Preface

Quality management has been commanding increasing attention within Hanze University of Applied Sciences, Groningen for a number of years, and a wide range of processes are being followed and activities carried out to give quality management shape and substance. This Quality Management Framework (QMF) is a revised version of the 2005-2007 Quality Management Framework and contains a number of specific points which have been modified:

- The QMF has been brought in line with the new accreditation system.
- The QMF now fits the Hanze (UAS) strategic policy plan, ‘Road to Excellence, 2010-2015’.
- Research, as well as education and learning, now also has a prominent place within the QMF.
- The university’s schools and knowledge centres (i.e., the centres of applied research and innovation) now use quality features which enable the quality of our courses and programmes to be (more) measurable.
- The measurements tools used to assess quality are more detailed.

This Quality Management Framework describes the Hanze University quality vision and sets out its quality management system. It is also intended to act as a guide for schools drawing up their own quality management systems. Having a framework for quality assurance and management is not only a requirement for accreditation, it is also an important precondition for good quality in higher professional education, a theme which is currently very much in the public eye.

The Quality Management Framework is based on three principles:

- Education and learning, and research (the ‘primary processes’) take priority
- Quality management is system-orientated
- Strategic planning and the quality management plan are linked to each other

This combination makes the Quality Management Framework an important reference for all the staff of Hanze (UAS). Implementing the QMF is primarily the responsibility of the individual schools, and staff will find within it the principles they should refer to when applying quality management in their own schools or knowledge centres.

This Quality Management Framework has been drawn up by the IKZ Team (the Integrated Quality Management Team) in the Education and Research Department with the collaboration of a focus group and an external expert. Thanks to their combined efforts, this revised QMF is a comprehensive reference which will serve Hanze (UAS) as a guide in the years to come.

Henk Pijlman
Chair of the Executive Board
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Summary

This Quality Management Framework is organised as follows:

- **In Chapter 1**, the reasons for revising the existing Hanze (UAS) Quality Management Framework are discussed and the scope of the QMF is explained.

- **Chapter 2** deals with the Hanze (UAS) vision of the quality of its primary processes, i.e., education and learning and applied research. This vision of quality is elaborated in an overview of characteristics that define quality. These quality characteristics are organised into three categories, namely, Education, Research and Organisation. Quality management itself is also broken down into a number of quality characteristics.

- **Chapter 3** describes the Hanze (UAS) vision of quality management. It concludes with the presentation of the university’s Quality Management Framework, the main elements of which are: internal quality measurements, internal quality assurance and external quality assessment. As the quality management system is directly related to the university’s policy and management system (and the related result measurements) the latter is also discussed in this chapter. Chapter 3 demonstrates that quality management at Hanze (UAS) is in compliance with the quality characteristics formulated in Chapter 2, i.e., Hanze (UAS) uses a methodical evaluation system, its management system and quality assurance procedures guarantee an effective improvement cycle, and various stakeholders are involved in quality management in a regular and structured way.

- **Chapter 4** presents an overview of the various types of quality measurements, which include input and process measurements, satisfaction measurements (of the various stakeholders) and impact and output measurements. The quality measurements involve the primary processes of education and research in the schools and knowledge centres as well as the processes in the support departments, which come under the category ‘Organisation’.

- **Chapter 5** describes the elements of the Hanze (UAS) internal procedures for quality assurance and external quality assessment. With regard to education and learning, this involves an internal EFQM audit and an accreditation preview and, externally, an institutional audit and the accreditation of study programmes. In terms of research, internal quality assurance comprises a mid-term review and an audit preview, while external quality assurance is managed by validation at the institutional level and evaluation of the knowledge centres.

- **Chapter 6** provides an insight into how quality management can be assured in schools and knowledge centres. A distinction is made between making quality management operational in education and research, embedding quality management in schools and knowledge centres, and communication regarding quality management. The roles of the university’s support services are also briefly discussed.

- **In Chapter 7**, an overview of the available process descriptions, which are included in a separate Procedures Handbook, is presented.
Abbreviations and Translations

APL  Accreditation of Prior Learning  [Erkenning van Verworven Competenties, EVC]


CROHO Central Register of Courses in Higher Education  [Centraal Register Opleidingen Hoger Onderwijs]

EFQM European Foundation for Quality Management
ENQA European Network for Quality Assurance in Higher Education
EUA European University Association

Facilities Department  Facilitair Bedrijf (FB)
Finance Department  Stafbureau Financieel-Economische Zaken (SB FEZ)

HBO-raad Netherlands Association of Universities of Applied Sciences
HG Hanze (UAS) Groningen  [Hanzehogeschool Groningen]
HMR Hanze (UAS) Representative Council  [Hogeschoolmedezeggenschapsraad]

INK Dutch Quality Institute  [Instituut Nederlandse Kwaliteit]
IKZ Integrated Quality Management  [Integrale kwaliteitszorg]

Institutional audit Instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg (ITK)

Knowledge centre Centre of Applied Research and Innovation  [kenniscentrum]

Marketing & Communication Department  Stafbureau Marketing & Communicatie (SB M&C)
MT Management Team

NVAO Accreditation Organisation for the Netherlands and Flanders  [Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie]

Personnel & Organisation Department  Stafbureau Personeel & Organisatie (SB PO & O)
PO-O&O Education and Research Consultative Body  [Portefeuilleoverleg Onderwijs & Onderzoek]

Procedures Handbook  Processenboek
QMF Quality Management Framework

Support services/departments The stafbureaus and the Facilities Department

Education & Research Department  Stafbureau Onderwijs & Onderzoek (SB O&O)

UAS University of Applied Sciences  [hogeschool, HBO-instelling]
VKO Committee Validation Committee for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education  [Validatiecommissie Kwaliteitszorg Onderzoek]
1 Introduction

Hanze (UAS) Groningen uses a Quality Management Framework (QMF) which was approved in June 2005 by the Education and Research Consultative Body (PO-O&O) and the university’s Executive Board. The QMF has also been approved in the programme accreditations made from 2005 to the present date.

1.1 Reasons for Revising the Quality Management Framework

The main reasons prompting this revision of the current Quality Management Framework were the introduction of a new accreditation system in January 2011 and the opinion expressed by the audit team during the pilot institutional audit of the QMF at the beginning of 2009, in combination with recent developments relating to quality management of applied research and the publication of the new Hanze (UAS) Strategic Policy Plan for 2010-2015. In other words, there are national, external reasons as well as internal reasons for taking a critical look at the current QMF and adapting it to reflect changing views on quality and quality management.

A new accreditation system

After a period of six years during which all the study programmes in higher education were accredited in a single instance on the basis of generic qualities, a need arose for a new accreditation system which would involve less bureaucracy and focus more on the actual quality of the study programmes and on teachers’ professionalism. The new accreditation system, which took effect on 1 January 2011, gives higher education institutions a choice between an institutional audit being performed in combination with a limited assessment of individual study programmes, or a comprehensive assessment of the study programmes without an institutional audit being held. Hanze (UAS) has opted for the combination of an institutional audit with limited programme assessment.

Recommendations from the Pilot Institutional Audit

In the advisory report by NVAO [NVAO, 2009] which was based on the pilot audit of the Hanze (UAS) quality management system, the audit team described it as being thorough and sound, but also commented that it did not cover the quality and level of the study programmes properly.

By revising its Quality Management Framework, Hanze (UAS) aims to strengthen its internal quality assurance so that it can continue to live up to the confidence that external parties have in its quality management system, and so that staff responsible for study programmes have the benefit of a limited programme assessment regime.

Quality assurance of applied research

The research role of universities of applied sciences gradually took shape after professorships were introduced into higher professional education in 2001. In 2008, the Council for Higher Professional Education, the HBO-raad, adopted a Protocol for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education, the BKO Protocol, which included agreements made about introducing a national quality assurance system. The quality assurance system for research has three components:

- an internal quality management system at each university of applied sciences including an independent external evaluation of the research units (at Hanze (UAS): the knowledge centres, or centres of applied research and innovation);
- a six-yearly national validation of the internal quality management system for each university of applied sciences;
- annual national monitoring of a limited set of research indicators.

In light of these developments, in this revised Quality Management Framework we will address quality and quality management of both education and learning and applied research.
The new Hanze (UAS) strategic course

Quality is the key word in the Hanze (UAS) 2010-2015 strategic policy plan, ‘Road to Excellence,’ which was presented on 1 July 2009. To realise its strategic policies, Hanze (UAS) must continue to develop its quality management system, focusing, in particular, on the substance of its programmes and curricula. It goes without saying that the Quality Management Framework now requires updating, given that important new concepts have emerged in the University’s strategic policy.

Having a detailed, demonstrably effective quality management framework is an essential precondition for achieving positive outcomes in the institutional audit of education and the institutional validation of research.

1.2 Demarcation

The focus of this Quality Management Framework is on the university-wide quality management system and the activities undertaken by the university to guarantee a good quality of education and learning and applied research. Quality management in the support departments is referred to, but has not been worked out in any great detail as, besides having their own specific procedures, they are largely covered by the general quality management procedures. The relationship between quality management and the Hanze (UAS) policy and management cycle is discussed at some length.

1.3 Parties involved in drawing up the QMF

A focus group consisting of a number of school deans, team managers, lecturers and employees of the Finance and Education & Research Departments all contributed to the project. Three meetings were held with the focus group to discuss earlier versions of the Framework. At the last meeting on 1 July 2010, the group gave the green light for the revised QMF, commenting in its report that: “The focus group’s general impression of the QMF is definitely positive. In places, the QMF seems overly detailed. It is as comprehensive in its regard for the knowledge centres as it is for the schools. The relationship to the management cycle is included, including the indicators. The process descriptions are presented in a separate appendix, which is good”.

The focus group further remarked that the QMF was intended mainly for the people who have to work with it. The QMF was also submitted to an external expert. We have used the comments made by both the focus group and the external expert and are grateful to them for their input.

1.4 Publication and Communication

The Education and Research Consultative Body (PO-O&O) approved the revised Quality Management Framework on 28 September 2010, and the Executive Board decided to endorse it on 11 October 2010. The Hanze (UAS) Representative Council (the HMR) gave its consent on 6 December 2010. The revised QMF is available via the Hanze (UAS) intranet.

A short version of the QMF was put out on paper in the autumn of 2010. The focus group was also involved in this publication as was the Marketing and Communication Department. The full QMF is available on the intranet under the Education & Research Department. The digital version will be evaluated from time to time, and updated, if necessary.

Throughout the 2010-2011 academic year the Education & Research Department is carrying out a project, the Project Instellingsoets Kwaliteitszorg, to ensure that the university’s quality assurance procedures are approved in the 2011 institutional audit. All the schools have to prepare for this, as they may be subjected to random staff, facilities and quality management assessments during the year. As a part of this project, the QMF is being implemented and embedded in Hanze (UAS), its schools and knowledge centres.
2 The Hanze (UAS) Vision of Quality

This chapter concerns the Hanze (UAS) vision of quality. It starts by describing our aims and mission, we then go into detail about our views on quality and what a culture of quality means. At the end of the chapter an overview of the quality characteristics for education and learning, research, organisation and the quality management system is presented. A comprehensive overview of all the quality characteristics is set out in Appendix 1.

2.1 Aims and Mission

The Hanze (UAS) strategic policy plan for 2010-2015 is called the ‘Road to Excellence’, which clearly indicates that quality is the key concept in the university’s policy for this period. Hanze (UAS) wishes to focus on quality in an international perspective, as summarised in the following objective:

Hanze (UAS) aims to develop into a well-respected university of applied sciences.

This aim is worked out in the following mission statement:

From a European perspective on higher education, Hanze (UAS) wants to be the most important partner for businesses and institutions in the North Netherlands in the training of professionals and in developing relevant, practice-orientated knowledge.

To achieve its principal aim, Hanze (UAS) wants to enhance the quality of its education and practice-orientated (i.e., applied) research, and increase the scope of the latter. By concentrating on quality, Hanze (UAS) hopes to achieve international recognition as an important provider of professionally-orientated higher education which is associated with high-quality applied research. For Hanze (UAS) to be able to enhance the quality of its education and learning and research, it should first be made clear what it meant by quality.

