CvB stukken voor agenda Universiteitsraad

Overlegvergadering d.d.:	3 oktober 2018	
Commissievergadering :	1️⃣ september 2018	
Agendapunt :	Projectplan ITK	
Bijgevoegde stukken :	Projectproposal - Preparation towards Institutional audit 2019	

Betrokken dienst: S&B   paraaf: _____

Secretaris: Wichman   paraaf: _____

Portefeuillehouder: Palstra   paraaf: _____

1. Status agendapunt:
Rol URaad: Ter informatie

2. Eerder behandeld in:
Naam gremium:	CvB
Datum behandeling:	23 juli 2018
Naam agendapunt:	Projectplan ITK
Conclusie toen:	Vastgesteld en ter informatie naar UR zenden

3. Toelichting/samenvatting:
In 2013 the first NVAO institutional audit was carried out at the UT. This resulted in a positive decision of the NVAO on valid for 6 years up to and including 1 May 2020. The University will have to re-apply for assessment at least one year prior to expiry of the institutional audit. The second institutional audit will be carried out in accordance with a framework that has been slightly adapted since 2014. For instance the current framework has even more options to link the assessment to the institution's specific goals and profile. The role of students and employee participation has become more explicit.

The preparation of the institutional audit coincides with the development of quality agreements that will be effective over the period 2019-2024. The quality agreements are to be evaluated by the NVAO on three occasions, the first of which is the assessment of the plan regarding the quality agreements of the institution in 2019. The NVAO offers the possibility to include this assessment as a trail in the institutional audit. Since this is an organizationally efficient and a logical way of working, the University has chosen to ask the NVAO for this joint assessment. Currently site visits by the NVAO are to be expected late 2019, the planning of the site visits will be arranged in consultation between the NVAO and the UT in autumn 2018.

Preparation for the institutional audit requires a planned approach to ensure that the organization is involved in a timely and structured way. The project plan contains process milestones and has been established by the Steering Committee and the Executive Board. After the products of phase 2 are established, a more extensive and substantiated planning will be determined as soon as possible.

4. (Voorgenomen) besluit CvB:
Het College van Bestuur heeft het projectplan ITK vastgesteld op 23 juli 2018 en besloten dit ter informatie naar de Universiteitsraad te zenden.

GRIFFIE URaad: (door griffie UR in te vullen)

Eerder in URaad aan de orde geweest?

- o Nee.
- o Ja, op

  Conclusie toen:

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

....

....

PROJECTPROPOSAL

PREPARATION TOWARDS INSTITUTIONAL AUDIT 2019

AUTHOR

R.E. van Luijk

DEPARTMENT

Strategy & Policy

TELEPHONE

1130

E-MAIL

r.e.vanluijk@utwente.nl

STATUS

To be approved

DOCUMENT HISTORY

VERSION	DATE	AUTHOR(S)	REMARKS
0.1	07/05/18	Van Luijk	Initial document, discussed with Secretary of the University
0.2	11/05/18	Van Luijk	Second draft discussed within Strategy & Policy
0.3	25/05/18	Van Luijk	Third draft discussed with Secretary of the University
0.4	28/05/18	Van Luijk	Discussed with Rector Magnificus
0.5	26/06/18	Van Luijk	Extended after receiving feedback from UC-Ow and adapted to match preliminary conclusions from institutional portrait
0.6	08/07/18	Van Luijk	Accepted by steering committee

APPROVAL

VERSION	DATE	ROLE	NAME
1.0	23/07/18	Project executive	Executive Board

CONTENTS

Contents

Project definition

Background

In 2013 the first NVAO institutional audit was carried out at the UT. During the assessment carried out, Twente Educational Model (TEM) was new and many documents regarding educational quality (for instance vision on education, system of evaluation, assessment policy) were recently drafted. This was noted by the visiting panel, but consistency was praised as was the quality culture, the informal way of working and the enthusiasm of the staff. Even though the organisation was still in transition, the audit was passed with flying colours. . This resulted in a positive decision of the NVAO on valid for 6 years **up to and including 1 May 2020**.

