

Wageningen University

Advisory Report

NVAO | Department The Netherlands | Institutional Audit
16 March 2018

Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
2	Introduction	7
2.1	Aim and objectives	7
2.2	Expert panel	8
2.3	Audit process	8
3	Institution under Review	10
3.1	General data	10
3.2	Profile	10
3.3	Key figures	11
4	Assessment	11
4.1	Vision and policy	11
4.2	Implementation	14
4.3	Evaluation and monitoring	17
4.4	Development	20
4.5	Final conclusion	22
4.6	Recommendations	22
4.7	Specific aspect: Sustainability	24
4.8	Specific aspect: Internationalisation	26
	Appendix 1 – Panel	27
	Appendix 2 – Accreditation Record	29
	Appendix 3 – Visit Programme	33
	Appendix 4 – Documents	40
	Appendix 5 – Abbreviations	41

1 Executive Summary

Institutional audit

This report contains the panel's advice to NVAO on the institutional audit of Wageningen University. The audit assesses whether the university has a quality culture and a system of quality assurance which guarantee that the education offered at Wageningen University meets (inter)nationally accepted standards and demands. When assessing the university according to the four standards of the NVAO assessment framework, the panel took the ambitions, vision and choices formulated by the institution as a point of departure and reviewed the realisation of these ambitions.

The panel considers that Wageningen University's vision on education is clear, explicit and distinctive with respect to other universities in the Netherlands and abroad. It offers a rich and challenging perspective on education, which is shared by staff and students. The panel encourages the university to translate its new vision on education in concrete objectives and indicators for the coming implementation period 2018-2022.

The principles of the new 2017 vision have already found their way into two high quality policy documents on assessment and on quality assurance and enhancement. During the visit, the panel established furthermore that the university features an adequate tenure track system and pays proper attention to students with functional impairment. According to the panel, the advantages of the fairly simple one-faculty organisational structure of Wageningen University are partly lost by the use of a local terminology, concerning chair holders and personal professors, which is not (inter)nationally recognised. While it advises the university to clarify some of the positions, the panel does consider that this one-faculty structure to a large extent contributes to the quality culture at Wageningen University, which values community-wide involvement and is characterized by an effective informal network.

The panel considers that the participation of students and staff in both programme committee and programme board is exemplary and should be maintained. The panel encourages the university to review and strengthen the composition and capacity of the Staff and Student Council, since participation of students and staff is an important element of the quality culture at Wageningen.

Wageningen University has at disposition a well-established quality assurance system. The explicit link between quality assurance and quality enhancement demonstrates that the university has a mature approach to quality. Until now, the quality assurance system was operating particularly effectively at the level of courses and programmes. The panel therefore welcomes the intention of the university to enhance the effectiveness of its system at institutional level by defining quality goals and indicators to monitor more explicitly and systematically the implementation of its vision and strategy.

Innovation is high on the agenda of Wageningen University. The panel considers that the university is effective in stimulating innovation in a very genuine and bottom-up way. Over the years, several innovations in education have had the time to mature, were disseminated often in an informal way and now need to be implemented across the university. The panel sees a specific task for the Executive Board to organise this transfer from innovation to standardisation.

In sum, the panel concludes that the university has a quality culture and a quality assurance system which guarantee that education at this institution fulfils national and international requirements. The panel's overall judgement on the institutional audit of

Wageningen University is therefore positive. Given the outcomes of the institutional audit the panel advises NVAO to take a positive decision.

Specific aspects

The panel was also tasked to advice on the specific aspect 'Sustainability'. According to the panel, sustainability is a topic that touches the core of Wageningen's mission and constitutes an important focal point for its education and research. It appreciates the efforts of the university to address sustainability in an all-encompassing way covering education, research and operations. This comprehensive coverage of sustainability has resulted in excellent positions on specialist national and international rankings. These elements allow the panel to advice positively on sustainability as a valuable and distinctive specific aspect of Wageningen University. This positive advice, however, should not refrain the university from incorporating sustainability even more explicitly in its activities.