2.2 Quality and Culture of Quality

In the ‘Road to Excellence’, Hanze (UAS) stated that it was going to concentrate on professional education, as indeed it is required to by law, being an institution of higher professional education and not an academic or research institution. Its mission statement refers to ‘the training of professionals’. With regard to (applied) research, Hanze (UAS) favours a close association between education and research, and expects this to lead to the further development of occupations and professions. In addition, research must generate practical knowledge which can be applied in, and made available to, business and industry and society in general; this is the process which goes by the name of knowledge valorisation, also known as knowledge transfer or technology transfer. The Hanze (UAS) mission statement summarises the aim of applied research as ‘developing relevant, practice-orientated knowledge’. From the above principles, the following definitions of education and learning and research quality follow:

Quality of education and learning is the extent to which Hanze (UAS) succeeds in training students to become research-minded professional practitioners, and

Quality of applied research is the extent to which Hanze (UAS) succeeds in providing added value to education and learning, professional practice and society.

Both definitions contain the three following elements:
1. a reference to either of the two primary processes, i.e., education and learning or applied research;
2. a reference to the outcomes of the primary processes, i.e., ‘research-minded professional practitioners’ or ‘providing added value to education and learning, professional practice and society’; and
3. A reference to a measurement which presupposes a norm: ‘the extent to which’ an outcome is achieved.

2.2.1 Quality of education and applied research

The quality of education and learning and applied research is defined more closely in a number of quality characteristics that apply to the primary processes and to the outcomes to be achieved in those processes (see Section 2.3). Quality standards are defined by attaching specific indicators with target values to the quality characteristics, so that outcomes can then be measured. Establishing indicators and making agreements about quantitative and qualitative outcomes is part of the Hanze (UAS) management system (see Chapter 3). The outcomes to be achieved are recorded in a management agreement drawn up between the Executive Board and the deans.

In the definitions given above, the relationship between education and research is evident: graduate students are professional and also research-minded, where applied research also contributes to education.

2.2.2 Quality of the organisation

 Preconditions that are essential for realising a good quality of education and research, are the quality of the staff and an efficient and effective operational management system. The quantity and quality of staff must be adequate at all levels and in all departments across the organisation. The organisation must be set up in an effective and efficient way to be able to realise quality at the schools and knowledge centres, and the services and facilities must support and strengthen the quality of the primary processes appropriately. Quality of staff and operational management is defined in detail in the Quality Characteristics of the Organisation (Section 2.3.4). Like the quality characteristics for education and research, these quality characteristics are linked to specific indicators and target values in the management system, as agreed by the Executive Board and the deans in consultation.

2.2.3 Culture of quality

The strategic policy plan, the ‘Road to Excellence’, contains clear statements about a culture of quality in which quality and quality improvement can thrive. Such a culture is expressed in four key values:

- Individual development:
  Recognising people as individuals despite the size of the university, developing talent, interaction, and a creative and innovative spirit.

- Respect and active tolerance:
  Allowing space for, and being tolerant of, differences in backgrounds, cultures and opinions, being willing to discuss and challenge opinions.

- An enterprising spirit:
  Being outward-looking; having contact with, and collaborating with, businesses and institutions; being proactive.

- Responsibility:
  Awareness of each other and the society around us; social responsibility, which includes giving attention to sustainability and development cooperation.

When discussing quality in education with lecturers and students, they all described a culture of quality in their own fashion but were in agreement about the key values supported by the university [HG-1, 2010]. In a variety of ways, they confirmed that quality depends on lecturers and students forming a respectful culture of learning. The interaction between lecturers and students forms the basis for educational quality; when subject content and lecturer and student behaviour come together in a unique way, resulting in learning and development. The quality of the interaction determines the actual quality of education and learning.
Applied research requires a culture of quality for it to thrive, but it also plays a role in the development of that culture itself. Lecturers and students who contribute to research are challenged all the more to be enterprising, creative and innovative, and these skills in turn enhance the quality of education and learning.

The features of a culture of quality are set out under the Quality Characteristics of the Organisation (Section 2.3.4).

2.3 Quality Characteristics

To be able to determine to what extent Hanze (UAS) is succeeding in training students to become research-minded professional practitioners and in providing added value to education and learning, professional practice and society, it is necessary to work out the quality definitions in greater detail. This is done in the form of quality characteristics. Quality characteristics are the properties which clarify what Hanze (UAS) means by quality.

The quality characteristics (the ‘good things’) form a framework, to which a system of indicators and, if desired, target values can be linked, so that quality can be identified and measured. The stronger the relationship between the quality characteristic and the indicator, the clearer it is that the university is doing the right things, and that it is doing them well and is achieving the desired outcomes. Appendix 1 (under 5) gives examples of quality characteristics, linked to indicators, and methods for evaluating or measuring them.

2.3.1 Grouping of quality characteristics

The main quality characteristics are those relating to the primary processes of education and research. Education and research are supported and facilitated by vital organisational processes which are referred to, together, as the ‘organisation’. The quality of the organisation is (also) broken down into quality characteristics and these are grouped under Culture, Design, Staff and Facilities. Accreditation and validation of the institution as a whole concerns the quality of the organisation and its quality management. Quality management is concerned with the processes used for assuring the quality of the primary and support processes. It in turn can be broken down into quality characteristics, as shown in Figure 2.1.

An overview of all the quality characteristics given in Appendix 1 sets out the generic quality standards based on external assessment frameworks, and the additional qualities that are specific to Hanze (UAS). To highlight the latter, the related quality characteristics have been explicitly included in this chapter (see Section 2.3.2ff).

![Figure 2.1 Grouping of Quality Characteristics](image-url)
Education and research have each been divided into three areas which reflect the plan-do-check approach of the PDCA cycle. The educational quality characteristics might be refined in 2010-2011 as part of the project, Herziening HG-Onderwijsvisie en HG-Onderwijskaders, which will update the current Hanze (UAS) educational frameworks.

In the ‘Road to Excellence’, Hanze (UAS) expressed its intention to participate in international working groups (developing classification systems, for example) and expanding its participation in European funded programmes (e.g., Erasmus Mundus 2 and various research programmes) for the purpose of entering into partnerships with other reputable educational institutions. European classification, ranking and benchmarking are important topics in this connection and have been taken into account in the Quality Management Framework. The QMF, including the quality characteristics, has been reviewed using the European guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance, such as those of the EUA (European University Association) and the ENQA (European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education). It has also been compared with the various European guidelines for Internal Quality Assurance [HG-5, 2010].

2.3.2 Quality characteristics of education

The new NVAO assessment frameworks lay down the basic characteristics of what constitutes good education and learning. For the limited programme assessment, this essentially concerns the quality of the intended learning outcomes or professional competencies, the education and learning environment, the assessment system and the professional competencies or learning outcomes achieved. Hanze (UAS) has, of its own accord, added a number of quality characteristics which are derived from the ‘Road to Excellence’ and from the ideas about education and learning quality articulated by education staff and students. These specific quality characteristics also give a good insight into what the Hanze (UAS) notion of a culture of quality is.

The overview of education quality characteristics given in Appendix 1 is organised as follows:

A. Quality characteristics of the particular professional competencies
   - Intended competencies and learning outcomes:

B. Quality characteristics of the educational programme
   - Curriculum
   - Programme design
   - Optimum articulation to secondary education
   - Optimum feasibility
   - Tutoring

C. Quality characteristics of assessment and achieved learning outcomes
   - Assessment
   - Learning outcomes

Table 2.1 presents an overview of the Hanze (UAS)-specific quality characteristics of education, which supplement the generic characteristics of a good quality of education defined by the NVAO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.1 Hanze (UAS)-specific quality characteristics of education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended competencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.3.3 Quality characteristics of applied research

In 2007, the HBO-raad adopted a Protocol for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education (“BKO Protocol”). This protocol provided the outlines of a national quality management system, with internal and external quality management components, which were elaborated in more detail in 2008. On the basis of the principles contained in the BKO Protocol, the Validation Committee for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education (“VKO Committee”) was entrusted with the validation of the quality management systems set up by universities of applied research to monitor their research activities.

The BKO Protocol and the documents produced by the VKO Committee are the main external sources which Hanze (UAS) is using as a base for its own quality characteristics for applied research [HBO-raad, 2008], [VKO, 2009]. The university’s particular ideas about the quality of applied research are derived in part from the document, Versterkt verder met praktijkgericht onderzoek [Enhancing Applied Research] [HG-2, 2010].

The overview of the quality characteristics related to applied research in Appendix 1 is organised as follows:

A. Quality characteristics of the particular unit’s mission and aims, and their elaboration in accordance with the research profile
   - Mission of the research unit
   - Research profile

B. Quality characteristics of the research programme
   - Programme design
   - Execution of the research programme

C. Quality characteristics of the performance areas
   - Knowledge development
   - Added value for professional practice and society
   - Added value for education and research

Table 2.2 gives an overview of the Hanze (UAS)-specific research quality characteristics.
Table 2.2 Hanze (UAS)-specific quality characteristics of research

| Mission of the research unit | • Is clearly related to the Hanze (UAS) strategic policy  
|                            | • Is apparent in the research programme  
|                            | • Demonstrates the coherence of the performance areas of Knowledge Development, Professional Practice & Society and Education & Training, and accounts for their relative weight  
|                            | • Is supported by the relevant stakeholders (i.e., internal and external parties who have an interest in the research unit)  |
| Research profile           | • Is elaborated in terms of specific feasible and tangible outcomes which are related to the objectives of the research unit  
|                            | • Is based on methodologically sound research  
|                            | • Has valorisation of knowledge as its objective (i.e., generating knowledge and making it available to business and industry, and society in general)  |
| Programme design           | • Includes one or more strands of research that clearly reflect the mission and objectives  
|                            | • Is agreed in consultation with the stakeholders in the occupational field and society  
|                            | • Is related to the taught themes  |
| Execution                  | • Takes place in formal partnerships with knowledge institutions, public authorities and businesses (which have appropriate facilities)  
|                            | • Is characterised by productive interaction with relevant stakeholders in all the stages of the research (stakeholder interest)  
|                            | • Is carried out by researchers, lecturers and students in stimulating and learning-centred knowledge valorisation agreements (kennisarrangementen)  |
| Knowledge development      | • Is of a high quality and can be applied across the sector or industry  
|                            | • Targets not just operational and short-term problems, but strategic and long-term issues (sustainability) as well  |
| Added value for            | • Is evidenced by the appreciation of the relevant stakeholders  
| professional practice and  | • Is sustainable, and contributes materially to problem-solving or innovation in professional practice and or society (outcome and impact)  
| society                   | • Is evidenced by being recognised as an important player in sustainable networks  |
| Added value for            | • Contributes to expanding/encouraging the research component of study programmes  
| education and research     | • Is evidenced by the further professionalization of education staff and students (creating reflective practitioners)  
|                            | • Contributes to the knowledge base of the study programmes  |

2.3.4 Quality characteristics of the organisation

The quality characteristics of the organisation - an important aspect of which is the organisational culture - are based on the strategic policy plan, the ‘Road to Excellence’, and on the interviews held with education staff and students in 2009 [HG-1, 2010]. The NVAO assessment frameworks and the BKO and VKO principles were used as external reference frameworks for determining the quality characteristics related to Staff and Facilities. The quality characteristics of the organisation are relevant to education and learning as well as to applied research.

The overview of the quality characteristics relating to the organisation in Appendix 1 is organised as follows:

A. Characteristics of a Culture of Quality
   • Characteristics of culture

B. Quality characteristics of Organisational Design
   • Organisational design

C. Quality characteristics of Staff
   • Hanze (UAS) staff policy
D. Quality characteristics of Facilities

- Buildings
- Facilities

Table 2.3 presents an overview of the specific quality characteristics of the organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.3 Hanze (UAS)-specific organisational quality characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Culture of quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being customer and student centred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Space for personal development including excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect for differences between people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active involvement in and with Hanze (UAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taking responsibility for one’s professional development and professional practice within one’s own organisation and in society at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being result-orientated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working together, reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The positioning and design of the organisational units supports the aims and profile of the unit (programme or knowledge centre/lectorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to develop and maintain relevant long-term internal and external networks of relationships and partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ability to use these networks effectively, in particular, in the northern Netherlands, when setting up and conducting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff policy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on practical experience, research skills and international orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Both education and support staff are afforded a degree of autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Attention to competency development of support/education staff, and to team development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being result-orientated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good lecturers and lecturer researchers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are inspiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are innovative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are qualified to a level which is at least one level higher than the students they teach or whose research they supervise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sufficient staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lecturers, lecturer researchers and students have opportunities to engage in accordance with agreements about contact time and professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings and facilities</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are appropriate for the education concept and/or the research profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage contact and engagement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.5 Quality characteristics of the quality management system

The institutional education audit, which can be held from 2011 onwards in accordance with the new accreditation system, and the institutional research validation both centre on the quality management system of the assessed institution. The purpose of the assessment is to establish whether the institution’s systems are adequate for guaranteeing the quality of its taught and research programmes. Thus, it is important to establish quality characteristics for the quality management system itself as well. The Hanze (UAS) quality management system is described in Chapter 3.