The University will have to re-apply for assessment at least one year prior to expiry of the institutional audit. This will mean that the University of Twente should be ready for a second visit by the NVAO panel in autumn 2019. The University has proven to be capable of delivering quality education individual programs have received positive evaluations from NVAO visitation on programme level and student satisfaction is high. By no means should the University underestimate the level of preparation needed for a second audit.

Focus will be on the ability to guarantee quality on all levels and internal consistency of vision, processes, evaluation of output and improvement. The visiting panel will look at realisation of new policy and plans that were presented during the first audit. Documents to be presented will need to be actualised to the current situation and way of working. The point of improvements noted during the first visit can be expected to be under scrutiny. Furthermore, the organisation should be able to consolidate the picture presented in the written information during the audit panels.

Therefore, on the level of documentation to be presented as well as the preparation for the panel meetings during the site visits, work has to be done to get the organisation fully ready. This may be regarded by some as a chore or a necessary evil, but the preparation process is also an ideal opportunity to enhance the already strong quality culture of the University and mobilise the organisation to improve on critical points.

Project targets and scope

Goal of this project is to prepare the University of Twente for visits by the NVAO audit panel to be carried out in the last quarter of 2019.

Inclusions

Preparation for the institutional audit includes

- Organizing the institutional visit
- Drawing up the critical self-evaluation
- Designating documentation to be available during the panel visits
- Preparing interviewees for the panel visits
- Reviewing the provisional report by the NVAO
- Project evaluation including recommendations

Exclusions

Project conclusion is independent of the outcome of the NVAO decision on the institutional audit. Since the NVAO decision is an external assessment, the project is aimed at preparation and evaluation, but neither includes nor guarantees the actual outcome of the audit.

The preparation of the institutional audit is critically reliant on the results of several other projects and being able to present certain documentation. Results of these projects will be monitored in relation to the requirements for the preparation of the institutional audit. However, these projects have separate have a separate project organization and are technically excluded from the scope of this project

With regards to documentation, this project designates critical documentation to be available to the audit panel during the site visits early on. . The first phase will yield a **documentation assessment**[1]. This is a list of the documents to be made available to the panel appointed by the NVAO including the current status of these documents.
If documents are not yet ready to be reviewed by the audit panel, they will be included in the **project planning 2.0**. If documents need to be drawn up or updated, the progress of writing or actualizing this documentation will be monitored as part of this project. The decision can be made to include this in a theme track for further preparation.

Dependency with current projects @ UT

Since the scope of an institutional audit is about the implementation of educational philosophy vision of education in the broadest sense (is it widely supported, is it effectively realized, monitored and improved), the project of preparation for this audit is closely related to and critically dependent on several other projects. Currently[2], projects that have already been initiated at the UT and are as critically related to the institutional audit are:

- Quality agreements
- Vision on education including TEM evaluation
- Development longterm strategy ("Vision 2030")

These projects are linked to the institutional audit, however they have their own organization. The situation analysis will most likely identify several other projects that should be started to get ready for the institutional audit.

The preparation of the institutional audit coincides with the development of quality agreements that will be effective over the period 2019-2024. The quality agreements are to be evaluated by the NVAO on three occasions, the first of which is the assessment of the plan regarding the quality agreements of the institution in 2019. The NVAO offers the possibility to include this assessment as a trail in the institutional audit. At this moment, this is both a organizationally efficient and a logical way of working, since the quality agreements are bound to take an important place in the agenda on quality improvement.

Pre-requisites

In order for this project to be successful, involvement of management and stakeholders is critical. The institutional audit is both concerned with hard controls and soft controls. The soft controls are what is also called "quality culture". It is of the utmost importance that the preparation of the audit matches the culture of the organization, so that the representation of the hard controls is in alignment with the organizational culture.