The panel also looked into the quality of internationalisation as a specific aspect. The panel's findings and considerations are reported in a separate document, in accordance with the CeQulnt procedure for the assessment of quality in internationalisation at institutional level. The panel considers that Wageningen University fulfils each of the five standards of the CeQulnt assessment framework: intended internationalisation, action plans, implementation, enhancement, and governance. The panel's advice on the quality of internationalisation at Wageningen University is therefore positive.

The Hague, 16 March 2018

On behalf of the panel,

Frank van der Duijn Schouten,
chair

Mark Delmartino,
secretary

Overview of the panel judgements

Institutional audit: positive

Standard	Judgement
Vision and policy	Meets the standard
Implementation	Meets the standard
Evaluation and monitoring	Meets the standard
Development	Meets the standard
Final conclusion	Positive

Specific aspect 'Sustainability': positive

Specific aspect 'Internationalisation': positive

2 Introduction

2.1 Aim and objectives

The institutional audit assesses whether an institution harbours a quality culture and a system of quality assurance which guarantee that the education offered by the institution meets (inter)nationally accepted standards and demands. The institutional audit takes the ambitions, vision and choices formulated by the institution as a point of departure, and reviews the realisation of these ambitions.

The audit focuses on four questions:

1. Are the institution's vision and policy concerning the quality of the education it provides widely supported and sufficiently coordinated, both externally and internally?
2. How does the institution realise this vision on quality?
3. How does the institution monitor that its vision of quality is realised?
4. How does the institution work on improvement?

Institutions undergo an institutional audit on a voluntary basis. The audit functions alongside the assessment and accreditation of individual study programmes. Passing the institutional audit successfully allows institutions having their programmes assessed using the framework for the limited programme assessment. In all other instances, programmes are assessed according to the standards for the extensive programme assessment.

In the first round of audits (2011 to 2016) 35 institutions of higher education passed the audit. These institutions offer around 80% of the total number of degree programmes in Dutch higher education.

NVAO appoints a panel of experts ('peers') for conducting the institutional audit. These experts have no ties with the institution under review or any other conflict of interest. The panel comprises leading expertise on the management of institutions, educational expertise in higher education, and audit expertise and/or expertise in the design and efficiency of systems of quality assurance. Students and the professional field are also represented in the panel.

A qualified and independent secretary assists the panel and writes the advisory report based on the discussions in the panel. NVAO offers a training and/or briefing to all panel members and the secretary prior to the audit. An NVAO staff member coordinates the audit and acts as a liaison officer between the institution and the expert panel.

Full details of the institutional audit process can be found in the framework posted on the NVAO website: Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands 2016. Information on the assessment of the quality of internationalisation according to the CeQulnt methodology is available on the website of ECA: www.ecahe.eu

2.2 Expert panel

The expert panel comprises:

- Professor Frank van der Duijn Schouten PhD, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, Erasmus University Rotterdam, former Rector of Tilburg University and VU Amsterdam, and Professor Emeritus in Mathematics of Operations Research, Netherlands (chair);
- Professor Lisa Sennerby Forsse, president of the Royal Swedish Academy of Agriculture and Forestry, Stockholm, and former vice-chancellor, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Uppsala, Sweden;
- Professor Mag. Eva Werner, hon. prof., rector of the IMC University of Applied Sciences Krems, and certified assessor for ECA (CeQuint), Austria;
- Dr. Colja Laane, CEO T&E Product Development / T&E Advice;
- Lennart van Doremalen MSc, PhD candidate in Subatomic Physics, Utrecht University, Netherlands (student member).

The panel is assisted by:

- Mark Delmartino MA, secretary;
- Michèle Wera MA, NVAO process coordinator.

The resumes of the panel members are included in Appendix 1.

2.3 Audit process

The panel received the university's self-evaluation report (SER) on 25 October 2017. Based on this report, the panel members exchanged views on the topics that might form the object of an audit trail by e-mail. On 22 November 2017, the chair of the panel and the NVAO process coordinator met with the Rector Magnificus, the Dean of Education, the Manager and a Policy Advisor of Education & Student Affairs to discuss the programme of the site visit and the choice of audit trails.