The overview of the quality characteristics relating to quality management in Appendix 1 is organised as follows:

- The evaluation system (the Hanze (UAS) quality management system)
- The improvement activities
- The degree of stakeholder involvement
Table 2.4 presents Hanze (UAS)-specific quality characteristics relating to quality management.

**Table 2.4 Hanze (UAS)-specific quality characteristics of quality management**

| Degree of stakeholder involvement | • Primary responsibility for the quality of education and learning and applied research lies with the lecturers and researchers  
| | • Lecturers and researchers are given professional latitude to achieve quality |

### 2.3.6 Applying quality characteristics

The overview of the quality characteristics in Appendix 1 shows what is meant by generic quality based on external frameworks, and lists the additional quality characteristics that profile Hanze (UAS). This Appendix is not a simple ‘tick-off’ list, but is intended to help schools and knowledge centres get a grip on their own quality determinants and enable them to demonstrate to what extent they are achieving them. Different quality characteristics will apply to the various schools and knowledge centres. With indicators and target values in place, the Hanze (UAS) management system is all set for improving those characteristics in a purposeful way.

The overview of quality characteristics is also intended to make the Hanze (UAS) quality management system and, in particular, the quality measurement more concrete, so that schools and knowledge centres will have relevant data for demonstrating quality. It is not an absolute or exhaustive list; it is the list that was current in 2010 which was based on external frameworks and internal priorities. The list will be adapted to the current situation and the dynamics of the organisation on a regular basis.
3 Quality Management and the Quality Management System

Where Chapter 2 dealt with the concept of quality and quality characteristics, and their division into the categories of Education, Research, Organisation and Quality Management, in this chapter we will discuss quality management. The three quality characteristics relating to quality management are: cyclical improvement activities, stakeholder involvement and the Hanze (UAS) quality management system.

3.1 Improvement Activities in accordance with the PDCA cycle

Hanze (UAS) has adopted the following definition of quality management:

Quality management is the ongoing assessment, monitoring and improvement of the quality of education and learning and research in a methodical and cyclical manner.

The purpose of having a quality management system is that it allows Hanze (UAS) to revise and update its policies based on the results of a range of evaluations and analyses. For this to be effective, it is essential that there is an exchange with and between education staff, students, the regional and (inter)national professional field and alumni.

When implementing the PDCA cycle (see Figure 3.1), the following questions must be answered in every cycle:
- Are we doing the right things? Are these the most important things?
- Are we doing things well?
- How do we know?
- Do others agree?
- How do we act on this information?

![Figure 3.1 The PDCA Cycle](image)

Continuous improvement depends on the ability to learn from past mistakes and respond to internal and external developments in a timely manner. By doing this, Hanze (UAS) is positioning itself as a ‘learning organisation’ working continuously to improve and re-invent itself. Monitoring results and keeping track
of improvement measures, and making them visible, assures that the improvements and innovations are not lost.

It is important in educational quality management to make agreements about the quality of education and research and to determine what results one wants to achieve. A limited set of practical, measurable indicators and well-defined target values enable assessments, based on the quality characteristics described in Chapter 2, to be carried out properly. Input and process measurements, satisfaction measurements (of various stakeholders) and output and impact measurements all supply valuable additional information (see Chapter 4).

Hanze (UAS) is well aware of its social responsibilities and always tries to act in a socially responsible way. Accordingly, it aims for sustainability and transparency when accounting for the effective and efficient management of the quality of its education and research.

### 3.2 Stakeholder Involvement

For quality management to be effective, it is important that a culture of quality exists and that the people involved are intrinsically motivated to continue improving. The characteristics of quality management formulated by Hanze (UAS) are: “Lecturers and researchers have primary responsibility for the quality of education and applied research” and “lecturers are given professional latitude.”

Quality management also has to be organised efficiently, which includes:
- transparent processes and a clear division of tasks and powers;
- effective communication with the internal and external stakeholders;
- clear goals and measures that enable the PDCA cycle to be used.

Hanze (UAS) has an integrated approach to quality management, in other words, its quality management covers the full scope of education and learning, research and the organisation. It is important to involve all the stakeholders: students, education staff, support staff, the professional field and alumni. In terms of quality characteristics: “Staff as well as students are actively involved in and with Hanze (UAS) and take responsibility for their professional practice within their own organisations and towards society.”

Decisions about quality management are taken by the schools and knowledge centres, who weigh up the interests and communicate the decisions to the persons involved.

### 3.3 The Quality Management System

#### 3.3.1 General purpose

Hanze (UAS) wants to enhance the quality of its education and learning and applied research, and increase the scope of the latter. It is important that education and research continue to be of a high standard, which means that, at minimum, all the study programmes are accredited, that the knowledge centres/professorships are validated, and that the quality of education and research is assured by using an effective quality management system.

The quality management system provides an overview of all the quality management processes and serves as a manual for the design, organisation and implementation of quality management in the university in general and the schools and knowledge centres in particular. It is designed to be a dynamic system which will be fine-tuned and modified when necessary to adapt to internal and external developments.

Besides clarifying the Hanze (UAS) vision of quality, the main emphasis of the Quality Management Framework is on the implementation of quality management in the schools and programmes, the knowledge centres and professorships. To assist this process, guidelines have been included in Chapter 6 about how to apply quality management in schools and knowledge centres.
3.3.2 Specific purposes

The Hanze (UAS) quality management system has several purposes:

- Being accountable to the outside world and society by submitting to education audit and research validation at the institutional level, and to accreditation of individual programmes and evaluation of research in knowledge centres
- Assessing, monitoring and improving the quality of education and learning and research
- Analysing and improving the conditions of education and learning and research
- Internal and external positioning (benchmarking).

3.3.3 Areas of application

Integrated quality management covers all the processes within the university and is implemented and shaped by the individual schools, knowledge centres and support departments. The quality of the services and products is monitored at various different levels within the organisation. Each unit is responsible for its own processes and has its own quality assurance and improvement cycle.

The quality of education and research is paramount in the quality management system, and the focus is on the implementation of these primary processes in the schools/programmes and knowledge centres/professorships. In accordance with the strategic policy plan, the ‘Road to Excellence,’ the processes of education and research are being more closely integrated. For the time being, however, they are being treated separate for the purposes of the quality management system, partly because they are at different stages of development.

The support processes in the schools and knowledge centres and the processes in the support departments are crucial to the success of the primary processes and are, therefore, evaluated in that light. The support departments themselves are largely responsible for the organisation of their quality management activities.

3.3.4 Components of the quality management system

An outline of the Hanze (UAS) quality management system is presented in Figure 3.2. Schools and knowledge centres may elaborate the various components in greater detail; see Chapter 6. The quality cycle runs parallel to other cycles employed by the university, such as the policy cycle and the HRM cycle.

The components shown in Figure 3.2 are:

- The Hanze (UAS) policy and management; this operates in close relationship with the quality management system (see Section 3.4)
- Internal quality measurements (Chapter 4)
- External quality assessment (Chapter 5)
- Internal quality assurance (Chapter 5)

Figure 3.2 illustrates the processes that are linked to the three components of the quality management system. The arrows between the ‘University policy and management’ box and the three components of the quality management system indicate their mutual influence. For example, changes in university policy may influence the accreditation of programmes, and the outcome of an EFQM audit may affect policy and management (see Section 3.4). The ‘Internal quality measurements’ component is shown in the middle, as the information gathered from quality measurements form the input for external quality assessments as well as internal quality assurance.
Figure 3.2 Components of the Quality Management System

**Internal quality measurements**

Quality measurements such as input and process measurements, satisfaction measurements, output and impact measurements are conducted and integrated performance evaluations to monitor the quality of education and learning, research and the organisation. These measurements represent the (evaluation) activities that are carried out to collect information for the quality assurance and improvement cycles. Internal quality measurements are dealt with in more detail in Chapter 4 of this Quality Management Framework.

**External quality assessment**

All the institutions of higher education in the Netherlands are subject to an accreditation system for education which is administered by the NVAO, the Accreditation Organisation for the Netherlands and Flanders. Institutions or individual programmes can both be accredited.

As regards research, external evaluation of research units such as the Hanze (UAS) knowledge centres is governed by the BKO Protocol (the Protocol for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education), which has been in force since 2008. The VKO Committee (Validation Committee for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education) carries out validation of UAS at the institutional level. External quality assessment is discussed in depth in Chapter 5.

**Internal quality assurance**

To assure the quality of its education and learning, Hanze (UAS) carries out internal audits of its study programmes (including self-assessments/consensus meetings) and accreditation previews. The audits are based on the EFQM model. The concept of the continuous improvement of processes is central to the approach, and the idea is not to just look at education and research processes and performance, but to consider any factors that may influence the quality of the education and research as well. Accreditation previews, which are held one year before the external review of programmes, address the same topics as those outlined in the NVAO Accreditation Framework.

To assure the quality of its research, Hanze (UAS) holds mid-term reviews and evaluation previews, both of which are based on the evaluation questions from the BKO Protocol. A stakeholder analysis and survey is an important element of the mid-term reviews and evaluation previews. Internal quality assurance is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.
3.4 **Relationship between the Quality Management System and the Hanze (UAS) Policies and Management**

The Hanze (UAS) policies and management do not fall within the scope of the quality management system, but operate in tandem with it. The policy and management cycle is shown in Figure 3.3 in the context of the PDCA cycle:

- **PLAN.** This is the starting point for the planning of quality management activities in the schools and knowledge centres, and is based on the various policy plans and the management agreement.
- **DO.** All the quality management activities for the planning period are set out in a quality management plan.
- **CHECK.** Involves the various quality measurements and the recording of results in reports and the management dashboard.
- **ACT.** Relates to the integrated performance evaluation, which is based on the quality reports and the results shown on the management dashboard. It is used for internal quality assurance and for the external quality assessments planned for that year: internal audits, site visits, research evaluations, SWOT analysis, etc.

![Figure 3.3 PDCA Cycle for Policy and Management](image-url)
3.4.1 Policy and management cycle

The Hanze (UAS) policy is based on a four-year cycle which starts with the Executive Board drawing up a strategic plan in consultation with internal and external stakeholders. On the basis of this plan, the schools, knowledge centres and support departments then draw up their individual four-year strategic plans, which form the backbone of their annual plans over the next four years. The management cycle runs on two levels; at the level of the institution and at the level of the schools, knowledge centres and support departments. The Executive Board makes agreements with the deans and the heads of services about the results to be achieved and these are set down in management agreements, complete with targets and performance indicators, including target values, which are based on the Hanze (UAS) strategic plan. The policy and management cycle and the related activities are described in a management systems handbook, the Managementhandboek Besturingssystematiek [HG, 2004].

The strategic policy plan, ‘Road to Excellence’, established ten performance indicators for the next four years (see Table 3.1). These indicators clarify how Hanze (UAS) will measure success in the areas of strategic development and innovation.

Table 3.1: Performance indicators from the ‘Road to Excellence’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance indicator</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percentage of bachelor’s students taking talent development courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intake of master’s students</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of joint programmes (bachelor’s and master’s)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Intake of part-time students and the number of post-graduate students enrolled in HanzeConnect courses</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of participations in large-scale regional projects with intensive level of contact with businesses and institutions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of start-up companies by students and recent graduates</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Number of participations in international research projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Proportion of own/external research funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Percentage of lecturers holding a master’s degree or a PhD</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Number of cultural projects carried out by Hanze (UAS) (on its own or in collaboration with others)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schools and knowledge centres also formulate their own specific goals in the areas of education and research including performance indicators and, if possible, target values.

3.4.2 Management dashboard

The Hanze (UAS) management dashboard makes performance visible and organises the agreed targets into primary and secondary objectives. The management dashboard is where management has its target values, the latest performance data and analysis tools at its fingertips to support the management and monitoring of these targets.