Risks

In order for the second institutional audit to be successful the University should be able to provide thorough, up to date and consistent documentation and show the audit panel that this documentation is an accurate representation of reality. Therefore internal support for the documents presented at the institutional audit and the ability to present an united front is paramount to success. Disagreement between stakeholders on issues critical to the institutional audit are a risk. To counter this risk, a proper communication strategy is important. A communication specialist is to be assigned to the advisory board and one should be available to assist the project-team.

A second risk to be noted in advance are the critically dependent projects listed above. Insufficient results in those projects lead to a bad track record for the institutional audit. Expectations for the deliverables with regard to the institutional audit should be clear to all concerned and reports to monitor the progress of those projects are critical to check if all is on course. The close relation of these projects is not only time-bound, but even more importantly regarding consistency of content between the deliverables of these projects. Therefore the steering committee of the institutional audit will need to be put in position to guard this aspect in order to counter this risk.

---

[1] Definition of done of milestone products (bold) is described in the appendix

[2] This list can be expanded after further analysis

Project organization
Roles and responsibilities
Project executive
The project executive is the most important decision maker and has to ensure that the project objectives are achieved. The project executive is the person who is accountable for making strategic decisions. Tactical and operation decisions may be delegated to the steering committee. The project executive is ultimately responsible for ensuring the project:
- Is carried out in alignment with the organizational goals and strategies
- Has the right team and resources

In doing so, the project executive is responsible for a close review of the project plan to set key deliverables and milestones. During this project, the project executive monitors progress reports, in order to remove obstacles that would endanger the project's completion.

Furthermore, the project executive links the project team to the stakeholders and decision making groups. The project executive also acts as a sponsor in being a champion for the project. If called for, the project executive actively communicates the importance of the project to influence stakeholder cooperation.

In this project, the Executive board of the University has the role of project executive, with the Rector Magnificus as prime portfolio holder. The project executive and project leader will meet regularly to discuss the overall progress of the project. For practical purposes the Secretary of the University, being chair of the steering committee, will be the first point of contact to support the project leader. The project executive, the chair of the steering committee and the project leader will also meet in preparation of the meetings of the steering committee in order to align decisions.

Steering committee
The project steering committee has an initiating, signaling and objectives-oriented role with respect to a project. The steering committee assesses the project results, the project objectives and the project risks regularly based on reports provided by the project leader. The steering committee oversees all operational and tactical issues and works together with the projectleader in delivering proposals on strategic issues to the project executive. After completion of a project phase, the steering committee will have to check whether the project results are sufficient, the project objectives still apply and the project risks are acceptable and / or sufficiently covered.

This task of the steering committee implies that the members of the steering group should be well informed about the status and progress of the project. Members of the steering committee should be authorative and well informed on institutional auditing. Also it is important that they are able to oversee the broad spectrum of topics that are related to the institutional audit and are knowledgeable about the specifics of the faculties and service centers of the University.

Members:
- Secretary of the University: Susanne Wichman (chair)
- Director Strategy & Policy: Chris Tils
- Dean: Tom Veldkamp
- Programme director : Heleen Miedema
- Managing director: Stephan Maathuis

Project leader
The project leader has the overall responsibility for the successful initiation, planning, design, execution, monitoring, controlling and closure of this project. The project leader manages the core project team and keeps an overview of all activities related to the successful completion of the project. The project leader gathers and synthesizes relevant input

and proposes a course of action—or alternative courses, complete with pros and cons so that the choices presented to the steering committee and/or the project executive are as clear, simple and timely as possible.The project leader is responsible to update the project executive and the steering committee regularly on the overall progress and proactively notify the project executive and the steering committee of in case of bottlenecks and risks. In this project the project leader is senior policy advisor at the unit strategy & policy

Core project team

The core project team is responsible for the timely realization of deliverables that are included in the project plan. The capacity and competences for the members of core project team will depend on the outcome of the first two phases and should be described in more detail in the **project planning 2.0**. The steering committee will advise on the necessary capacity for the project team.