The members of the panel exchanged their initial impressions, listed the issues that required clarification and prepared for the different sessions at the site visit by email.

The site visit took place from 29 January until 2 February 2018. The programme consisted of two parts:

- Part I: exploratory visit (29 and 30 January);
- Part II: in-depth visit (31 January until 2 February).

The panel members gathered in the morning of 29 January to prepare the first interviews. The site visit started with a meet and greet, offering the opportunity for panel and stakeholders to connect in a more informal setting. During the site visit, the panel met with various staff members, management and stakeholders: the Executive Board, the Supervisory Board, the educational management, lecturers, students, quality assurance staff, university services staff, alumni and representatives from the professional field. A detailed overview of the visit programme is provided in Appendix 3.

Audit trails

The panel carried out five audit trails to gain more in-depth knowledge:

- Trail 1: vertical trail on past performance and internal quality assurance of two programmes;
- Trail 2: horizontal trail on Growth
- Trail 3: horizontal trail on Innovation in Education
- Trail 4: sustainability

- Trail 5: internationalisation

Trails 1-3 are part of the regular institutional audit. Through the trail on sustainability, the panel has verified to what extent this topic can be considered a 'specific aspect' of Wageningen University & Research (WUR). The panel's findings and considerations are described in a separate section of this report. Similarly, the trail on internationalisation has been undertaken as part of the university's application for the specific aspect internationalisation. The panel's assessment is reported in a separate document, according to the CeQuInt framework for internationalisation at institutional level.

On Wednesday 31 January, the panel focussed on the past performance trail. The main aim was to review the assurance of programme quality, by examining whether the university's past performance demonstrates its timely identification and effective address of quality risks. As suggested by the university, the panel looked into the programmes International Land and Water Management and Animal Sciences.

As horizontal trails, the panel chose two topics that were on the shortlist submitted by WUR: growth is a key issue at the university and the panel has established during three sessions how the university is accommodating its growing student numbers through a range of measures regarding infrastructure, scheduling, staff professionalization, etc. The panel also looked into Innovation in Education: this topic is high on the university's agenda and has been a domain of considerable investment and developments over the past few years. The panel finished its meetings on Thursday 1 February with a trail on sustainability, a topic that touches the core of WUR's mission and constitutes an important focal point for its education and research.

On Friday morning 2 February, the panel discussed the issue of internationalisation with several stakeholders, verifying what Wageningen University is currently doing and which efforts have been made since the university earned the distinctive feature internationalisation in 2012.

Advisory report

After the site visit, the secretary drafted the advisory report, which was circulated among the panel members for comments and amendments. Those comments and amendments were incorporated in a version, which was approved by the panel and validated by the chair on 16 March 2018. This version of the report was then presented to WUR with a request to check for errors of fact. The remarks made by WUR have been taken into account in the final version.

3 Institution under Review

3.1 General data

Institution	Wageningen University
Location	Wageningen
Type	Publicly funded university

3.2 Profile

The first predecessor of what is now known as Wageningen University was created in 1876 when the 'Hoogeschool voor de Land- en Tuinbouw' was established in Wageningen. In 1918 the 'Landbouwhogeschool' was founded and granted university status. In 1998, the name of the university changed into Wageningen University.

According to the Self Evaluation Report (SER), Wageningen University & Research (WUR) nowadays is an internationally renowned scientific research and education institute. A unique feature of WUR is its ability to combine the expertise of Wageningen University with the specialised research institutes of Wageningen Research.

The mission of the university is to "explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life". Its education and research focuses on "healthy food and living environment" and has three strongly interlinked focal areas: (i) society and well-being; (ii) food, feed and bio-based production; and (iii) natural resources and living environment.

