel during these limited programme assessments should be made readily available. This analysis is therefore not meant to note programme specific risks and points of improvement, but rather to note where specific strong points or weaknesses were noted for several programmes and therefore would benefit from being addressed at institutional level in the preparation for the institutional level.

All the reports published by the NVAO on UT programmes have been analyzed and listed below. A small number of programmes have been visited before the UT had applied for the institutional audit. They underwent a full assessment. These results were not taken into consideration. This assessment is so different and possibly also outdated, that it is not useful for comparison. For programmes visited since the application for the institutional audit, the limited programme assessment has been used.

Limited programme assessment standards

The standards that are used in the limited programme assessments are:

- **Standard 1: The intended learning outcomes** tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements
Explanation: The intended learning outcomes demonstrably describe the level of the programme (Associate Degree, Bachelor's, or Master's) as defined in the Dutch qualifications framework, as well as its orientation (professional or academic). In addition, they tie in with the regional, national or international perspective of the requirements currently set by the professional field and the discipline with regard to the contents of the programme. Insofar as is applicable, the intended learning outcomes are in accordance with relevant legislation and regulations.
- **Standard 2: The curriculum**, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.
Explanation: The intended learning outcomes have been adequately translated into educational objectives of (components of) the curriculum. The diversity of the students admitted is taken into account in this respect. The teachers have sufficient expertise in terms of both subject matter and teaching methods to teach the curriculum, and provide appropriate guidance. The teaching-learning environment encourages students to play an active role in the design of their own learning process (student-centred approach).
- **Standard 3: Assessment;** The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.
Explanation: The student assessments are valid, reliable and sufficiently independent. The requirements are transparent to the students. The quality of interim and final examinations is sufficiently safeguarded and meets the statutory quality standards. The tests support the students' own learning processes.
- **Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes;** The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.
Explanation: The achievement of the intended learning outcomes is demonstrated by the results of tests, the final projects, and the performance of graduates in actual practice or in post-graduate programmes. (Note: since 2016 this is a separate standard, previously this aspect was addressed, but less explicitly as part of standard 3)
- **Standard 4 in case of initial assessment: Financial Guarantees;** The institution gives students the guarantee that the program can be fully completed and provides adequate financial facilities.
Explanation: The graduation guarantee covers a reasonable term that is related to the duration of the study program.

The panel evaluation on the standards is expressed on the following scale:

- Insufficient (I)
- Sufficient (S)
- Good (G)
- Excellent (E)

In the table below, the reports published before the institutional audit was awarded (2 may 2014), are in grey lines. The results are still useful for the overall analysis, but the NVAO will most probably zoom in on several programmes that had a more recent visitation. An audit panel might be interested to review a programme during the site visits that is:

- Midway between reviews, so evidence of handling improvement points can be looked into
- Specific to the profile of the university, or a more or less unique programme in Dutch-Flemish Higher Education
- That has fallen short on major points during a previous visitation, to see if the improvement plan is actually carried out

Bachelor programmes: limited programme assessment

The courses marked with * received a full assessment since the institutional audit had not been applied for.

	Date decision	Valid until	St 1	St 2	St3	St 4	Overall judgement
B Bedrijfsinformatie-technologie (BIT)	15/06/10	31/12/18	*	*	*	*	*
B European Public Administration	01/02/12	31/12/18	*	*	*	*	*
B Technology and Liberal Arts and Sciences (ATLAS)	18/07/12	01/01/20	S	S	S	S	Initial Assessment
B Psychologie	20/02/13	31/12/19	S	S	S		S
B Scheikundige Technologie	25/02/13	31/12/19	S	G	S		S
B Werktuigbouwkunde	25/03/13	31/12/19	G	G	S		S
B Gezondheidswetenschappen	17/07/13	31/12/19	G	S	G		G
B Onderwijskunde	26/09/13	31/12/17	G	G	S		S
B Bedrijfskunde	05/11/13	31/12/19	S	S	S		S
B Biomedische Technologie	10/12/13	31/12/19	S	S	S		S
B Civiele Techniek	01/01/14	31/12/19	G	S	S		S
B Klinische Technologie (TG)	29/01/14	28/01/20	S	S	S		S
B Technische Informatica	31/07/14	30/07/20	S	S	G		S
B Technische Wiskunde	30/09/14	29/09/20	S	S	S		S
B Industrieel Ontwerpen (Industrial design)	31/10/14	30/10/20	S	S	S		S
B Advanced Technology	28/11/14	27/11/20	S	S	S		S
B Technische Natuurkunde	31/12/14	01/07/22	S	S	S		S
B Creative Technology	30/09/15	01/01/22	S	S	S		S
B Electrical Engineering	31/05/17	30/05/23	S	G	S	S	S
B Technische bedrijfskunde	31/07/17	30/07/23	S	G	S	S	S

Synthesis findings bachelor programmes

Standard 1: The intended learning outcomes

The panels were positive about the profile and the underlying vision of the programmes. The t-shaped professional and TEM were mentioned regularly as assets in the outcomes. The panels were of the opinion that this vision could be put more firmly or more elaborate in the intended learning outcomes. In many cases, the final qualifications were formulated too generally.