For the execution of phase 1 and 2, support of a student-assistant will be necessary to ensure timely delivery of milestone products.

After the peer-audit the composition of the core project team will be reviewed by the steering committee, in order to have sufficient capacity to get ready for the institutional audit, this will be included in the **project planning 3.0**

Advisory board

The advisory board is sparring partner for the project leader / core project team. To successfully scope the attention in preparing for this project, the way to involve stakeholders, execution of tracks and communication strategy will need the attention of the advisory board. Furthermore, the advisory board can be a linking pin to the rest of the organization, by acting as ambassadors for the project in their own faculty or organizational unit. The advisory board will be appointed by the project executive after nomination by the steering committee. Care will be taken that representatives from all faculties are either involved in the steering committee or the advisory board. The advisory board will also include:

- Education specialist
- Communication advisor
- Personnel representative: to be nominated by the University Council
- Student representative: to be nominated by the University Council

Project planning

General structure

The project is consisting of seven phases some of which are overlapping in time. Generally however, results from previous phases can be seen as a minimal viable products that are improved on in the consecutive phases. On all themes critical to the institutional audit tracks will be initiated to prepare for the panel visits. Depending on the complexity, risk and scope, these will be organized as either development, compound or exploratory tracks. The steering committee has the responsibility to decide which issues have to be addressed in which way

Compound an exploratory tracks are incorporated in this project and will be run with the same project organization. For development tracks a separate project structure will be started. The rationale for these tracks and their exact scope will be reviewed by the steering committee at the earliest opportunity as part of the strategic planning.

	2018								2019				2020	
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2
1 Situation assessment	▓	▓	▓	▓										
2 Strategic planning			▓	▓		▓								
3 Preparation of self-evaluation and documentation			▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓		
4 First series tracks (develop, compound, explore)		▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓				
5 Peer challenge		▓	▓											
6 Second series tracks (develop, compound, explore)										▓	▓	▓		
7 Audit organization						▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓	▓		
8 Review and learn												▓	▓	▓

Phase 1: Situation assessment

Timeframe:	May 2018 – August 2018
Results:	**preliminary institutional portrait**
Project organization:	Project executive + project leader + steering committee
Capacity needed:	-

To identify the best way to prepare for the institutional audit an analysis has to be carried out of the current situation compared to the desired situation for when the panel visits are planned. This will consist of:

- Field analysis (reports and experiences second institutional audit TUDelft, UU, RUN, both "on site" as with UT-employed panel members)
- Stakeholder interviews on "UT way of working" (quality culture)
- **Documentation assessment**: assessment of current level of documentation in accordance with assessment framework)
- **Audit portrait** (summary of all quality assessments made by the NVAO, both institutional and programme, including recommendations from 2013 onwards)

This will result in an **preliminary institutional portrait** that is foundational work to base further phases on. This institutional portrait is also the backbone material that can be used in a peer-review.

This phase will be concluded once the steering committee is appointed by the project executive and the preliminary institutional portrait is discussed with steering committee and the project executive.

Phase 2: Strategic planning

Timeframe:	July 2018 – October 2018
Input:	**preliminary institutional portrait, project planning 1.0**
Results:	**institutional portrait, strategy proposal institutional audit, project planning 2.0**
Project organization:	Project executive + project leader + steering committee
Capacity needed:	**-**

Based on the first drafts of the institutional portrait, the steering committee and the project leader will prepare a detailed proposal for the project executive. This will include
- Further refinement of the institutional portrait
- A **strategy proposal institutional audit** consisting of advice on
    o Whether or not to apply for distinctive quality features
    o The language in which the institutional audit is to be carried out
    o Guidelines for the planning of the institutional audit and the desired characteristics of the audit panel
    o The way to include the quality agreements in the institutional audit
    o A risk assessment (including proposed countermeasures)
    o The first series of tracks (to be prioritized as development, compound or exploratory)

For this phase to be successful, the steering committee needs to be appointed and running, so they can give input on the strategy proposal. This phase will be concluded when the project executive has decided on the choices presented in the strategy proposal. The choices made will be incorporated in the **project planning 2.0**. The **project planning 2.0** will be discussed in detail with the steering committee and established by the project executive.