The university has one faculty, the Faculty of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, with about 90 chair groups. The Executive Board (EB) is the overall governing body and responsible for vision, policies and portfolio of education and research. The Rector Magnificus is also the Dean of the faculty and a member of the EB. The Programme Board, which consists of four students and four professors, is responsible for the content and quality of the study programmes. Programme Committees advise the Programme Board on content, design and quality of individual study programmes.

The chair groups are clustered into five Science Groups: Agro-technology & Food Sciences; Animal Sciences; Environmental Sciences; Plant Sciences; and Social Sciences. Managing Directors lead the respective Science Groups and are responsible for the overall management of the chair groups and research institutes with regard to staff, academic results and financial performance. Each chair group is led by a chair holder, a full professor who appoints staff for the courses offered by the chair group. Managing Directors and chair holders meet regularly in departmental meetings; the EB meets with the Managing Directors in the Board of Directors.

The guiding framework for education at Wageningen University is the so-called "Education Ecosystem". Created in 2015, it is a response to several developments in society, education and the labour market. Through this Education Ecosystem, the university acknowledges the collaboration needed for dealing with complex global issues (climate crisis, food security), the growing need for highly educated people, and the rapid IT developments in education and beyond.

3.3 Key figures

Student numbers (1 October 2017)	Total number of students	11480
	Bachelor's students	5572
	Pre-master's students	87
	Master's students	5821
	of which international BSc & MSc students	2511
Programmes (2017-2018)	PhD students (31 December 2017)	1984
	Total number of programmes	48
	Bachelor's programmes	19
	Master's programmes	29
Degrees awarded (2016-2017)	English-language programmes	30 *
	Bachelor's	1095
	Master's	1851
Staff (in fte) (31 December 2016)	PhD	295
	Total staff	2654
	Academic staff	1536
	Full professors	101
Financial data (2016)	Associate professors	194 **
	Total budget	€ 295 M

* (all Ma + 1 Ba) The first two years of bachelor's programmes are taught in Dutch, the third year in English. One joint bachelor degree in Tourism is taught entirely in English.

** Including 52 fte personal professors.

4 Assessment

4.1 Vision¹ and policy

Standard 1 – The institution has a broadly supported educational vision and pursues a corresponding policy focused on the internal quality assurance of its education.

Findings

Every six years, Wageningen University reformulates its vision on education. At the time of the site visit, the university had just adopted its 2017 vision, which is in line with and builds further on the previous vision from 2011. Its new mission statement for education is “to educate students to become academic professionals who can contribute to sustainable solutions for existing and future complex issues in the domain of ‘healthy food and living environment’ all over the world, and who take their social, personal, and ethical responsibilities seriously.” To accomplish this mission, the university will offer (i) high-quality scientific knowledge; (ii) rich learning environments, and (iii) flexible and personal learning paths.

The panel noticed that the new vision is clearly articulated and broadly supported by staff and students. It appreciates that external stakeholders have also been involved in the discussions. The consultations on this vision took place after a first draft of the vision

¹ The English version of the NVAO framework mentions ‘philosophy’.

was composed by staff at supporting departments. Notwithstanding general satisfaction with the vision among both students and staff, the panel observed that this approach had not necessarily captured all elements that students and staff consider important features of the Wageningen DNA.

The new vision informs the new strategic plan 2019-2022 describing trends, challenges and ambitions. The panel noticed that the current strategic plan 2015-2018, which is still based on the 2011 vision on education, has a somewhat stronger focus on research than on education. Nonetheless, for education several qualitative objectives were formulated, grouped in the following themes: “coherence between research and education”, “growth and quality: our new approach to education”, “digitalisation and various target groups: a single system of education” and “international education”. For two objectives key performance indicators are derived: (1) to keep student satisfaction at the same level as in 2014 despite growing student numbers, and (2) to develop every year at least for one field of study or course digital education materials that are used for more than one target group or type of education.