Standard 2: The curriculum

In general, the panels are positive about the quality of staff. Commitment and team spirit are high. The TEM principles and the way in which they have been worked out are also often mentioned as (very) positive. It is sufficiently clear that management and staff enthusiastically embraced project-based learning, multidisciplinary approach while maintaining disciplinary focus. Staff is dedicated to students and student find them easy to approach. The facilities are very good as is study guidance.

The work pressure of the teaching team was the subject of attention in several audits. With programmes taught in English, not all documents appear to be available in English. There are also general comments on internationalization (language policy, unclear objectives).

In general, the Quality Assurance seems to be insufficiently formalized in a number of programmes (for instance involvement of stakeholders, systematically closing of the circle). In some courses, comments are placed on the performance of the programme committees: are they well informed and equipped for their task? Involving the work field more closely was another point of concern for the commission in several audits.

Standard 3&4: Assessment & Achieved learning outcomes

All in all the achieved learning outcomes are sufficiently proven by the final thesis, only outliers seem to be graded too optimistically. The panels are not in doubt about the quality of the final judgements and the level that is realized, although is remarked that some thesis are written in rather poor English.

Furthermore, the theory behind the grading is not transparent for numerous programmes. For bachelor thesis there are evaluation forms, but the substantiation of the lecturer is not always sufficiently indicated. There are numerous remarks on the way examination boards seem to function. Examination boards perform most of their legal tasks, but several panels noted that the examination board should take a more pro-active role with regard to:

- Transparency of grading procedures, with more elaborate explanation on the grading. It needs to be clear how the comments on every aspect of the assessment come together in a final grade.
- Policy against fraud and plagiarism and assessment of the individual contribution in group assignments

Such documents should be well known by the students and staff, and to keep the completed forms as a record.

In the case of older accreditations, there is a high (late) dropout rate and a relatively high number stagnant students. It is unclear to the panels whether this is sufficiently addressed.

Master programmes: limited programme assessment

The courses marked with * received a full assessment since the institutional audit had not been applied for.

	Date decision	Valid until	St 1	St 2	St3	St 4	Overall judgement
M Business Information Technology	15/06/10	13/12/18	*	*	*	*	*
MSc Public Administration	01/02/12	31/12/18	*	*	*	*	*
Ma European Studies	01/02/12	31/12/18	*	*	*	*	*
M Science Education and Communication	12/02/13	01/07/21	G	S	S		S
M Chemical Engineering	25/02/13	31/12/19	S	S	S		S
M Mechanical Engineering	25/03/13	31/12/19	G	S	G		G
M Water Technology	28/03/13	01/01/20	S	S	S	S	Initial Assessment
M Systems & Control	02/07/13	31/08/19	G	E	S		S
M Construction Management and Engineering	08/07/13	01/01/20	G	S	S		S
M Environmental and Energy Management	02/10/13	01/07/20	G	G	S		S
M Business Administration	05/11/13	31/12/19	S	S	S		S
M Biomedical Engineering	10/12/13	31/12/19	S	S	S		S
M Civil Engineering and Management	01/01/14	31/12/19	G	G	G		G
Ma Technical Medicine	29/01/14	28/01/20	S	S	S		S
M Computer Science	31/07/14	30/07/20	S	S	S		S
M Telematics	31/07/14	30/07/20	S	S	S		S
M Human Media Interaction	31/07/14	30/07/20	S	S	S		S
M Applied Mathematics	30/09/14	29/09/20	S	S	S		S
Ma Industrial Design Engineering	31/10/14	30/10/20	S	S	G		S
M Applied Physics	31/12/14	01/07/22	S	S	S		S
M Nanotechnology	31/12/14	01/07/22	S	S	S		S
M Geoinformation Science and Earth Observation (post-initial)	30/06/15	29/06/21	G	G	S		S
Leraar Voorbereidend Hoger Onderwijs in Maatschappijleer en Maatschappijwetenschappen	31/07/15	30/07/21	S	S	S		S
M Applied Geoinformatics (HBO)	30/10/15	29/10/21	S	S	S		S
M Electrical Engineering	31/05/17	30/05/23	S	G	S	S	S
M Riskmanagement (post-initial)	30/06/17	29/06/19	S	S	I	S	Recovery
M Industrial Engineering & Management	31/07/17	30/07/23	S	S	S	S	S
M Educational Science and Technology	31/10/17	29/11/23	S	S	S	S	S
M Spatial Engineering	30/03/18	29/03/24	S	S	S		Initial Assessment
Educatieve Master Zaakvakken, afstudeerrichting Maatschappijleer en Maatschappijwetenschappen	30/04/18	28/07/22	S	I->S	S	S	Initial assessment (after recovery)
M Philosophy of Science, Technology and Society	31/05/18	30/05/24	G	S	S	S	S
Ma Sustainable Energy Technology	31/05/18	30/05/24	S	G	G	S	S
M Embedded Systems	31/05/18	30/05/24	S	S	S	S	S