Phase 3: Preparation of self-evaluation and documentation

Timeframe:	September 2018 – November 2019
Input:	institutional portrait, strategy proposal institutional audit
Results:	**critical self-evaluation** + **audit documentation**
Project organization:	Project executive + project leader + steering committee + advisory board
Capacity needed:	-

The first two phases will yield insight in the themes that have to elaborated on in self-evaluation. The institutional portrait will contain a document analysis and the strategy proposal will give pointers towards themes to be accentuated. The writing of the self-evaluation will be a cyclical process, so that draft versions can be made in collaboration with the people involved in the specific theme. Relevant stakeholders will be invited to reflect on the material early on, to ensure that the self-evaluation is both truthful, complete and broadly supported. A more detailed planning of this phase will be included in the **project planning 2.0**

Phase 4: First series of tracks (explore, compound, develop)

Timeframe:	June 2018 – July 2019
Input:	**institutional portrait, strategy proposal institutional audit, project planning 2.0**
Results:	t.b.d. dependent on the outcome of phase 1 & 2
Project organization:	Project executive + project leader + steering committee + advisory board + project team
Capacity needed:	t.b.d.

The institutional portrait will identify all themes relevant to prepare for the institutional audit. For all themes material will have to be collected and reviewed to be "audit ready". During the first two phases, several themes will be designated in which more intensive preparation for the institutional audit is either necessary or recommended. For instance, if the organization is to apply for a distinctive quality feature, if critical documentation is outdated or missing, or to strategically underwrite excellence in certain areas. These themes are identified by the steering committee on the basis of an analysis made by the project leader. Depending on the necessary work to be carried out, the preparation will be done in either exploratory, compound or development tracks. For all themes, the first series of tracks should deliver the following results:

- A description is made of the current state of affairs on this theme
- The of working, including the plan-do-check-act cycle is described
- Relevant points of improvement of the first institutional audit are evaluated
- People directly involved and relevant stakeholders are identified
- An analysis is made of strengths and weaknesses regarding this theme
- Issues and risks for in depth visits (audit trails) are to be identified
- Key documents are stored in Join

Exploratory tracks
The exploratory tracks are used for themes of which the current way of working and level of documentation is deemed by the steering committee to be more or less at the level required for the institutional audit.

For each theme one or more specialists (content expert / process responsible) will be identified. Members of the core project team will work closely with them to identify the necessary documents, collect other information and make a synthesis on the current state of affairs. This document(s) will provide valuable input for both the self-evaluation and the available documents during site visits. Furthermore, in this process people will be identified who can be called upon for panel meetings during site visits.

Compound tracks
Compound tracks are aimed at describing the state of affairs, with some development issues. Some documents will have to be revised / updated and formally adopted again. The compound tracks will be identified by the steering committee and managed by members of the core project group. The project leader will supervise the progress of the tracks. Compound tracks will be run in an AGILE way, so an iteration of minimal viable products will lead to quick results that can already be reviewed during consecutive phases for further refinement.

They are aimed at delivering results in a relatively short amount of time (several months). Compound track teams will be run by core project members and will include subject experts. Members are to be decided dependent on focus of specific compound tracks. The AGILE way of working is preferred here, because the focus is on early delivery of so called "minimal viable products" that are shared and refined. Each project will have deliverables that are part of the end result and can be shared early on (within weeks or months). This way involvement of stakeholders is integral part of the development process.