The respective visions and strategic plans are translated into policies, implementation plans and quality indicators. The panel noticed that Wageningen University has at its disposition a quality assurance system that supports the university in enhancing its education and in reaching its goals. It implies the use of Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycles on various levels and a connection of these cycles throughout the organisation. An important aspect of this system is the determination of the objectives and the indicators that are used to measure whether objectives are reached. The panel was informed that in the new strategic plan more explicit goals will be formulated with concrete objectives and performance indicators, as well as an integrated policy with respect to growth and internationalisation.

Furthermore, the panel gathered from the materials and the discussions that the university’s vision on education has been, is and will continue to be student-oriented as it puts the students and their personal and professional development into the focus of all fundamental strategic considerations. This orientation is clearly emphasised in the three core principles of the new vision and their translation in student-related objectives: gaining a solid foundation in advanced scientific state-of-the-art knowledge, acquiring entrepreneurial, academic, scientific competencies in international environments, and receiving more freedom and opportunities to choose personalised courses and learning paths.

Considerations

The panel considers that Wageningen’s vision on education is clear, well-described and distinctive with respect to other universities in the Netherlands and abroad. It offers a rich and challenging perspective on education with a clear focus on healthy food and living environment, and encompasses various relevant and specific aspects such as sustainability and internationalisation, that will be helpful in directing the university towards the future and in taking position in national and international developments and challenges.

The new vision is broadly supported by staff and students. Further to the discussions on site, the panel thinks that a broader consultation round before writing the first draft would have enriched the final draft. The panel advises the university to follow a more structured bottom-up approach when elaborating the forthcoming strategy as this is likely to further enhance ownership. In this regard, the panel also welcomes the plans of the university to strengthen systematically the role of external stakeholders in developing its vision and strategy.

As far as the translation of vision and strategy is concerned, the panel strongly encourages the university to formulate concrete objectives and measurable indicators at institutional level for the period 2018-2022. The panel holds strong views on this point as the issue was already mentioned in the previous audit in 2012. Although the quality assurance system of the university is functioning well, the panel considers that the system can support the university in performing even more effectively when quantifiable targets are set, monitored and documented regularly and systematically, and communicated at all relevant levels

Judgement

Based on the above-mentioned findings and considerations, the panel concludes that the university has a broadly supported educational philosophy and a corresponding policy that is underpinning the internal quality assurance of its education. The panel judges that Wageningen University **meets** Standard 1, *Vision and policy*.

4.2 Implementation

Standard 2 – The institution realises its educational philosophy in an effective manner, which is demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes, particularly relating to staff, student assessment, services and facilities, and students with a functional impairment.

Findings

The principles of the university's vision on education are translated into policies and actions. On the basis of the self-evaluation report and the discussions on site the panel understood how the institution is implementing its key principles and overarching themes in practice. The panel noticed that the actual realisation of these actions is invariably linked to broader processes of planning, monitoring and possibly enhancement. Moreover, the panel learned that developments within and outside the university require the institution to be flexible. Therefore, working groups are installed during the implementation period of a strategic plan to address specific priorities or unforeseen challenges. Several interviewees informed the panel about their involvement in, for example, actions related to accommodating the growing student numbers at the university, to course scheduling or to turning existing Dutch-language BSc programmes into international programmes.

During the visit, the panel noticed that the interaction between research and education is translated into a well-defined tenure track policy. Junior staff enter the track with a career perspective of at least five to six years; in case of successful completion, they then move on to associate professorship for another six years, and afterwards possibly acquire the rank of (personal) professor. The panel was surprised to learn the distinction between personal professors and chair holders, where a personal professor holds the position of full professor without the managerial duty of leading a chair group. This distinction complicates the (inter)national transparency of the human resources system of Wageningen University. The panel acknowledges with interest the recent experiments of the university to allow staff to the tenure track system who have more extensive or even full teaching duties, a development that may alleviate to some extent the pressure staff and students are feeling given the considerable growth of student numbers in recent years.