Synthesis findings master programmes

Standard 1: The intended learning outcomes

As in bachelor programmes, there is a clear profile which is well-elaborated within the domain. The idea of a T-shaped professional is met with enthusiasm of panels. Some clearly distinguish themselves from similar (international) programmes, others could do better with regard to profiling. Intended learning outcomes could be more elaborate for some programmes as this will give direction to the development of the teaching learning environment and the assessment system. For some programmes the didactical concepts could be more explicit. More pro-active work field and alumni involvement is desired for numerous programmes.

Standard 2: The curriculum

Overall the quality of the teaching staff is held in high regard by the panels, as they are well qualified, dedicated, committed to the teaching concept and its role in giving guidance to students. The programmes provide a close-knit community, with short feedback loops. Study guidance is deemed (exceptionally) good for several programmes. Facilities are good. Overall the teaching-learning environment is deemed coherent.

Several committees made comments that staff workload is high. Student-staff ratio and proportion of staff with a PhD questioned for several programmes. In some programs student-staff ratio seems to be decreasing, which worries the panels.

The attention to internationalization is not always operationalized in concrete goals. For instance no target for percentage of students going abroad during their programme. In older assessments, course material was not yet fully provided in English and many of the case studies used reflect the Dutch context. Furthermore, the level of English of the teaching staff is not always up to par.

Standard 3&4: Assessment & Achieved learning outcomes

Both from final thesis as from work field and alumni, it is sufficiently clear that the intended learning outcomes are achieved. Most alumni seem to be well prepared for their career. Panels are not in doubt about the accuracy of the given grades.

Many panels express their concern about quality assurance of the thesis. The substantiation of assessment of thesis is lacking. The programmes are advised to redesign their thesis assessment forms to allow for additional qualitative feedback and to introduce greater transparency into the assessment process by asking all examiners to fill in assessment forms independently. In addition, a more systematic use of a scoring chart and the use of own grading descriptions is needed. It needs to be clear how the comments on every aspect of the assessment come together in a final grade. Completed forms should be kept as a record. Also there are questions raised on the functioning of some programme committees and examination boards. Are they adequately prepared for their task, do they work in a systematic and transparent fashion?

For some programs, the number of students that finish their thesis within the nominal time is cause for concern. A culture change could help to make students more aware that meeting a deadline with a product that is "good enough" will be a fact of life in their professional career.

For some programmes, student success rates were somewhat disappointing, sometimes without adequate answer. Career orientation and preparation could be improved for several programmes.

Appendix 3 – Findings second institutional audit other universities

An analysis was made of the complete self-evaluations and NVAO panel reports from four institutions that have already completed an institutional test for the 2nd round (Delft, Nijmegen, Utrecht and Wageningen). These institutions have been chosen, since they are either 4TU institutions or have been inspected by an auditor affiliated to the UT. In this analysis attention was paid to learning points relevant to the UT audit preparation. Non-transferable, institution-specific qualities that were highlighted in the self-evaluation (for example the focus on sustainability of WUR) have been omitted in this analysis.

In the analysis it was stated which elements of the self-evaluation or the panel discussions were appointed by the committee as positive (+) or on which points for improvement were found (-). Issues that raised questions, but didn't lead to improvement points are also listed (with ?). The purpose of this analysis was to map what the panels are focusing on, so that this is (partly) leading for the preparation of the self-evaluation at the UT.

Standard 1: Philosophy and policy

Key question: "Are the institution's vision and policy concerning the quality of the education it provides widely supported and sufficiently coordinated, both externally and internally?"