The concept of the management dashboard is derived from the Balanced Score Card. ‘Balanced’, in Hanze (UAS) terms, means that the targets are evenly divided across education, applied research, innovation, staff and finance. At the level of the schools, for example, the dashboard provides a month-by-month overview of how Hanze (UAS) ‘is doing’. The support departments are responsible for the various information systems that inform the management dashboard.
4 Internal Quality Measurements

4.1 Quality Measurements and the EFQM Model

Data are collected to measure the quality of education and learning, research and the supporting organisational processes, as defined in Chapter 2, (see Figure 4.1) which are then used in the quality assurance and improvement cycles of the schools and programmes, the knowledge centres and professorships, the support departments and the university as a whole.

The various quality measurements can be linked to the EFQM model. They are divided into:
- Input and process measurements
- Satisfaction measurements
- Output and impact measurements
- Integrated performance evaluation

These various types of measurements will be discussed in greater detail in Section 4.2. Appendix 4 includes an overview of the quality measurements performed by Hanze (UAS).
4.2 Input and Process Measurements

Input measurements primarily relate to determining the required staff complement and the right amount of resources. They may involve examining staff qualifications, or the FTEs available, or the money and square footage available per unit, student or staff member, or workspaces, equipment, etc. Information stored in various databases is used for planning and budgeting and is monitored in reports, budget statements and suchlike. The Finance Department and the Personnel & Organisation Department have their own responsibilities with regard to financial and staff information and data, and the Facilities Department with regard to the university’s estate and facilities. Recording the qualifications of incoming students (e.g., type of previous education) can also be regarded as an input measurement. Input data is often linked to output data, which gives characteristic numbers so that results can be determined.

Process measurements measure control and/or the course that (sub-)processes are taking so that they can be improved. Both quantitative and qualitative process measurements are used, and different methods are used for the different processes. They are used for education and research (see the next sub-section) and also in the support departments. This could involve ICT facilities, literature and media facilities, financial support, project support or the organisational processes involving staff or staff facilities. As the support departments provide specific products and services to education and research, matters such as delivery time, recording and handling of complaints, completion time, frequency of use and reliability of delivery can be measured. An example is ‘Number of visits to the Student Counsellor’s Office’ (see the processes overview in Chapter 7).

Input and process measurements for education

Several sub-processes can be identified when looking at education and learning as a process, such as the provision of information, educational development, intake, progress, academic advising, placement supervision, holding examinations, etc. Results can be linked to these sub-processes, all of which ultimately also affect total performance.

Looking at students, ‘completion time’ has a very different meaning compared to the completion time of services: it’s not just about determining how long students take to get a qualification (the pass rate), but it’s also about how they do it (first-year pass rates, drop-out rates, etc.). The academic advising service is benefited by a good student progress system which records students’ academic results. Intelligently combining data about pass rate history and students’ progress, in combination with making a thorough analysis, will provide information that can be used to enhance educational processes and thus improve the feasibility of courses and reduce the withdrawal rate; a ‘Results Project’ is under way. Process measurements relating to education and learning are sometimes carried out across the university, for
instance, counting the number of contact hours per week and year, but they can also be carried out within a school or programme, for instance, recording the time taken in marking examinations.

**Input and process measurements for research**

A lot of research is conducted on a project basis where fixed time limits and distinct phases apply. To be able to meet the project deadline, it is important that the data or the sub-products generated by the process itself become available on time so that the project can progress. Research also includes developing knowledge which requires all kinds of interaction between the research unit and internal or external stakeholders. This interaction can take place at various stages during the research process: when formulating the research question, during the research, or afterwards when the results are published and disseminated. Recording and storing data about the interactions that take place during the process is essential if the results are to be determined properly.

### 4.3 Satisfaction Measurements

Satisfaction measurements measure the satisfaction (or appreciation) of stakeholders both within and outside the organisation. These may involve staff, internal customers, students, alumni, collaboration partners, commissioning parties, the professional field, public authorities or society at large. Satisfaction measurements can be qualitative, quantitative or both. The results are usually quantified and totalled, in the same way as those of the National Student Survey or customer satisfaction surveys. The results of panel discussions (customer panels, user groups and the panel discussions with students) provide ratings as well as qualitative information which can be used for improvement activities. Satisfaction measurements may be national surveys or localised tools developed by Hanze (UAS). By measuring satisfaction or appreciation, the organisation demonstrates that it takes the opinions of its stakeholders seriously and that it includes them in its improvements activities.

**Satisfaction measurements relating to education**

Hanze (UAS) conducts satisfaction measurements on a fairly regular basis. For education and learning, these measurements are carried out in associate, bachelor’s and master’s degree programmes. Schools sometimes take part in carrying out satisfaction measurements and use the results for monitoring purposes or to check whether they have achieved their targets. If a target value was formulated, the measured value that is actually found can be compared to the target value. After further analysis of the data, a school or programme can then plan certain actions which it can include in its next policy cycle. Examples of satisfaction measurements used for education and learning are:

- **Customers (students):** National Student Survey, block questionnaires, appraisals of master’s degree modules, placement evaluations, thesis process evaluations; the Aansluitingsmonitor (‘transition monitor’); a poll of first-year students about the transition from secondary school to university, surveys of students who have withdrawn, student appraisals of education staff;
- **Partners (professional field, alumni):** surveys of the professional field, placement evaluations, thesis-stage evaluations and the HBO-monitor (annual monitoring of the relationship between higher vocational education and the labour market);
- **Staff:** staff satisfaction surveys;
- **Society:** Keuzegids, an annual national course guide; Elsevier magazine’s annual ‘best schools’ survey; Kennis in Kaart, an annual government survey of higher education and research.

**Satisfaction measurements relating to research**

Hanze (UAS) employs several methods for applying its satisfaction measurements relating to research. The method chosen depends on the way in which the stakeholders are involved: are they principal/direct users or stakeholders, or are they secondary/potential stakeholders? And at what level does the interaction take place, at the strategic level or at the tactical-operational level? The methods used include taking direct measurements such as conducting:

- **Oral interviews: in person or by telephone**
- **Written interviews: digital questionnaires, surveys**
- **Oral or written evaluations after projects have been completed**
or by taking indirect measurements such as:
- Website visitor analysis
- Purchase of products developed by Hanze (UAS)
- Attendance at workshops, symposia, lectures, etc.
- Invitations sent to keynote speakers.

The satisfaction measurements taken to measure the added value that applied research has for education are also included in the quality measurements for education. Examples include the National Student Survey (student appraisal of research skills taught), the education staff satisfaction survey (lecturers’ evaluation of their own research skills or collaboration with professorships) and the block questionnaires for the bachelor’s courses and the evaluations of master’s degree modules.

**Satisfaction measurements relating to the organisation**

Satisfaction measurements relating to the organisation include:
- Customer satisfaction surveys relating to the support departments
- Staff satisfaction surveys in the support departments
- Satisfaction surveys of staff members who have left their employment.

### 4.4 Output and Impact Measurements

Output measurements measure the actual output of an organisation or organisational unit. These measurements are mainly quantitative, and the data obtained from them form the basis for assessing the effectiveness, efficiency and productivity of the organisation or unit; matters which are critical for their continuity. Output is compared to input and/or related to the agreed standard. In this way, output can be related to the targets, and trends and developments can be examined. Output measurements are carried out at all levels of the organisation; the resulting facts and figures are displayed on the management dashboard and appear in annual reports, policy plans (retrospectives on results) and specific summaries that have to be drawn up for the purpose of external accountability.

Impact measurements measure the effects of interventions on observable behaviour, or whether observable changes have taken place. They are usually carried out to get a better grip of ‘cause and effect’ or to substantiate the relevance of an activity. A baseline measurement is therefore often made first.

Impact measurements are frequently used in the social and medical domains to determine the most effective treatment method.

Impact measurements can also be used to measure the social impact of the activities carried out by institutions of higher professional education. Knowledge development and its social value and relevance is a theme of increasing importance which is referred to as ‘knowledge valorisation’ (or knowledge transfer). Measuring the impact of valorisation is attracting a lot of attention lately, but is still relatively novel. Measuring impact is about measuring observable effects.

**Output and impact measurements relating to education**

In the domain of education and learning, output and impact measurements can be applied to measure the effectiveness of education and learning methods, strategies and formats, and the effect they have on learning and educational performance (behaviour). Examples would be, measuring the impact of a basic skills course on students’ language proficiency, or examining the optimum ratio of contact time and independent study.

**Output and impact measurements relating to research**

Output and impact measurements relating to research may pertain to: revision of policies, being socially visible, the implementation a new method or approach, generating additional revenue, new activities or patents, satisfied customers or new customers, willingness to fund research projects.

In both education and research measurements, the challenge is to discover qualitative indicators which demonstrate real changes. This will be different for each domain. For education, it could involve the
relevance to society of (specialist) courses, or the recognition by business and industry of graduates’ professional competencies. This is not so much about ‘more’ as it is about ‘better’. Evidently, external stakeholders must be involved in these measurements.

4.5 Integrated Performance Evaluation

Integrated performance evaluation uses the results of the various measurements. Depending on the purpose, tools such as benchmarking or comparison with recognised (inter)national rankings or mappings can be added to the findings to put them into perspective. This creates an extra dimension for improvement, learning and innovation so that policies and strategies can be modified. Examples of integrated performance evaluation for education are the Hanze (UAS) course monitor (Opleidingsmonitor) and the government’s course guide (Keuzegids). An example for research is, evaluating the school’s position with internal and external stakeholders.

Measurements are always analysed in an integrated and coherent manner, for good reasons. If the relationship between measurements and quality characteristics can be made visible, then the quality of education and learning and research can be demonstrated. Some examples are given in Appendix 1, under 5, of quality characteristics that are linked to indicators and evaluation or measuring methods.
5 External Quality Assessment and Internal Quality Assurance

Education and learning and research are both subject to external and internal quality reviews. External quality assessment (see left-hand section of Figure 5.1) is discussed in the first two sections of this chapter, the following sections deal with internal quality assurance.

Figure 5.1 External and internal quality assurance in the Hanze (UAS) quality management system

5.1 External Quality Assessment of Education

The NVAO accreditation system [NVAO, 2010] offers universities of applied science two routes for obtaining accreditation:

Option 1: Comprehensive programme accreditation:
- Programme accreditation based on six themes:
  - 1. Intended learning outcomes
  - 2. Curriculum
  - 3. Staff
  - 4. Services and facilities
  - 5. Quality assurance
  - 6. Learning assessment and achieved learning outcomes

Option 2: Institutional audit with limited programme assessment:
- Institutional audit based on five themes:
  - 1. Vision of educational quality
  - 2. Educational policy
  - 3. Results
  - 4. Improvement policy
  - 5. Organisational and decision-making structure
- Programme accreditation based on three themes:
  - 1. Intended learning outcomes
  - 2. Education and learning environment
  - 3. Learning assessment and achieved learning outcomes

Hanze (UAS) is opting for the second alternative and has to have its quality management system assessed at the institutional level by 2014, so that all its programmes can obtain accreditation on the basis of a limited programme assessment.
5.1.1 Institutional audit and limited programme accreditation

The institutional audit comprises five themes. Standards have been defined for each theme, to which the university must adhere:

Table 5.1: Institutional audit standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vision of educational quality</td>
<td>The institution has a broadly supported vision of the quality of the education which it wants to provide and of the development of a culture of quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Policy</td>
<td>The institution pursues a satisfactory policy for realising its vision of educational quality. Essential elements include: policies on education, staff, facilities, the embedding of research in education, and the interrelation between education, the field of study and the (international) occupational field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Results</td>
<td>The institution is aware of the degree to which its vision of education quality is achieved and regularly measures and assesses the quality of its programmes with input from students, staff, alumni and representatives from business and industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Improvement policy</td>
<td>The institution is able to show that its programmes are systematically improved, where necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Organisational and decision-making structure</td>
<td>The institution has an effective organisational and decision-making structure with regard to the quality of its programmes, a structure in which tasks, powers and responsibilities are clearly demarcated and which incorporates staff and student participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The institutional audit should lead to a positive assessment within three years of the introduction of the new accreditation system, which will then be valid for six years. The law also allows for a conditional positive institutional audit.