This cyclical way of working (presenting drafts, enlisting feedback and using this for further development) gives more certainty of support for the end results. Team members meet regularly face-to-face in standup meetings to discuss progress and bottlenecks. This shared responsibility and internal feedback loops are necessary to keep momentum. Transparency, openness to feedback and focus continuous improvement are cornerstones of this way of working. This

makes it suitable for an environment geared towards further development and learning like the UT and fits well with the quality culture that was praised during the last institutional audit.

Development tracks

Development tracks are separate projects to improve critical processes. For a number of themes, the risk of sub-par evaluation or the necessary degree of organization is too great to organize it as a compound track. These themes will be further developed in a project organization to be defined in consultation with the steering group. The project manager of a development track does not necessarily have to be part of the ITK core project team, but there must be close collaboration between project leader ITK and project manager of the development track, with a view to timely and adequate delivery of results for the institutional audit.

Phase 5: Peer-challenge

Timeframe:	May 2018 – January 2019
Input :	**institutional portrait, project planning 2.0**
Results :	**blueprint critical self-evaluation, peer-audit report**, **project planning 3.0**
Project organization:	Project executive + project leader + steering committee + advisory board + project team
Capacity needed:	Audit team (t.b.d.)

A peer-challenge is a very effective way to prepare the organization for the real audit. To make the most out of this, it should be done early on the preparatory process. This way, the recommendations and lessons learned can be used for further improvements. Albeit time-intensive, to write a blueprint of the critical self-evaluation for the TU/e audit panel, creates a good trial run for the NVAO preparation. However, concerns about joint preparation with TU/e with regard to giving full insight in internal processes will need to be addressed in order for this peer-challenge to be mutually beneficial. Secondly it may not be possible to include all aspects of the institutional audit in the peer-challenge given the relatively short notice to prepare for this peer-challenge. The steering group will propose the most strategic focus points of the peer-challenge and decide which documentation will be made available to the panel executing the peer-audit.

Elements of phase 5

No	Description	Timeframe	Comments
5.1	Set agreement with TU/e on audit	a.s.a.p.	
5.2	Prepare blue print critical self-evaluation		
5.3	Prepare documentation to be reviewed		
5.4	Prepare people (panels, auditors)		
5.5	Carry out audit	Autumn 2018	
5.6	Receive report peer-audit	December 2018	
5.7	Make refined project planning + decision on second series of theme tracks		

Phase 6: Second series of tracks (develop, compound, explore)

Timeframe:	January - December 2019
Input:	**institutional portrait, strategy proposal institutional audit, project planning 3.0, blueprint critical self-evaluation, peer-audit report**
Results:	to be decided
Project organization:	Project leader, project team
Capacity needed:	t.b.d.

Description: based on the preliminary results of the first series of theme tracks, the evaluation of the process of writing the blueprint critical self-evaluation and the finding in the peer-audit report, a second series of tracks can be started. These tracks will be proposed by the advisory board and the project leader, to be decided on by the steering committee. The second series will be run the same way as the first series of tracks. More focus will be given to preparing for possible audit trails.

Phase 7: Audit organization

Timeframe:	October 2018 – December 2019
Input:	**institutional portrait, strategy proposal institutional audit, project planning 3.0, blueprint critical self-evaluation, peer-audit report**
Results :	agreements with NVAO concerning site visits, site visits organized,
Project organization:	Project executive + project leader + steering committee + advisory board + project team
Capacity needed:	t.b.d.

At least a year in advance of the end of the validity of the current institutional audit, the UT has to make a formal application to the NVAO for re-assessment. This application is targeted to be done in autumn of 2018. The choices made in phase 2 are critical input to start this phase, for instance to assess whether to apply for one or more special quality characteristics. There will be several meetings with the NVAO, both on strategic and operational level in which executive decisions on the audit will be made. For instance, the university can vet proposed panel members, point out areas of interest, make agreements on the date of the panel visits and the delivery of the critical self-evaluation. This phase will start with a formal application to the NVAO for the second institutional audit. This phase will end with the second (in depth) visit by the audit panel to be carried out by the end of 2019.