AUDIT OUTCOMES ITK II	Panel outcome	Self-evaluation institution
DELFT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + vision on education includes PhD + broad support for "revised vision" + clear process for drawing up new vision on education, strong involvement all (internal and external stakeholders) - mission has more focus on research than education ? answer to challenge student growth is posing is not yet clear -> organize involvement external stakeholders like township ? no national or international benchmark on programme level -> organize midterm review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + limited focus points strategy outlined (student success, internationalization, digitization) + concrete retrospective on yields since previous ITK & follow up of improvement points previous ITK ++ process and concept version (80% version) strategy shared -> clear development from roadmap 2020 + translation vision in "quality ambitions"
NIJMEGEN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + large degree of autonomy of faculties and programs, guided by clear policy frameworks + clear management model; subsidiarity, communality and trust-driven control clearly perceptible as principles + cohesion four-year (strategic) cycle and annual cycle + great involvement of students and employees in the development of educational vision + policy is consistent with educational vision + core values well propagated, consistent with organization and reflected in conversations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + three core values (quality, binding, clarity) used as a guideline in the self-evaluation + linking core values to focus areas (eg quality -> coherence education & research, talent programs)
UTRECHT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + clear core concepts education vision + educational directive (including regulations for the quality assurance system at faculty level) that links the education model with quality assurance + educational vision actively used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + principles of education vision clearly described and summarized + consistency: elaboration of basic principles in 4 pillars + description of the quality assurance system (binding principles + functioning of networks)
WAGENINGEN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + clearly articulated vision that is supported by staff and students, external stakeholders have been adequately involved. - broader consultation before presenting first draft vision would have enriched final version + strategic plan has key performance indicators attached 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + 3 interlinked focus areas isolated + clear mission statement for education + development of vision of education stated (influences, results, process -> PDCA) + vision linked to new challenges (maintaining quality with raising influx) and overarching themes (e.g. sustainability)

Standard 2: Implementation

Key question: "How does the institution realise this vision of quality?"

AUDIT OUTCOMES ITK II	Panel outcome	Self-evaluation institution
DELFT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + clear implementation study success program + clear measures for internationalization, personnel policy, services and facilities + giving space to faculty-specific interpretation within frameworks of institutional policy + shared responsibility demonstrably - students question language proficiency English employees - effectiveness and efficiency in internal decision making should be analyzed, implementation takes too much time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + education profile includes MOOCS and attention to language proficiency + organizational structure clarified + importance of partnerships listed + elaboration of strategic priorities
NIJMEGEN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> +strategic documents on institutional level(strategic plan, binding guidelines, policy documents, stimulate faculties to further elaboration) + employee participation is well in position + vision on quality of education is clearly visible in various policy domains visible (interrelationship of research, internationalization, ICT, honors, studying with disability, assessment policy) + performance indicators are not a goal, but a tool for continuous improvement - management philosophy and method of policy making and implementation had to be reconstructed by panel (not stated well enough in critical reflection -responsibilities and competences are insufficiently harmonized and not transparent enough - decentralized autonomy is not desirable on all points, continuum between subsidiarity and guidance should be reconsidered on themes such as scheduling and systems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + for specific areas of interest, connected to overarching core values, some subdomains are listed with concrete actions taken; it is clarified how goals are operationalized + self-evaluation lists own improvement points, measures for improvement already indicated
UTRECHT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + education model source of inspiration for innovation agenda + large number of examples that elaborate strategic points of attention in concrete policy implementation (for example "flexibility" & "room for choice") ++ panel impressed by many policy actions and quality of the educational processes + recovery process of programme as a wake-up call, has clearly given a broader quality impulse 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + four priorities taken as focus for elaboration PDCA cycle + clear development of improvement and development trajectories after past performance + cohesion education with professional field + clearly stated how educational process is supported(staff, educational innovation, student facilities)
WAGENINGEN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ++ new education assessment policy as cornerstone in safeguarding to stakeholders that WUR delivers what it promises ? allocation of responsibilities regarding quality of education is complex -> responsibilities of programme directors and programme committee need to be reconsidered ?involvement of staff and students in decision making is key strength, consider strengthening involvement of council, training should be beneficial 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + ongoing development of vision ++ elegant interlinking vision with education assessment policy and quality assurance system + principles in practice: concrete examples of "high quality scientific knowledge" and "rich learning environment" + overarching themes sustainability and internationalization substantiated in practice

Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring

Key question: "How does the institution monitor that its vision of quality is realised?"