The limited programme accreditation comprises three themes. The programme must adhere to the standards that have been defined for the themes:

Table 5.2: Standards for limited programme accreditation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intended learning outcomes</td>
<td>The intended learning outcomes of the programme are specified as to content, level and orientation, and comply with international requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education and learning environment</td>
<td>The programme, staff and the programme-specific facilities enable incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment and achieved learning outcomes</td>
<td>The programme includes a satisfactory system of assessing students and can show clearly that the intended learning outcomes are being achieved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to meeting these standards, universities can apply to the NVAO and request that certain programmes (or the university itself) are given ‘distinctive feature’ status. This gives programmes the opportunity to profile themselves. A feature is not related to the academic level of a programme but can describe its type (e.g., a research master) or a particular objective, for example, sustainability. Two criteria apply:

1. The distinctive feature must differentiate the institution or programme from other equivalent institutions or study programmes in Dutch or Flemish higher education.
2. The consequences of gaining a distinctive feature status for the quality of education have been operationalized on the basis of the standards in the relevant NVAO assessment framework.

5.1.2 Accreditation cycle for programmes

Applications for the re-accreditation of existing programmes of study have to be submitted no later than twelve months in advance. In the months preceding the application, the visiting team has to draw up a report. If accreditation is not granted or is granted conditionally, a period of time is legally available for the deficiencies to be remedied. The division of the procedure into annual steps reflects the period of validity of the accredited status. An accredited status which has been obtained on the basis of an
An application made at the end of year 5 will be valid from year 1 of the following accreditation period. Figure 5.2 below illustrates the timeline of the accreditation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start of accreditation procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFQM self-assessment and EFQM audit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation preview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection and briefing visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application to the NVAO for continuing accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued accreditation granted by the NVAO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of new accreditation procedure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5.2 Timeline of programme accreditation**

Accreditation of a programme may also be applied for at an earlier date. For purposes of efficiency, it might be advisable to bring forward the application to make the accreditation process run concurrently with the other accreditation processes in a school. The accreditation period is shortened on that one occasion and then tallies with the other programmes. An accreditation period may never be extended.

### 5.2 External Quality Assessment of Research

The Hanze (UAS) vision of quality management of research, and the procedures and assessment frameworks for institutional research validation and the external evaluation of knowledge centres, are described in the BKO Protocol for Hanze (UAS) [HG-3, 2010]. Chapter 7 contains an overview of the processes with regard to the quality management of research.

#### 5.2.1 Institutional validation

Under the agreements made in the BKO Protocol in 2008, universities of applied sciences are reviewed every six years by an external body, the VKO Committee (Validation Committee for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education). Similarly to the institutional audit of education, this review evaluates the university’s quality management system for applied research. In addition, external teams evaluate research quality assurance at the knowledge centres (the centres of applied research and innovation) every six years.

The institutional validation process addresses four central questions:

1. Does the quality management of the UAS have a strong enough structure and coherence?
2. Are the preconditions adequate for quality management to be implemented?
3. Are the research evaluations being carried out in an expert and independent manner, and in accordance with the relevant sector agreements?

4. Are the evaluations being used to maintain and improve the quality of the research and the organisation?

The institutional validation is preceded by a self-evaluation by Hanze (UAS).

### 5.2.2 External research evaluation of the knowledge centres

The Executive Board draws up a schedule for the review of all the knowledge centres (the centres of applied research and innovation) which need to be assessed, and ensures that they are all assessed every six years [HG-4, 2010]. The research evaluation takes place at knowledge centre level or, where necessary, at the lectorate level, but the focus remains on the knowledge centre itself.

The research evaluation consists of five evaluation questions, as set out in the BKO Protocol:

1. Are productivity, impact, appreciation and recognition of a high enough standard and relevant to:
   - knowledge development within the domain of research;
   - valorisation for professional practice and society;
   - the significance for education and training
2. Are all the activities underpinned by a relevant, challenging mission and a clear research profile?
3. Are the mission and the research profile supported by the portfolio and the way in which the unit is organised?
4. Is the input of human and material resources adequate in terms of both quality and quantity?
5. Are the internal and external partnerships, networks and relationships sufficiently relevant, intensive and sustainable?

Hanze (UAS) has worked out these evaluation questions in further detail in its own reference framework (see Appendix 2). Prior to the research evaluation, the knowledge centre and the related professorships carry out self-evaluations.

The external evaluation report on research and any recommendations made in it form input for the knowledge centre’s management, in consultation with the Executive Board, to consider any improvements that might be expedient. Recommendations for improvement are included and monitored in the knowledge centre’s annual plans.

### 5.2.3 Timeline for external research evaluation of the knowledge centres

Hanze (UAS) has already initiated the first courses of action with regard to the external research evaluation of its knowledge centres. Over the next few years, all the knowledge centres will be subjected to external evaluations. Figure 5.3 illustrates the timeline.
In addition to the external quality assessment, based on formal frameworks, which Hanze (UAS) has to adhere to, the university also has its own internal system of quality assurance. Different procedures apply to education and research; these will be outlined below.

Besides following the procedures referred to above, it is important that the accreditation of programmes and the external research evaluation of knowledge centres are followed through. It is relevant, therefore, to record and respond to any points of improvement which are raised by the accreditation, or by the external evaluation of research, and to record the results of any actions taken with regard to these points of improvement.

5.3.1 Education: EFQM audits

Hanze (UAS) has been carrying out EFQM audits since 1996 and has been using the EFQM method of improving the quality of higher education to achieve this [HG-2008]. An audit team is assembled for each EFQM audit; Hanze (UAS) has its own pool of trained EFQM auditors who review the programme documents and materials and, on the day of the visit, conduct interviews with those involved in the programme: the management team, education staff, students, the Executive Board, graduates and representatives from the professional field. This all combines to form the basis of the audit report which is then drawn up.

Before the EFQM audit, a programme can opt to carry out an EFQM self-assessment for which a consensus coach will provide process support throughout. This EFQM self-assessment may involve all the staff members of a programme or a school plus, if desirable, students and external participants. A smaller group drawn from management, plus a few members of education staff and/or students is another alternative. This process can enable the particular programme to determine its position with regard to the EFQM model. It is also possible to opt for a process in which only the management team is involved. In that event, the consensus achieved may not be shared by all the staff in the programme.

The results of the EFQM self-assessment and the EFQM audit may encourage the programme to formulate initiatives and plans for improving certain aspects of the programme.

With the introduction of the new accreditation system in January 2011, the frequency of internal audits has been reduced from once every three years to once every six years with the audits taking place between the two external review processes. What is important to note here is that the programmes are
subject to the points of improvement raised in the previous external review, so the quality cycle is also applicable here. Shortly before the start of the external review process, an accreditation preview will now be undertaken instead of an audit; see the following subsection.

The same EFQM method can be used for the university’s support departments with a separate matrix for these departments as regards the processes, or the INK model for the public sector can be used, where necessary, with the addition of a questionnaire for members of staff or customers, where necessary. Here too, the EFQM audit can be preceded by an EFQM self-assessment.

5.3.2 Education: Accreditation preview

The new accreditation system, in combination with the audit team’s judgement based on the pilot institutional audit of the Hanze (UAS) quality management system (December 2008) prompted the decision to introduce accreditation previews. These replace the EFQM audits that were held immediately before the start of the external review process (see the previous subsection) and comprise the following steps:

1. An initial meeting to establish consensus
2. A document check
3. An assessment by one or more experts of the content, in particular, the learning outcomes
4. Reporting, and a concluding meeting with the Management Team of the programme

The accreditation standards of the new accreditation system will be applied during these activities. The accreditation preview is designed to provide a good insight into the state of affairs within the programme with regard to the accreditation standards and frameworks, and to provide useful leads for the accreditation procedure in general and for the briefing report, the Critical Reflection, in particular. A further advantage is that those involved within the programme are immediately included in the external review process.

5.3.3 Research: Mid-term review

The first external evaluations of research have been taking place since 2010; they are also regarded as pilots that can be used to develop and test procedures. Following these, a time frame of six years has been adopted before the following external research evaluation is to take place. After the external research assessment has taken place, an interim review will be undertaken of each knowledge centre as part of the research quality management system, similar to the quality management reviews of education; this interim review, referred to as a mid-term review, will take place no later than three years after the publication of the external research evaluation report.

The mid-term review is an interim appraisal which is held for the purpose of:

- monitoring the strong and weak points of the research and the research unit (current situation)
- examining the management agreements made after the previous external evaluation (reflection)
- introducing additional timely improvement initiatives before the research evaluations three years later and, where necessary, outlining further profiling and ambitions (anticipation).

The mid-term review consists of three parts:

1. A report by the management of the knowledge centre as to the state of affairs
2. Stakeholder positioning, carried out by the knowledge centre in collaboration with the Education & Research Department (SB O&O)
3. On the basis of (1) and (2), making a plan for the future and for improvement which sets out the policy and the organisational aims and objectives for the next period, that is, until the next external research evaluation.

The first mid-term reviews are due to be carried out in 2013, which is three years after the first external research evaluation.
5.3.4 Research: Evaluation preview

In the preparatory procedure leading up to the external research evaluation, analogous to the accreditation preview for programmes, an evaluation preview will be carried out in collaboration with internal and external experts under the guidance of the Education and Research Department. The procedure for the evaluation preview is:

- An initial meeting to focus on the Hanze (UAS) reference framework for research. This reference framework is based on the five evaluation questions of the BKO Protocol. The research unit will be consulted on the further detailing of the framework and on the position to be adopted with regard to the various criteria.
- Monitoring the progress of improvement initiatives. The input will be the current annual plans of the knowledge centre and the professorships and the results of the mid-term review, if available.
- A document check
- Report and concluding interview with the knowledge centre’s Management Team.
6 Implementation and Organisation of Quality Management

Every member of staff and every student at Hanze (UAS) comes into contact with the university’s quality management system at some time, for example because:

- a programme or school or one of the support departments is conducting an EFQM audit;
- an external team is visiting a programme or knowledge centre and wishes to speak to all the parties involved;
- a section of the organisation draws up a quality management plan;
- a section of the organisation draws up a (long-term) policy plan;
- a programme, lectorate or knowledge centre receives the results of the evaluation after an internal or external measurement.

This chapter aims to offer guidance to schools and programmes, knowledge centres and professorships so that they can assure quality within their own provinces. The purpose of quality management is to bring about quality improvement and so, quality or PDCA cycles are in place in the schools/programmes or knowledge centres/professorships which are primarily intended to improve the quality of education and learning and/or research.

Three aspects need to be considered:

- **Implementation of quality management at the schools and knowledge centres:**
  The policies of the schools and knowledge centres form the starting point for putting quality management into practice at the schools and knowledge centres. Annual and long-term policy plans set out objectives which can be converted into quantitative and qualitative indicators and target values. By agreeing on definite results that can be evaluated, safeguards can also be applied to education, research and project activities that have been laid down in policy plans. The quality cycles of education and research at schools and knowledge centres may lead to the emergence of particular (new) quality characteristics that may affect and/or may be added to the institutional quality characteristics (see Chapter 2). In this way, a dynamic system is in place. The information that is needed for improving the primary processes of education and research can be both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative evaluations such as panel or stakeholder interviews are often seen as a necessary to supplement and refine the quantitative information.

- **Organisational embedding of quality management:**
  In the same way that the interaction between lecturers and students is fundamental to achieving a good standard of education and learning, in research it is the interaction between the professors, lecturers, researchers, research students and external parties which matters. Quality improvement requires education and research staff to have a state of mind which is open to seeking continuous improvement; staff who consult and exchange ideas with all the other people involved, to assess the quality of education and learning and research. This is only possible in a culture of respect where there is a willingness to learn from each other. Suggestions for improvements or for new or better quality characteristics are submitted to the education and research teams who then assess them. Major changes and adjustments must be presented to the Programme Committee and the Representative Council, who then present them to the management of the programme/school or the knowledge centre. This ensures that the PDCA cycle is followed through; see also Figure 6.1.

- **Stakeholders and communication:**
  It is important that all the stakeholders, both internally and externally, are involved in the quality management processes and that there is continuous and effective dialogue about the quality management process itself and the outcomes of the process.
The support departments can help schools and knowledge centres embed quality management in their organisation. The Education and Research Department (SB O&O) plays an important role in internal quality assurance and external quality assessment, but other units can also provide support. Quality assurance is also relevant in the support departments themselves; this will be discussed in the last section of this chapter.