Elements of phase 7

No	Description	Timeframe	Comments
7.1	Formal application for institutional audit	Autumn 2018	At the latest 1 may 2019
7.2	Consultations with NVAO (Board consultation and practical consultation)		
7.3	Panel composition by NVAO		Two weeks to inform NVAO of any substantiated objections to the composition of the panel
7.4	Submit self-evaluation report to NVAO		To be submitted to the representative council or participatory body/bodies appropriate to the institution for advice
7.5	Prepare for exploratory site visits		Make documentation available to panel
7.6	Exploratory site visits		
7.7	NVAO informs institution of topics to be included during in depth visits		
7.8	Organize and prepare for in depth site visits		
7.9	In depth site visits		At least four weeks after exploratory visits
7.10	Receive brief feedback from panel Chair regarding preliminary findings	Right at the end of 7.9	

Phase 8: Review and learn

Timeframe:	end 2019 – mid 2020
Results:	NVAO audit report and **project evaluation**
Project organization:	Project executive + project leader + steering committee + advisory board + project team
Capacity needed:	-

As soon as the audit by the NVAO panel is carried out, the organization is presented with lessons that can be learned from the process. Before the final report is presented, the organization will be given a preliminary report with the possibility to correct errors.

A full evaluation of the project, is not only possible after the final report but also mandatory to ensure further development. Therefore, this project should not end before closing the quality circle. The **project evaluation** should include recommendations for further projects to consolidate and further enhance institutional quality.

Elements of phase 8

No	Description	Timeframe	Comments
8.1	Wrap up after site visits: acknowledge participants and review process		
8.2	Receive draft advisory report audit panel		
8.3	Correct factual errors in draft advisory report	Within two weeks after 8.2	
8.4	Consultation NVAO with panel (possibility to attend)		
8.5	Receive definitive audit report + NVAO decision on institutional audit		
8.6	Publish conclusions of NVAO internally		
8.7	Review content of NVAO report and make plan for improvement		

Stakeholder involvement and communication

In this project involvement of stakeholders is an essential element of success. The critical self-evaluation report and documentation provided to the audit panel could be excellent, but if there is lack of support for these written documents visible during the panel visits, this will a huge risk.

University Council

At least the following milestones should be used to formally inform the University Council during the preparation for the institutional audit:

Date	Product	Involvement
October 2018	Project planning institutional audit	Information
November 2018	Strategy proposal institutional audit	Advice
November/ December 2018	Blueprint self-evaluation peer-audit	Information
February 2019	Key findings peer-audit	Advice
June 2019	Draft self-evaluation report institutional audit	Consent

UC-Ow

In this project, the members of the UC-Ow can be crucial ambassadors within their own faculties. Therefore, the UC-Ow members make a significant contribution towards the realization of the project. The UC-Ow should have an prominent advisory role and can be used as a critical sparring partner and sounding board for the project executive. Not only should all milestone products be reviewed by the UC-Ow, regular updates on the progress are also essential for the UC-Ow to fulfill the role as leading platform for preparing the institutional audit.

Date	Product	Involvement
June 2018	Project planning institutional audit	Advice
September 2018	Institutional portrait	Advice
October 2018	Strategy proposal institutional audit	Advice
October 2018	Project planning 2.0	Advice
November 2018	Blueprint self-evaluation peer-audit	Advice
January 2019	Key findings peer-audit by TU/e	Advice
February 2019	Project planning 3.0	Advice
May 2019	Draft self-evaluation report institutional audit	Advice

Other stakeholders and relevant platforms

A communication strategy will be drawn up consulting the advisory board and the steering committee part of the extended project planning.