AUDIT OUTCOMES ITK II	Panel outcome	Self-evaluation institution
DELFT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + audit trail on past performance, accreditation record programme level + systematic evaluation and monitoring quality of teaching and realization of education policy by Executive Board + Educational Quality assurance plan including guideline faculties + systematic generation of management information + good balance hard & soft controls ++ use of audits + large student involvement, pro-active role ++ improvement point involvement professional field well handled (structural links, committees for faculties, contribution supervisory board) - involvement alumni to be improved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + clear passage on quality culture, top-down - bottom up, including the way the formal system supports the culture! + use of partnerships and dialogue + description of internal assessments (minors, joint education, post-initial) + peer-level assessments and thematic audits + cohesion educational quality assurance and planning & control cycle + closing the quality circle on 3 strategic themes + way in which educational quality assurance information is used to identify shortcomings and make necessary adjustments + clear involvement of stakeholders
NIJMEGEN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + striving for continuous improvement is clear in internal quality assurance system + clear procedures for systematic reporting + after each programme audit, the Executive Board asks for an action plan + program committees are well in position with a crucial role in quality assurance + points for improvement previous visitation well follow up - advisory boards should be more prominent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + attention paid to concrete improvement actions that have been identified on the basis of internal quality assurance and have been initiated + explanation of how quality assurance on programmes is related to institutional quality assurance -> how do circles interlock + importance of the informal, involvement of programme committees, student and staff participation elaborately explained + multiple instruments with external stakeholder involvement + description of monitoring instruments
UTRECHT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + quality culture, openness + interviews on quality assurance between Executive Board and faculties based on SWOT and balanced scorecard + expertise of programme committees systematically enhanced - systematic monitoring of accreditation reports not yet standardized in way of working - feedback to students about improvement measures ad hoc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + coordination circle institution-faculty-programme PDCA & long-term / annual quality cycle ++ clear description of responsibilities and mandates of all actors (from advisory board to students) + requirements set for quality assurance at faculty level (university-wide minimum requirements) + roles at faculty level also described + description of monitoring instruments (for internal quality assurance, monitoring strategic objectives, monitoring the effects of projects) -> all accessible through data warehouse
WAGENINGEN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + panel very enthusiastic on document "Education quality assurance and enhancement". - internal task division and decision making structure might be too complex -- scope of examination boards too big to fulfill their tasks ? no external peer reviews (mid-term) yet, although this is "by now [...] common practice within Higher Education in the Netherlands for programmes" according to the NVAO. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ++ exemplary chapter on quality assurance! + development perspective: which improvements have been implemented over the previous years; which elements need to be strengthened

Standard 4: Development

Key question: "How does the institution work on improvement?"

AUDIT OUTCOMES ITK II	Panel outcome	Self-evaluation institution
DELFT	<p>? Formal and informal loops make system work</p> <p>+ necessary procedures and adequate tools in place</p> <p>+ pro-active response on issues raised at all levels</p> <p>? community approach</p> <p>- combining data and funneling back to strategy can be improved</p>	<p>+ look ahead based on strategic agenda and "progress so far"</p> <p>+ elaborated how engineering mentality plays a role</p>
NIJMEGEN	<p>++ quality culture in programmes is stimulated by giving autonomy to use instruments in a relevant way</p> <p>+ good mechanisms to tackle recovery trajectories in programmes</p> <p>+ external assessments demonstrably lead to concrete improvements</p>	<p>+ description of policy cycle on different levels, system of yearly reports, etc</p> <p>Clear description on the systematic follow up of programme reviews</p>
UTRECHT	<p>+ clear management philosophy</p> <p>+ progress improvements made visible</p> <p>+ frameworks and structures to realize intentions</p> <p>+ informal networks also convincing in terms of quality culture (couleur locale)</p>	<p>+ improvements based on previous ITK recommendations described at the beginning -> current starting position</p> <p>+ 5 clear areas identified on the basis of a strategic plan;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o with concrete examples the panel is offered a coherent perspective; o description of what has been realized, but also of necessary adjustments; <p>++ organization and decision structure included in the appendix, which clarify a lot</p>
WAGENINGEN	<p>+evolvment since first institutional audit: shift from course level to programme level, trend from monitoring to enhancement</p> <p>+ quality assurance system has been adjusted to reflect this</p> <p>+ all relevant stakeholders are involved</p> <p>? the executive board should organize the transfer from initiatives that have developed informally to standardization</p>	<p>+ongoing development clearly listed throughout self-evaluation</p> <p>+ incremental changes made to vision, internationalization, etc</p> <p>+ themes that require further attention mentioned, which makes the self-evaluation somewhat "critical"</p>

Strategy towards the institutional audit

AUTHOR

R.E. van Luijk

DEPARTMENT

Strategy & Policy

TELEPHONE

1130

E-MAIL

r.e.vanluijk@utwente.nl

STATUS

For discussion purposes

DOCUMENT HISTORY

VERSION	DATE	AUTHOR(S)	REMARKS
0.1	09/08/18	Van Luijk	To be discussed with Rector Magnificus & Secretary of the University
0.2	05/09/18	Van Luijk	To be discussed during steering committee meeting
0.3	19/09/18	Van Luijk	Elaborated version to be discussed during steering committee meeting
0.4	27/09/18	Van Luijk	To be discussed by UC-Ow

APPROVAL

VERSION	DATE	ROLE	NAME
1.0	08/10/18	Executive board	

Preamble

The institutional audit is an all-encompassing project, that needs an adequate framework. The project proposal clarifies the main steps and their planning in time, but doesn't answer questions about the current state of affairs or themes that need to be addressed in the self-evaluation and preparation for the site visits. The institutional portrait (UC-Ow) / theme analysis (UC) serves this purpose, by identifying the themes relevant towards the content preparation. In the process towards the institutional audit, several strategic decisions need to be made regarding the way (the preparation for) the audit is to be carried out. The main choices to be made are addressed in this document, which is connected to both the project proposal and the institutional portrait / theme analysis.