6.1 **Guidelines for the Implementation of Quality Management in Schools and Programmes**

**Figure 6.2 Quality management system at the school level**

6.1.1 **Implementation of quality management in schools and programmes**

In principle, the policy of the school or programme is the starting point for putting quality management into practice in the schools and programmes.
### Table 6.1: Implementation of quality management in schools and programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of the quality management system</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Remarks/availability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. School policy and management cycle      | • Strategic policy plan of a school, drawn up every four years based on evaluation of the previous policy plan, SWOT analysis, etc.  
• School annual plan, drawn up every year on the basis of evaluation and analysis of results from qualitative and quantitative evaluations and the management dashboard.  
• Quality management plan, drawn up every year based on the school’s long-term or annual plan, using feedback from evaluation and analysis of the results from qualitative and quantitative evaluations, other | Guidance in determining objectives and indicators [qualitative and quantitative] |
| 2. Programme policy and management cycle   | • Programme and/or team annual plan drawn up on the basis of the school annual plan and containing targets derived from it, with corresponding indicators and target values based on the results achieved in the previous cycle | The overview of quality characteristics is available for guidance. |
| 3. Internal quality assurance              | • Having an EFQM audit performed; the results of this can then be used by the school or programme to draw up a plan of improvement.  
• Ensuring that results and improvements are sustained. Using up-to-date records with relevant documents for quality management (also in relation to accreditation) | Processes are defined in the Procedures Handbook which is part of the Quality Management Framework. |
| 4. Internal quality measurements           | • Implementation of the quality management plan, which sets out the range of evaluation methods that are applied in the school or programme.  
• Carrying out or ordering evaluations, analysing results and making plans of improvement. | Overview of evaluation methods: see Chapter 4, Quality Measurements, or the intranet under Quality Management |
| 5. External quality assessment             | • Carrying out the accreditation procedure of the programme, consisting of:  
  o Accreditation preview  
  o Drawing up a self-reflection report  
  o Audit visit, may be preceded by a briefing visit  
  o Application for re-accreditation  
  o Amendment of CROHO registration | Processes are defined in the Procedures Handbook which is part of the Quality Management Framework. |

The **assurance of quality management** can be organised in various ways. Possible actions are:

- Including a quality management plan in the school annual plan.
- Making a separate **quality management plan** which is amended annually after the school annual plan has been drawn up. It specifies the **quality management activities** of the year in question and lists those involved in the specific activities.
- Formulating the quality policy at a school in a quality policy plan (long-term)
• Formulating the procedures with regard to quality management, e.g., carrying out evaluations, conducting analyses and mapping out the scenario for the EFQM audit.
• Assuring (quality management) products and results by archiving them. Using a group disk or a site on Blackboard is an option here.

The intranet site of the Education and Research Department (SB O&O) shows an example of a quality policy document and a quality management plan for a school. It is a clear example of the kind of subjects that could be included in quality policy and the various aspects which are relevant in a quality management plan.

6.1.2 Organisational embedding in schools and programmes

The tasks, powers and responsibilities related to quality management can be embedded in an organisation in various ways. Appendix 3 gives an example.

It is very important that all the sections of the organisation ensure that the various steps of the PDCA cycle are carried out and that they are transparent and coherent, and are assured. This implies that, after an evaluation has been held, the schools/programmes must clearly outline the points of action or improvement and incorporate them in the next policy or education cycle. The participation of staff, students and representatives from the professional field is essential to this process.

6.1.3 Stakeholders and communication structures in the schools/programmes

Parties involved:
• Internal stakeholders: students, teachers, support staff and management
• External stakeholders: the professional field (clients, visiting lecturers, placement mentors and work-based supervisors), graduates and feeder schools.

In addition to the formal consultative structures such as school consultations and meetings, programme consultations, team consultations and away days, other possibilities include student panels, alumni meetings, placement supervisor meetings and so forth, where quality data can be collected, shared and discussed.

It is important to ensure effective communication with regard to the results of the PDCA cycle. All those involved must be informed about such matters as the evaluation results, the plans and actions for improvement which have been drawn up and the results of those plans and actions. Digital media such as Blackboard or email can play a part as well as other (paper) media such as newsletters, overviews of improvements in Block books and so on.
6.2 **Guidelines for the Implementation of Quality Management in Knowledge Centres and Professorships**

In principle, the knowledge centre’s policy is the starting point for the implementation of quality management in the knowledge centre and the associated professorships. The quality management policy and objectives of applied research are formulated in the long-term policy plans and the annual plans of the knowledge centre. The activities in the quality management system are repeated regularly and can be depicted in an overview of quality management activities: ‘the quality management schedule.’

---

### Table 6.2 Implementation of quality management in knowledge centres and professorships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of the quality management system</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>To be found at</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Knowledge centre policy and management cycle | - Strategic policy plan of the knowledge centre, drawn up every four years based on evaluation of previous policy plan, SWOT analysis, other.  
- Annual plan, drawn up every year based on the evaluation of the previous annual plan (annual report) and objectives for performance and context of the knowledge centre. The annual plans of the professorships are added in appendices.  
- Application for and evaluation of new professorships.  
- Annual evaluation and review of the research programme and the knowledge centre’s lines of research. | - ‘Applying for professorships’ and ‘Appraising Professorships’ procedures.  
- Format/guidelines for the long-term strategic policy plan and annual plans of the knowledge centre/lectorate including annual report (retrospective)  
- Guidelines for determining the objectives and indicators (qualitative and quantitative) of knowledge centres/professorships. |
| 2. Internal quality assurance | - Drawing up a quality management plan based on a long-term or annual plan  
- Carrying out a mid-term review consisting of a report of the status quo with regard | - Guidelines for status quo report  
- Mid-term review  
- Example of quality management plan for knowledge centres. |
### 3. Internal quality measurements

Various evaluation methodologies are available and in use at the knowledge centre. Some are specific to the knowledge centres or professorships, others are applied throughout Hanze (UAS).

- Aid for possible evaluation methodologies.
- Aid in stakeholder analysis and survey

### 4. External quality assessment

- Carrying out a research evaluation process including:
  - Audit preview
  - Drawing up a self-evaluation report
  - Improvement activities and plan for the future are added to the self-evaluation
  - Composition of review team
  - Site visit by the evaluation team; may be preceded by a briefing visit
  - Publication of research evaluation report
  - Management activities in response to the research evaluation report

- Processes are defined in the Procedures Handbook which is part of the QMF
- Protocol for research evaluation in the knowledge centres

The **quality management activities** in knowledge centres and professorships centre on:

- Evaluating and improving the primary process: the quality of applied research, its contribution to or added value for education, the professional field and knowledge development.
- Evaluation and adjustment of strategy and policy, personnel and means.
- Evaluation of supporting processes: ICT facilities, data and literature provision, project support, marketing, internal and external communication, finance.

A **quality management plan** may contain the following information (see the intranet of the Education and Research Department (SB O&O) for an example).

- Advisory body (external): coordination of the main strands of research, policy and relevance for the professional field
- Steering committee of knowledge centre (internal): evaluation of the primary processes, strategy & policy and the supporting processes
- Education staff/students/management: evaluation of applied research and contribution to education and learning
- Professorship: a professor and his/her knowledge network: evaluation of quality of research
- Project evaluations with internal and external stakeholders
- Mid-term review
- Stakeholders’ survey
- External research evaluation: self-evaluation, site visit, research evaluation report and management response.

### 6.2.2 Organisational embedding in knowledge centres and professorships

The tasks, powers and responsibilities with regard to quality management can be embedded in a knowledge centre in several ways. Appendix 3 gives an example.
6.2.3 Stakeholders and communication structures at knowledge centres

Stakeholders:
- Internal stakeholders at the strategic and operational level: lecturers, researchers, student researchers, management, schools, and the Executive Board
- External stakeholders at the strategic and operational level: clients, customers, partners in collaborations, consortium members, and project partners

Consultation and communication at the knowledge centre:
- Professors’ meetings, programme manager and support staff meetings, programme manager and leading lector/leading dean staff meetings, knowledge networks, advisory body, and steering committee
- Study days and sessions on aspects of applied research
- Intranet/community/Blackboard/Surfnet/Hanzeweb

Consultations transcending knowledge centre level:
- Consultations between leading professors and leading deans, respectively
- Consultations between programme managers of knowledge centres
- Support/coordinating group for applied research, comprised of representatives from the support services. Permanent contact persons with support services
- Consultation rounds about quality and quality management topics and issues, with programme managers and leading deans

6.3 The Roles of the Support Departments in Quality Management

It is the Education and Research Department (SB O&O), in particular, which provides guidance and support to schools/programmes and knowledge centres/professorships in (implementing) the Hanze (UAS) quality management system. The other support departments also provide support. Naturally, all these departments have to ensure that their own quality management procedures are up to standard as well.

6.3.1 The role of the Education & Research Department

The role of the Education & Research Department in quality management is one of implementation, offering support and advice and of fulfilling a coordinating and monitoring role in relation to both the Executive Board and the schools/programmes and knowledge centres/professorships. The products and services provided by the Department are set out in its product book (Productenboek SB O&O).

Several policy officers/advisors are involved in policy development and advice at the Education and Research Department. Their remit also includes process supervision and evaluation with regard to new and current associate degree, bachelor’s and master’s programmes, external accreditation and validation, internal audits and mid-term reviews. They also contribute to the preparation, implementation, analysis and reporting of quantitative and qualitative quality measurements and their results, and they fulfil an important role in development and consultation with regard to new and existing master’s degree programmes, professorships and knowledge centres and the development of applied research. The educational advisers at the department also give advice and support to the schools and programmes about education and research themes, including academic and research quality.

The Education and Research Department publishes information about the internal quality assurance and external quality assessment of education and research on the intranet, for example, results from university-wide evaluations or developments with regard to accreditation procedures. Conclusions and material changes are published on its intranet site or circulated in a newsletter. Any proposals or suggestions for change are first presented to stakeholders in the relevant support departments, knowledge centres, and schools. They are then discussed by the Education and Research Consultative Body (PO O&O) after which decision-making takes place in the Executive Board.
For important changes or developments, special topic meetings are organised for those involved, or steering committees or project groups can be set up to provide support the developments.

### 6.3.2 The role of the other support departments

The role of the Finance Department (SB FEZ), the Personnel & Organisation Department (SB P&O), the Marketing & Communication Department (SB M&C) and the Facilities Department (FB) is mainly a supportive one, namely, provision of information. On the one hand, this information relates to the services developed and offered by these departments, such as formats, guides and procedures, and on the other, to the databases they build and maintain, which constitute an indispensable source of information for the university’s quality measurements.

The main tasks or roles of the Finance Department are:

- The development and maintenance of the management dashboard;
- Making financial data and information from the management dashboard available.

The main tasks or roles of the Personnel & Organisation Department are:

- Making analyses available with regard to personnel information;
- Developing and providing formats and guides for performance interviews, personal development plans (PDPs), resumes, etc.

The main tasks or roles of the Marketing & Communication Department are:

- Providing guides and formats for communication and information provision;
- Facilitating the issue of publications.

The main tasks or roles of the Facilities Department are:

- Developing and keeping in order the personnel and student administration;
- Making personnel information available (e.g., sickness or numbers of education and support staff, by programme);
- Making information about students available (e.g., enrolments, intake characteristics, length of study, progress and pass rates, etc.).

### 6.3.3 Quality assurance in the support departments

The support departments have their own quality management systems for ensuring that the quality of the services delivered to the schools and knowledge centres is satisfactory. They are responsible themselves for assuring their quality management systems and keeping them up to date. They are also included in the university’s general quality management system in some ways, for example, as regards the implementation of the EFQM/INK audit, and staff and customer satisfaction surveys relating to the support departments themselves. If they wish to undertake any additional measurements, they can draw on the expertise of the Education and Research Department. Process descriptions are available for all the quality measurements mentioned above.
7 Quality Management Procedures

In the preceding Chapters, the components of the Hanze (UAS) quality management system were discussed in detail. In this Chapter, an outline is presented of all the processes and procedures that are described in the Procedures Handbook which accompanies this Quality Management Framework. The organisation of the process descriptions is explained in this Chapter. It concerns those processes that are owned by the Education and Research Department (SB O&O) or in respect of which, quality measurement, quality assessment and/or quality assurance are relevant.