At least the involvement of the following stakeholders or platforms will be added:

- UCB
- CvB-D
- Supervisory board
- UTpK

Appendix 1: Definition of done – milestone products in chronological order <mark>(dates in approximation)</mark>

Project planning 1.0 (July 2018)
First project planning containing project scope, organizational structure, milestone products and global timeframe. Finalized when established and approved by the executive board after being reviewed by the steering committee

Audit portrait (July 2018)
Overview of the findings of all audits executed by the NVAO since the last institutional audit. Key findings of each audit, specific qualities and points of improvement for the programmes and analysis overarching themes to be addressed in preparation of the institutional audit. To be discussed with advisory board and reviewed by steering committee before it is finalized.

Documentation overview (August 2018)
A list of the documents to be made available to the panel appointed by the NVAO including assessment of the current status of these documents in relation to the requirements of the institutional audit. To be discussed with advisory board and reviewed by steering committee before it is finalized.

Preliminary institutional portrait (August 2018)
Backbone of audit preparation. Scan of current practice set against the current NVAO assessment framework of institutional audit. Contains SWOT analysis on each standard of the framework. Documentation overview and audit portrait are included as appendices. To be discussed with advisory board and reviewed by steering committee.

Strategy proposal institutional audit (September 2018)
Proposal on the strategic choices for the preparation of the institutional audit. Will include analysis of risks specific to the current state of affairs at the UT and proposed countermeasures. Will also give insight in the way project communication will be handled.
To be drawn up by the project leader and the steering committee and established by the project executive.

Project planning 2.0 (September 2018)
Refined project planning containing strategic choices pertaining the preparation for the institutional audit. Will contain a specific elaboration for the personnel capacity and other resources needed for subsequent phases of the project. The project planning will be drawn up by the project leader and established by the project executive.

Institutional portrait (September 2018)
The preliminary institutional portrait will be discussed with the advisory board and established by the steering committee. This product can then be refined into the institutional portrait, which is to be established by the steering committee and the project executive.

Blueprint critical self-evaluation (October 2018)
The blueprint critical self-evaluation is based on the institutional portrait and is a written evaluation on (most significant aspects of) the NVAO standards, that is at close as possible to the criteria and guidelines for the critical self-evaluation to be written for the NVAO audit panel later on. The blueprint is written by the project team, under guidance of the steering committee. The advisory board will provide feedback on the blueprint. The end product is established by the project executive.

Key findings peer-audit (December 2018)
The peer-audit report will be written by the visiting audit panel. Apart from this report, the actual visit and oral feedback from both the visiting panel and the auditees give valuable input for the remaining time. All information gathered during the peer-audit will be summarized in a key findings report, which is discussed with the advisory board, the university council and the steering committee.

Project planning 3.0 (January 2019)

The advice of the university council, advisory board and the steering committee on the findings of the peer-audit will be taken into consideration and used to make a refined project planning for the preparation of the institutional audit. The project planning will be drawn up by the project leader and established by the project executive.

Critical self-evaluation (July 2019)

The critical self-evaluation is the core document to be used by the NVAO audit panel. In the board consultation agreements will be made on the delivery date and specific characteristics.

Audit documentation (July 2019)

The audit documentation is the list of documents to be made available to the NVAO panel. These documents are deemed critical by the steering committee. As early on as possible a list will be made and refined to ensure timely delivery of these documents. The audit documentation includes actual availability of these documents in accordance with the specific agreements made during the board consultation (for instance: digital and/or paper).

Project evaluation (early 2020)

The project evaluation is a written evaluation made by the project leader and the steering committee on both the outcome and the process of the institutional audit. The outcome evaluation will be based on the oral feedback of the NVAO panel and the findings in the formal NVAO report. Also the impressions of auditees and stakeholders will be taken into consideration. The evaluation of the process will be carried out by interviewing auditees and stakeholders on (the preparation of) the institutional audit. The project evaluation should include recommendations for further projects to consolidate and further enhance institutional quality.