Overall approach towards preparing for the institutional audit

The process towards the institutional audit needs a wise balance between two approaches which both have their value.

The first approach is based on **trust** in the quality of our education and the way our processes are run. Following this route, the situation "as it is" should be described and (critically!) reflected upon in the self-evaluation. This way main documents are collected and together with the self-evaluation report, they give an idea of the current status. The current status may not be perfect, but acknowledging points of improvement is the way forward. The general idea is that quality improvement is always a work in progress, which we dare to address with transparency at all levels, also towards the visiting panel.

The second approach can be typified as a "better safe than sorry" mentality, in which **verification** of ticking all the boxes and building a solid paper trail is the main focus. On aspects where the paper trail is not complete or where plans and reality don't match, corrective measures should be taken to address these issues before the institutional audit takes place. This way policy documents are reviewed and if necessary documents to proof the way of working should be filed.

At the UT the focus on continuous improvement and informal way of working are important elements. The first approach would be most in line with our quality culture, which was praised highly during both the first institutional audit and at audits at programme level. Also the NVAO works from a **justified belief** in the quality of the institution and promotes having open conversations. Moreover our programme assessments since the first institutional audit show only a limited number of points of improvement that need addressing at institutional level. The first approach is therefore the preferable one. Nevertheless one should tread with caution and an incremental way of working in *themes and clusters* is a way to do combine both approaches

The *theme tracks* contribute material towards writing the self-evaluation report which should reflect the current situation, complete with strong points as well as points of improvement. The overall report should by all standards be an honest critical self-reflection on the actual situation. With regards to building a paper trail, current documents will be used. Therefore, the theme tracks focus on **describing the organization as it is**.

In *clusters* development issues are addressed that are often outside the scope of a single theme. The clusters are identified by the steering committee and the project leader will supervise the progress which is aimed at delivering results in a relatively short amount of time (several months). Each cluster will have deliverables that are part of the end result and can be shared early on (within weeks or months).

This cyclical way of working (presenting drafts, enlisting feedback and using this for further development) gives more certainty of support for the end results. Transparency, openness to feedback and focus continuous improvement are cornerstones of this way of working. This makes it suitable for an environment geared towards further development and learning like the UT and fits well with the quality culture that was praised during the last institutional audit.

Theme tracks

For each theme identified in the institutional portrait, at least the following results should be delivered in the theme tracks:

- a) A description is made of the current state of affairs on this theme
- b) The current way of working, including the plan-do-check-act cycle is described
- c) Relevant points of improvement of the first institutional audit are evaluated and documented
- d) Key documents are made available
- e) People directly involved and relevant stakeholders are identified
- f) An analysis is made of strengths and weaknesses regarding this theme
- g) Issues and risks for in depth visits (audit trails) are identified
- h) Materials for possible audit trails is collected

The content during the theme tracks is not generated by the core project team of the institutional audit, but rather the process is facilitated, coordinated and championed by them. For the institutional audit proper ownership is crucial for a good performance. The content preparation is not just about writing the self-evaluation and gathering the material for the panel to peruse, but also about addressing critical questions and enhancing a mindset of continuous improvement. Therefore ownership for theme-preparation should be as close as possible to ownership in the day-to-day situation. The proposed content responsables are listed per theme in the appendix. These prime responsables will be in the lead to bring forward the material requested.

The first series of theme tracks focusses on delivering a – d. To facilitate this, the core project team will start a dossier on each theme containing relevant passages from the first institutional audit and the NVAO report. This first series will provide sufficient material for a first draft of the self-evaluation and to base the preparatory audit on. This incremental way of working ensures that escalation to more intensive preparation can be prompt if necessary. Also, it is a natural way to ensure optimum involvement of people who will speak to the panel later on.

For many themes, material from faculties and service centers will be relevant in preparation of eventual in depth trails during the site visits. This supporting material is evidence of the actual way of working. To avoid faculties and service centers getting irregular requests from different angles to different staff members all related to the institutional audit, the core project team will be responsible to put out requests and gather this material. Content responsables for theme tracks will have regular contact with members of the core project team, so requests to faculties and service departments are coordinated. Each faculty and service department is to assign at least one staff member responsible for document management with regard to the institutional audit.