The Procedures Handbook describes the following processes and procedures:

Internal quality measurements

Process measurements
• Number of visits to the Student Counsellor’s Office

Satisfaction measurements
• National Student Survey
• Aansluitingsmonitor (‘transition monitor’; a poll of first-year students)
• Block questionnaires (bachelor’s degree students)
• Placement evaluation (students, placement supervisor, work-based/placement mentor)
• Thesis-stage evaluation (students, thesis supervisors, work-based supervisors)
• International Student Barometer (ISB)
• Minors students questionnaire
• Withdrawing students survey
• Student evaluations of education staff
• Staff satisfaction surveys
• Leaving staff satisfaction surveys
• Customer satisfaction survey relating to the support departments (management)
• HBO-monitor; survey of the articulation between higher professional education and the labour market (alumni)
• Professional field/employers survey

External quality assessment

Accreditation of (new) programmes:
• Critical Reflection (briefing report)
• Site visit and report
• Application for accreditation
• Updating the CROHO registration
• Application for initial accreditation (new programme)
• Following up accreditation decisions

External research evaluation of knowledge centres:
• Self-evaluation by the knowledge centres and professorships
• Appointment of, and preparation by, the research evaluation team
• Site visit and report

Internal quality assurance

Schools/programmes:
• Quality management planning
• EFQM audit
• Consensus meeting
• Accreditation preview

Knowledge centres/professorships:
• Quality management planning
• Mid-term review and stakeholder positioning
• Audit preview

Explanation of the process descriptions
The descriptions in the Procedures Handbook include description of all the processes accompanied by activity diagrams.

The process descriptions describe the following aspects of processes:
• What component of the process in the Quality Management System
• Process name
• Process purpose
• Relationship to other processes of the quality management system, if any
• Trigger: How is the process initiated (by whom, why)
• Actors: Who are actively involved in the process?
• Use of documentation: Which documents are relevant
• Result: Result of the process
• Archiving the results: Where are the process results stored
• Frequency: How often is the process performed
• Completion time: How long it takes for the process to be completed
• Process owner: Who has ultimate responsibility for performing the process
• Quality characteristics: How is the quality the process assured
• Archiving: Who holds the process description, how is it archived

Each activity diagram consists of a number of successive steps that have to be carried out to complete the process. Each step consists of one or more activities, and the persons who are actively involved in that step are indicated. These persons (actors) are identified in the activity descriptions. Finally, the process step is explained, if necessary. In almost all the processes, the PDCA cycle can be recognised: planning, execution, evaluation and, where necessary, modification.
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Appendix 1: Overview of Quality Characteristics

This appendix relates to Chapter 2 of the Quality Management Framework.

**Education and learning** and **research** have both been divided into three areas which mirror the plan-do-check approach of the PDCA cycle. The quality characteristics of education are likely to be detailed further in 2010-2011 in the context of the project, Herziening HG-Onderwijsvisie en HG-Onderwijskaders, which will update the quality characteristics formulated in the current Hanze (UAS) Education Framework.

Presenting education and research together in an integrated way seemed like a good idea at the outset, but given the various stages of development that these two primary processes are in, it was found to be inappropriate at present. The external assessment frameworks (see Chapter 5 for accreditation and validation) have not yet been integrated either. Moreover, the quality criteria for applied research are still under development, as research quality assurance is a new task in higher professional education.

The italicised quality characteristics below are specific to Hanze (UAS).

1. Quality characteristics of education and learning

A. Quality characteristics of the intended competencies

**Intended competencies and learning outcomes:**
- Are up-to-date
- Match a nationally recognised (professional) profile
- Match the requirements of the international occupational field or discipline
- Comply with the requirements of the Dutch qualifications framework for associate, bachelor’s or master’s degree programmes
- Explicitly refer to social responsibility
- Demonstrate entrepreneurship

B. Quality characteristics of the curriculum

**The curriculum:**
- Demonstrates a clear relationship between competencies or higher professional education qualifications and the various programme components
- Is up to date and has recognizable input from the (inter)national occupational field and research practice (professorships)
- Has recourse to current (international) professional literature
- Prepares students for professional practice in an international perspective
- Offers opportunities for excellence, enterprise and (social) responsibility to both students and teachers
- Aims to develop students’ research skills and stimulate an inquisitive attitude in order to produce professionals with a clear research focus
- Includes a variety of practical components and a clear relationship between theory and practice
- Offers a solid and explicit knowledge base giving specific attention to the development of professional skills
- Includes interdisciplinary components (e.g., minors)
- Matches the qualification levels and the target group:
  - **Bachelor**: Broad orientation, varied education methods
  - **Master**: Clear relationship with applied research (knowledge centres and professorships)
  - **Part time**: Practice-related; contextual learning
  - **Dual**: Business-related; contextual learning
  - **Associate degree**: Targets working people, part of lifelong learning

**Programme design:**
- Methodical structuring around recognisable themes from professional practice
- Coherence within themes and blocks, and across the curriculum (horizontally and vertically)
- Strands of learning are clearly identifiable
- Design based on own educational philosophy or education methods
- Active learning through a variety of stimulating and challenging education methods which are tailored to the professional competencies required
- Sufficient contact and involvement of students and teachers (knowledge community)
- Compliance with legal requirements vis-à-vis the workload and length of the programme: 240 ECTS for bachelor’s, at least 60 ECTS for master’s and 120 ECTS for associate degree programmes

**Optimum articulation:**
- Providing correct and honest information about courses and occupations to prospective students
- Holding intake interviews and carrying out APL procedures at the beginning of the course of study
- Selecting the most appropriate course for each student as soon as possible
- Diversity awareness: offering opportunities to improve basic skills
- Excellence: identifying and selecting outstanding students
- Mobility: using target figures for exchange students and entrants from abroad
- Maintaining contact with (international) feeder institutions

**Optimum feasibility:**
- Effective internal communication
- Announcing timetables on time
- Guaranteeing sufficient contact hours
- Keeping cancellation of classes to a minimum
- Setting attendance requirements
- Clear, unambiguous assignments with explicit criteria
- Coaching and tutoring for assignments including feedback about results
- Applying clear but challenging Binding Study Advice (BSA) standards
- Making test results available in good time
- Having study progress information available for students
- Offering a reasonable (limited) number of resits
- Continually checking student progress data to be able to take further action in time

**Tutoring:**
- Is organised in a transparent way for all course years
- Acknowledges differences between individual students (diversity, personal development)

**C. Quality characteristics of assessment and achieved learning outcomes**

**Assessment**
- Is based on defined professional competencies, explicit attainment targets and/or learning outcomes
- Attainment targets are measurable and feasible
- Forms of assessment are adapted to the attainment targets
- Assessment criteria are clearly formulated and can be viewed in advance
- Assessment procedures are detailed and efficient
- Assessments are overseen by the Examining Board, whose duties are clearly defined, or by an Assessment Committee (Toetscommissie) which acts under the responsibility of the Examining Board

**Learning outcomes**
- The final thesis or project reflects themes of (current) professional interest
- Graduates have an open and enquiring mind
- The final thesis or project demonstrates that the graduate has attained the necessary competencies or qualifications of higher professional education
2. Quality characteristics of applied research

A. Quality characteristics of a particular unit’s mission and objectives, and their elaboration for the research profile

The mission of a research unit:
- Is clearly linked to the Hanze (UAS) strategic policy
- Is apparent in the research programme
- Is elaborated into the three performance areas of Knowledge Development, Professional Practice & Society and Education & Training
- Demonstrates the coherence between the performance areas, and accounts for their relative weight
- Is supported by relevant stakeholders (i.e., internal and external parties who have an interest in the research unit)

The research profile:
- Is elaborated in terms of specific feasible and tangible results which are related to the objectives of the research unit
- Is based on methodologically sound research
- Applies scientific standards and research methods that are relevant to the discipline
- Has knowledge valorisation as its objective (i.e., generating knowledge and making it available to business and industry, and society in general)

B. Quality characteristics of research programmes

The programme:
- Includes one or more strands of research that clearly reflect the mission and objectives.
- Is coherent
- Is established in consultation with stakeholders in the occupational field and society
- Is related to the taught themes

Implementation of the research programme:
- Takes place in structured partnerships with knowledge institutions, public authorities and businesses (which have appropriate facilities in place).
- Is characterised by productive interaction with relevant stakeholders in all the stages of the research (stakeholder interest)
- Is carried out by researchers, lecturers and students in stimulating and learning-centred knowledge valorisation agreements (‘kennisarrangementen’)

C. Quality characteristics of the performance areas

Knowledge development:
- Is of a high quality and can be applied generically across the sector or industry
- Targets not just operational and short-term problems, but strategic and long-term issues as well (sustainability)
- Reflects new developments in the knowledge domain
- Contributes materially to government policies, the policies of civic or industrial organisations and/or the social debate in the region or beyond

Added value for professional practice and society:
- Is evidenced by the appreciation shown by relevant stakeholders
- Is demonstrated by knowledge being visible and accessible in various ways (dissemination of knowledge, productive interaction)
- Is sustainable and contributes materially to problem-solving or innovation in professional practice and/or society (outcome and impact)
- Is evident from being recognised as an important player in sustainable networks

Added value for education & training:
- Is apparent from improvements to, and the bringing up to date of, the curriculum or (parts of) bachelor’s or master’s degree programmes
- Contributes to the expansion/promotion of the research component of programmes
- Is evidenced by the further professionalization of lecturers and students (producing reflective researchers)
- Contributes to the knowledge base of the study programmes
3. Quality characteristics of the organisation

A. Characteristics of a culture of quality (values central to Hanze (UAS))
   The culture of quality, in relation to staff as well as students, is characterised by:
   - Customer/student centredness
   - Scope for personal development, including excellence
   - Respect for differences between people
   - Active involvement in and with Hanze (UAS)
   - Enterprise
   - Taking responsibility for one’s own professional development and professional practice within one’s organisation and in society at large
   - Being result-orientated
   - Co-operation and reciprocity

B. Quality characteristics of organisational design
   The organisation is designed so that:
   - The positioning and design of the organisational units support the aims and profile of the unit (programme or knowledge centre/lectorate)
   - Operations and decisions are transparent, and tasks, responsibilities and powers are clearly defined
   - The support departments provide the very best support to education and research
   - Relevant, sustainable internal and external networks of relationships and collaborations can be developed and maintained
   - Such networks can be used effectively in the planning and execution of activities, in particular, in the northern Netherlands

C. Quality characteristics of staff
   The Hanze (UAS) staff policy is marked by:
   - Focus on practical experience, research skills and international orientation
   - Both education and support staff enjoy a degree of autonomy
   - Due attention for competence development of staff and for team development
   - Being result-orientated
   - Sustainability

   Effective lecturers and lecturer researchers are:
   - Inspiring
   - Innovative
   - Competent in their field
   - Possess the requisite education skills
   - Are competent in the area of applied research
   - Are trained to a level which is at least one higher than the qualification level of the students they teach or whose research they supervise
   - Are able to develop and maintain networks that are relevant to their field of education and research

   There is an adequate number of staff if:
   - Education and research can be carried out in accordance with the organisation’s vision and the internal and external quality requirements
   - Lecturers, lecturer researchers and students can regularly engage professionally in accordance with agreements about contact time and professional practice
   - The workload of the staff and executive staff is acceptable

D. Quality characteristics of facilities
   Buildings and facilities:
   - Are adequate for realising the programmes
4. Quality characteristics of the quality management system

The institutional audit, which was introduced into the accreditation system in 2011, focuses on the quality management system of the university as a whole and assesses whether the system enables the institution to properly guarantee the quality of the programmes it offers. Hence, it is important to formulate quality characteristics for the quality management system itself as well. The Hanze (UAS) quality management system is described in Chapter 3.