Furthermore, since follow up of programme assessments will be part of an in depth trail, each programme will be responsible for making a reflection on the current state of affairs regarding improvement points identified during programme assessments. Relevant proof should also be collected. The core project team will provide a framework for doing this.

Cluster preparation

On a very limited number of (clusters of) themes, new policy documents prepared or corrective measures will be taken in preparation of the site visits. In the discussion of the institutional portrait (UC-Ow) / theme analysis (UC), the following clusters are proposed

1) Institutional quality assurance

1a) Governance and evaluation of education: Several ideas on enhancing PDCA at faculty & institutional level and ideas about starting a system of midterm audits are formulated, but not yet fully developed let alone decided upon. This is of concern to the Institutional Audit and more attention on this issue is highly recommended, also with regard to the projects on educational vision and quality agreements.

1b) Closing the quality cycles: The policy document on quality assurance gives an elegant description on the quality cycles at the level of course unit, programme, faculty and institution. As such, it addresses many of the points of improvement voiced during the ITK 2013. During the coming institutional audit, it is expected that much attention will be given to the implementation of this policy. Variations between programmes and faculties are not a problem, but should be transparent and well documented. Instruments used should be clear, also in this regard are local variations not a problem as long as the systematic approach to quality assurance is sufficiently clear. Moreover, the PDCA cycle on each of the described levels should be closed systematically and on all levels proof of the actual way of working should be readily available if needed during the in depth visit.

2) Assessment and examination boards:

In 2015 institutional policy on student assessment was established. This document is not widely known and may not be implemented at all programmes. The policy states that evaluation would take place after 3 years. During programme assessments, remarks were made on grading procedures for thesis, independent positioning and responsibilities of examination boards, as well as their working in a systematic and transparent fashion.

3) Work field involvement:

During the institutional audit a recommendation was made on work-field involvement. Several programme audits received similar remarks. Since this is an explicit item in the NVAO framework on both institutional and programme level, this needs serious attention. An inventory was started, but was not widely responded to. Local variations are not a problem as such, although the UT might want to formulate certain standards and promote sharing of good practices. Of each programme the way work field is involved should be transparent and choices in the way to do so clear.

4) Representative / participation bodies:

During several programme audits, the functioning of the programme committees was addressed critically. In the preparation of the Quality Agreements, an inventory was made of participatory bodies. Points of improvement need to be addressed. The legal functioning of the representative/participation bodies as noted in the "Wet Versterking Bestuurskracht" also needs attention. By this law and by the importance of representative/participation bodies in the Quality Agreements, the bar is raised and the institution needs to respond accordingly.

Scope of the institutional audit

Inclusion of the plan of the quality agreements

Before July 15, the university had to communicate to the NVAO in what way the plan on the quality agreements was to be audited. After consultation of the steering committee, the Executive Board has decided to inform the NVAO that the plan on the quality agreements will be audited as a trail as part of the institutional audit. The NVAO report on the quality agreements must be finalized by 1 April 2020 at the latest, while the ITK report should be adopted before 1 May 2020. This will necessitate bringing forward the institutional a little bit, but will reduce the overall impact on the organization since it makes a much more efficient assessment process possible.

Special quality characteristics

Most likely, all special quality characteristics except internationalization will be eliminated from future institutional audits as per 2019. The university will not apply for the assessment of any special quality characteristics.

It is advisable to postpone an eventual application for the special characteristic internationalization and not include it in the coming institutional audit. Firstly, it would become far easier once more programmes have obtained this characteristic (currently only one programme of the UT holds this characteristic). Also the framework requires a more explicit view on intended international and especially intercultural learning outcomes at an institutional level. Thirdly, the assessment of the special quality characteristic internationalization will mean an international panel. This will necessitate the exploratory and in depth site visits to be combined in one week. This will pose an extra burden on the preparation towards the institutional audit. It is however advisable to use the ECA framework on the assessment of internationalization internally, within the internationalization programme, for further enhancement of (the quality of) internationalization.

The university will not apply for the assessment of the special quality characteristic “Entrepreneurial”. Currently it is expected that assessment of this characteristic will not be included in the institutional audit due to foreseen changes in the assessment procedure. Nevertheless, profiling towards the quality characteristic “Entrepreneurial” will be part of the preparation since this is an essential and unique element of the identity of the UT. The current framework for the assessment of this characteristic will be taken into account, since it is a non-descriptive framework that is useful to check whether all quality-aspects (plan-do-check-act) are sufficiently addressed. The highlights of this framework will be communicated to the content responsible for the theme entrepreneurial.

Main language during the institutional audit

Regarding the audit language of the quality agreements, the UT has proposed to the NVAO that the documents will be delivered in English in order to ensure maximum participation of staff and students in the process of drawing up the plan. New documents in preparation for the institutional audit (like the self-evaluation report and the plan on the quality agreements) will be written in English. The UT will not ask for an international panel, but will propose a flexible approach towards the language during the site visits so conversations can be conducted either in Dutch or in English, depending on the auditees. The report of the institutional audit is important for future development of the University and should be accessible for all staff and students. Therefore the UT will propose the NVAO-panel to deliver their report in English.

Preferences regarding specific focus of the institutional audit and panel composition

The formal presentation of the panel and specific areas of focus for the institutional audit will be discussed with the NVAO in the board consultation (approx. May 2019), about six months prior to the institutional audit (approx. October & November 2019). Beforehand a panel will be proposed by the NVAO during administrative consultation between the NVAO process coordinator and the project leader.

Preferences towards specific focus areas during the institutional audit can be discussed in the board consultation. There is time to prepare this, taking into account the delivered results from the first series of theme tracks and the preparatory audit.

If the UT has any preferences towards panel composition, this should be addressed during administrative consultation on short notice, as the NVAO has limited capacity of suitable panel combinations. The NVAO cannot guarantee that specific wishes towards panel composition can be granted, but will take suggestions into consideration. Experience from other universities shows limited control over appointed panel members, although when an institution can point out a conflict of interest it is possible to ask for another panel proposition. Therefore, the option to state preferences beforehand is somewhat limited. Possible preferences that could be voiced are:

- Panel member with expertise in educational renewal, with understanding of our educational model (for instance project based learning)
- Panel member with background in engineering

Organizational involvement

Members advisory group

The execution of tracks, reflection on draft versions of the self-evaluation report, the way to involve stakeholders and the communication strategy will be points of attention for the advisory group. Furthermore, the advisory group can be a linking pin to the rest of the organization, by acting as ambassadors for the project in their own faculty or organizational unit. Therefore a broad group, that is a reflection of the themes deemed essential in the trajectory towards the institutional audit will be asked to participate in the advisory group. This also enables them to make connections to work done in other themes. The following people will be approached to take part in the advisory group on the institutional audit.

1. Frank van den Berg (CELT)
2. Tanya Bondarouk (BMS, platform examencommissies)
3. Caroline van Dijken (CES, platform Wet- en regelgeving)
4. Roos Edgar (SU)
5. José Franken (HR, programmamanager LEAN)
6. Annet de Kiewit (ET, platform studiebegeleiding)
7. Sofie Kölling (student assessor)
8. Bertyl Lankhaar (communication advisor)
9. Tom Mulder (S&B, senior strategic advisor)
10. Maria Sjerps (HR)
11. Cynthia Souren (EWI, UTpK)
12. Yannick Verkerk (overleg studieverenigingen)
13. Hans Vossensteyn (CHEPS)
14. Ramses Wessel (BMS, NVAO panel member)

The University Council will be invited to propose a student and personnel representative (who can be members of the UC, but are not necessarily so).

Kick off content preparation

Before the first formal meeting of the advisory group there will be a kick off meeting towards the content preparation. Even though activities have already been initiated on several themes, this will be an opportunity to share the highlights of the project proposal, the strategy proposal, the institutional portrait and discuss expectations and timeline. The kick off need not be a very formal event, although presence of the project executive and (some) members of the steering committee is expected.

Future decisions

- Organization of preparatory audit
- Themes of preparatory audit
- Focus point institutional audit (preparation board consultation)
- Internal communication

Appendix

St	Theme	CLUSTERS				
		Institutional quality assurance		Assessment	Work field	Representative bodies
		Governance	Quality cycles			
1	Profile & Vision (Tils)					
1	Strategy (Vermeij)					
1	Educational vision (Woud)	X				
1	Governance (Wichman)	X				
2	Assessment policy (Vlas)			X		
2	Human Resources (Sjerps)					
2	Study guidance and policy for students with functional impairment (Kiewit)					
2	Educational environment and facilities (Oeloff)					
2	Partnerships (Essers)				X	
3	Quality assurance policy institution (Wichman)	X				
3	Quality assurance policy faculties and service centres (Souren)		X			
3	Evaluation of education (Muller)	X				
3	Instruments (Martens)		X			
3	Results and systems (N. Letteboer)	X				
4	Work field involvement (?)				X	
4	Examination boards (Bondarouk)			X		
4	Programme committees, faculty and university council (Wichman)					X
4	Follow up and further developments evaluations and programme assessments (Souren)		X			
I	Quality agreements (Zeeman)					
I	Societal impact (Beernink)					
I	Synergy (Kresin)					
I	Entrepreneurial (Iliohan)					
I	Internationalization (Lotze)					