Evaluation system (the Hanze (UAS) quality management system):
- Is adapted to the context of the organisation
- Is methodical and is evaluated periodically
- Uses indicators and targets for the assessment of outcomes
- Demonstrates a fully developed PDCA cycle
- Is regarded as providing added value by the persons involved

Improvement measures:
- Are identifiable in the policy cycle
- Are realistic, feasible and stimulating
- Are evaluated periodically

Stakeholder involvement:
- Responsibility for the quality of education and applied research lies primarily with the lecturers and researchers
- Lecturers and researchers are afforded a measure of autonomy to realise quality
- Stakeholder involvement is reflected in the consultation and communication structure
- Stakeholder involvement is laid down in procedures for implementing improvement plans

5. Examples of quality characteristics linked to indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality characteristics of professional competencies</th>
<th>Examples of indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intended competencies and learning outcomes of higher professional education:</td>
<td>• Appraisal of the learning outcomes by business and industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are up to date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Match a nationally recognised (professional) profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are adapted to the requirements of the international occupational field or discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Meet the requirements of the Dutch qualification framework for associate, bachelor’s or master’s degree programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Explicitly refer to social responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demonstrate entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the culture of quality</td>
<td>• Students’ appraisal of the general skills taught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality culture, in relation to both staff and students, is characterised by:</td>
<td>• Staff’s degree of pride in Hanze (UAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Opportunity for personal development, including excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Respect for differences between people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Active involvement in and with Hanze (UAS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enterprise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accountability within their own organisation and towards society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being result-orientated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working together and reciprocity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality characteristics of staff</td>
<td>• The number of programmes that have an AISHE certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The staff policy of Hanze (UAS) is marked by:</td>
<td>• Staff satisfaction about working in their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on practical experience, research skills and an international outlook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- A measure of autonomy of education and support staff
- Support for competence development of staff and for team development
- Being result-oriented

**Effective lecturers and lecturer researchers are:**
- Inspiring
- Innovative
- Competent in their field
- Possess the requisite education skills
- Are competent in the area of applied research
- Are educated to a level which is at least one higher than the qualification level of the students they teach or whose research they supervise
- Are able to develop and maintain networks in areas that are relevant to their education and research

**Percentage of the budget that is earmarked for professional development**

- Percentage of lecturers with recent practical experience / education endorsement / master’s degree / doctorate
- Students’ appraisal of the quality of the teachers

**There is an adequate number of staff if:**
- Education and research can be carried out in accordance with the unit’s vision
- Lecturers, lecturer researchers and students have frequent opportunity to engage
- The workload of staff is acceptable

**Lecturer-student ratio**

**Number of contact hours in the various phases of the course**

**Rate of absenteeism due to sickness**

**Quality characteristics of facilities**

**Examples of indicators**

### Buildings and facilities:
- Are adequate for realising the programmes
- Are appropriate for the skills required in the profession
- Suit the education methods and/or the research profile
- Encourage contact and engagement

- Student satisfaction about workspaces, computers, etc.
- Teachers’ satisfaction about workspaces, facilities, etc.

Appendix 2 relates to Chapter 5 of the Quality Management Framework.

The reference framework, below, relating to research quality management in the knowledge centres (the centres of applied research and innovation) and in the professorships, is the Hanze (UAS) elaboration of the five evaluation questions employed by the BKO Protocol (the Protocol for Research Quality Assurance in Higher Professional Education) [HBO-raad, 2008].

### Mission and vision of the knowledge centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mission: quality and scope</td>
<td>• The research unit (lectorate or knowledge centre) has formulated a mission statement which can be identified in its research programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The mission is integrated into the research environment</td>
<td>• The mission is related to the university’s strategic policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Research profile</td>
<td>• The mission is broken down into three performance areas:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Knowledge development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Contributing to professional practice and society including valorisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Providing added value to education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The stakeholders review the mission periodically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The breakdown of the mission into the different performance areas has the support of relevant representatives from those areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The knowledge centre has a clear vision of how the three performance areas fit together, and a rationale for why they are weighted as they are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The mission is broken down in terms of specific, feasible and tangible results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The professorships have formulated their research profiles in terms of scientific standards and research methods and techniques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The research programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Research themes and research portfolio</td>
<td>• The knowledge centre has developed one or more research themes/strands which clearly reflect the mission and the intended results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement of stakeholders in designing and carrying out the research programme</td>
<td>• The stakeholders in the occupational field and in society are involved in the planning of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The stakeholders in the occupational field and in society are involved in the execution of the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lecturers and students are involved in the execution of the research programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Resources and facilities, partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Embedding and positioning of the unit within the institution</td>
<td>• The positioning of the knowledge centre, and the related professorships, within the institution is consistent with the institution’s mission and research profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of the researchers</td>
<td>• The knowledge centre and the related professorships make use of the university’s organisational facilities and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Size of the research unit in terms of staff and (financial) resources</td>
<td>• The qualifications and quality of the participants in the research programme is adequate for carrying out the programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Internal and external partnerships</td>
<td>• The researchers develop and maintain networks in the areas that are relevant to their research&lt;br&gt;• The research unit develops and maintains a network of relationships in the areas that are relevant to it, and is able to harness this network when planning and executing its activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results in the three performance areas in terms of output, outcome and impact (relationship to the objectives and the mission):&lt;br&gt;• Knowledge development in the research domain&lt;br&gt;• Professional practice and society&lt;br&gt;• Education and training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Output: publications, presentations, other contributions</td>
<td>• The research unit, via the publications, presentations and other contributions which it has produced over the past period, demonstrates that the objectives are being realised in the performance areas: &lt;br&gt;  o Knowledge development in the research domain&lt;br&gt;  o Professional practice and society&lt;br&gt;  o Education and training &lt;br&gt;• The research unit systematically collects information from relevant stakeholders about the impact on, and recognition of its performance in the areas of: &lt;br&gt;  o Knowledge development in the research domain&lt;br&gt;  o Professional practice and society&lt;br&gt;  o Education and training &lt;br&gt;• The research unit uses this information to improve its work and work methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information about impact and recognition of the research in the three performance areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Organisational Embedding of Quality Management in Schools and Knowledge Centres

This appendix relates to Chapter 6 of the Quality Management Framework.

This appendix sketches an outline of how quality management can be embedded in schools and knowledge centres (i.e., centres of applied research and innovation). The size of a school will affect how many people are involved in quality management. The format for schools presented in Table B3.1 below is only an example. An example that is appropriate for knowledge centres is presented in Table B3.2, and was designed with reference to the initial experiences of embedding quality management in knowledge centres. The size of a knowledge centre and the way it is managed exert a strong influence on how tasks are organised.

Table B3.1 Example of organisational embedding of quality management in schools/programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality management activities</th>
<th>Persons conceivably involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate responsibility for quality management</td>
<td>Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated responsibility for quality management</td>
<td>Management Team (MT) member with a quality management remit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and management cycle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MT: Decision-making with respect to (changes to) policy development, implementation and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MT member responsible for quality management: drawing up/modifying quality management policies related to education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal quality assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MT member responsible for quality management: manages the consensus meeting, audit and accreditation preview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality assurance employee/ support staff: implementation support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/advice from:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IKZ advisor (Education &amp; Research Department, SB O&amp;O)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal quality measurements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MT member responsible for quality management: determines what to measure, and how; supervises result analysis and the drawing up of improvement plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Curriculum co-ordinators: implement improvement plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality assurance employee/support staff: provide implementation support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further support:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IKZ Team (as regards quality measurements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• MT member responsible for quality management: manages the Critical Reflection (briefing report) and site visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality assurance employee/support staff: implementation support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support/advice from:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educational advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• IKZ advisor (Education &amp; Research Department)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B3.2 Example of organisational embedding of quality management in knowledge centres and professorships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality management activities</th>
<th>Persons conceivably involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate responsibility for quality management</td>
<td>Leading lector or leading dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated responsibility for quality management</td>
<td>Knowledge centre’s programme manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy and management cycle</td>
<td>Leading dean/steering group: decision-making in respect of [amending] policy development, implementation and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Management Framework</td>
<td>Version 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal quality assurance</td>
<td><strong>Programme manager:</strong> drawing up/amending the quality management policy for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Programme manager:</strong> supervises mid-term review/stakeholder survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Programme manager:</strong> draws up improvement plans and monitors progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support/advice from:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IKZ advisor [Education &amp; Research Department]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal quality measurements</td>
<td><strong>Programme manager:</strong> organises and analyses the evaluations of processes, projects, student panels, knowledge centre’s advisory board, knowledge centre’s steering committee, knowledge networks, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support staff of the schools involved who have a quality management remit, for results of block/theme evaluations, EFQM audits, programme review visits, thesis-stage evaluations and minors evaluations that are relevant to the knowledge centre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support/advice from:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Educational advisor/research policy advisor [Education &amp; Research Department]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- IKZ advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External research evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Programme manager:</strong> supervises the self-evaluation process, coordinates the external research evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professors:</strong> co-author the self-evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IKZ Advisor:</strong> supervises the research evaluation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Support/advice from:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Educational advisor/research policy advisor [Education &amp; Research Department]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4: Overview of Internal Quality Measurements

This appendix relates to Chapter 4 of the Quality Management Framework.

The internal quality measurements referred to below are in random order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Respondent/Appraiser</th>
<th>For the benefit of</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Type of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Aansluitings-monitor ("Transition Monitor") | Survey held in the Northern Netherlands | First-year bachelor’s students | • Exec Board  
• School  
• Programme  
• Organisation | • Benchmark  
• Educational development | How do students perceive the connection between their previous education and their current course? |
| Thesis-stage evaluation         | Internal satisfaction measurement | Thesis students, thesis supervisors, work-based supervisors | • Programme | • Educational development  
• Social accountability | How do students, thesis supervisors and work-based supervisors appraise the thesis stage? |
| Block questionnaire             | Internal satisfaction measurement | Bachelor’s students | • Programme | • Educational development | How do students appraise the block? |
| Elsevier magazine               | National survey of courses | Students | • Exec Board  
• School  
• Programme | • Benchmark  
• Social accountability | What are the best courses in the country? |
| HBO-monitor                     | National survey          | Alumni | • Exec Board  
• School  
• Programme | • Educational development | How do alumni feel about how their course matches the needs of the labour market?  
What kind of employment do students find after graduating? |
| International Student Barometer | International survey     | International students | • Exec Board  
• School  
• Programme  
• Organisation | • Benchmark  
• Educational development | How satisfied are international students about their course of study and their university? |
| Kennis in Kaart                 | National survey          | Government | • Exec Board | • Benchmark | What is the current state of affairs in higher education in the Netherlands? |
| Keuzegids                       | National course guide    | Government; based on National Student Survey (NSE), experts’ opinions, other | • Exec Board  
• School  
• Programme | • Benchmark | How do courses compare in the Keuzegids course quality ratings? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Respondent/Appraiser</th>
<th>For the benefit of</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Type of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff satisfaction survey</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Exec Board, School, Programme, P&amp;O</td>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td>How satisfied are staff members (about Hanze (UAS) and particular aspects of their work)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors students questionnaire</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Minors students</td>
<td>Exec Board, Programme</td>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td>How do minors students appraise the minor they took?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s module evaluation</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Master’s degree students</td>
<td>School, Programme</td>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td>How do students appraise the master’s module they took?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Student Survey</td>
<td>National survey</td>
<td>All students [associate, bachelor’s, master’s degrees]</td>
<td>Exec Board, School, Programme, Organisation</td>
<td>Benchmark, Educational and organisational development</td>
<td>How satisfied are students with the course they are taking? How does this compare to similar courses taught in the Netherlands?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal of education staff</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Organisational development [HRM cycle]</td>
<td>To what degree are students satisfied with a certain teacher?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving staff satisfaction survey</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Leaving staff</td>
<td>Exec Board, P&amp;O</td>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td>How satisfied with Hanze (UAS) as an employer are employees who leave the university?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme monitor</td>
<td>Internal product</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Exec Board, School, Programme</td>
<td>Integrated performance evaluation</td>
<td>Summary of the outcomes of a number of evaluation and quality measurements, per programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer satisfaction survey relating to support departments</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Executive staff</td>
<td>Exec Board, Support departments</td>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td>How satisfied are internal customers with the services provided by the support departments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction Survey (Masters)</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Master’s students</td>
<td>School, Programme</td>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td>How satisfied are students with the course in which they are enrolled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placement evaluation</td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Placement students, placement supervisors, work-based mentors/mentors</td>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Educational development, Social accountability</td>
<td>How do placement students, placement supervisors and work-based mentors/mentors appraise the placement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Respondent/Appraiser</td>
<td>For the benefit of</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Type of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Withdrawing students survey</strong></td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Withdrawing / transferring students</td>
<td>• Exec Board</td>
<td>Educational development</td>
<td>Why, and for what reasons, do students withdraw from their studies?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey of business and industry</strong></td>
<td>Internal satisfaction measurement</td>
<td>Business and industry</td>
<td>• School</td>
<td>Social accountability</td>
<td>How do business and industry appraise the employability of Hanze (UAS) alumni?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>