The panel learned that the new vision on education also entailed a reconsideration and adjustment of the assessment policy. As part of both the flexible/personal learning paths and the rich learning environment, the university wants to enhance the feedback it gives to students. Even more than before, assessment and feedback should support students in becoming aware of their progress in the learning process and help them in making choices in their personal study path. Moreover, the panel noticed that assessment is playing an important role in the quality assurance of education: by safeguarding the quality of assessment and showing how and what is assessed, the university ultimately demonstrates to its stakeholders that it delivers on what it promises. The panel thinks highly of the new education assessment policy: the document was validated mid-December 2017 and contains a comprehensive view on assessment policy, assessment practice and on the actors and processes in assuring the quality of assessments.

The university pays adequate attention to students with functional impairment. According to the panel, this attention is demonstrated first of all by an up-to-date university-wide policy featuring a comprehensive set of provisions. The panel noticed in this respect that the current policy is much stronger than what was available at the time of the previous

institutional audit. Students indicated that they know where to obtain information and what type of reasonable accommodation they are entitled to in case their specific impairment forms an obstacle to their study progress. Moreover, interviewees appreciate highly the guidance and support they receive from study advisors, even before entering university at the open orientation days. Students also mentioned the forthcoming attitude of lecturers and examiners during classes and exams. It therefore comes as no surprise to the panel that Wageningen University ranks – again - number one in the latest survey (Gebruikerstoets 2016, Centrum Hoger Onderwijs Informatie) in which students with a functional impairment assess their programme and institution.

The panel noticed from the self-evaluation report and the discussions on site that the allocation of responsibilities with respect to the quality of education is complex. This complexity is enhanced by three levels of operation – course, programme, and institution – and because of the matrix structure in which Wageningen University as a one-faculty university operates. At the level of individual courses, chair holders are responsible for course quality, while Managing Directors of the respective science groups are responsible for the quality of the lecturers in these courses. The panel learned during the sessions on the past performance trail of individual programmes that the Programme Directors are 'go-betweens' between chair groups and Programme Committees, who are responsible for the quality of the (individual) programmes. According to the panel, the role of the Programme Director seems underestimated: sometimes s/he is referred to as the coordinator of the programme, while de facto the Programme Director bears responsibility for the quality of the programme but needs approval of the Programme Committee for major decisions. While the panel sees no reason to actually revise the de facto way of operation, it does advise the university to formulate the responsibilities of Programme Directors in such a way that it becomes clear that they are indeed responsible for programme quality. The Programme Committee could then assume its proper - and according to the panel more befitting - role of countervailing power. The reason for this advice is twofold: firstly, it is important in terms of quality control to have one person who holds responsibility and can be addressed if there are problems. Leaving this responsibility with a programme committee that consists of ten persons, there is a risk that eventually nobody takes decisions or assumes responsibility. Secondly, the panel points to a legal aspect: according to Dutch law, Programme Committees (opleidingscommissies) have countervailing power with regard to education quality; it would be impossible to bestow this countervailing power to the Programme Committees if these same committees would also hold responsibility for the programme and take decisions. The panel also sees that the strong involvement of staff and students in the decision making process at programme level is a key strength of Wageningen University. It hopes that the university is able to maintain this strength while guaranteeing the presence of countervailing power and implementing a clear line of responsibility.

The institution's perception of quality is laid down in two documents: an external report on the quality culture at Wageningen University (2017) and an even more recent (October 2017) policy document on education quality assurance and enhancement, which incorporates the results from the external study. In both documents the panel noticed that at Wageningen University, there is a strong correlation between the quality system and quality culture. Quality culture in this context means a culture that intends to enhance quality permanently; it is characterised by both a cultural element of shared values and expectations and by a structural element with defined processes that enhance quality. The panel read in the policy document that quality culture at Wageningen has four values: the lecturer as main actor in the quality of education; students as co-owners of education; stimulation of bottom-up initiatives; and involvement of the entire academic community in quality assessment. This 'Wageningen way of doing things', according to the panel, is indeed reflected across the whole quality system.

Throughout the discussions, the panel has experienced that there is still a strong emphasis on informal procedures, with an informal network culture that helps to implement improvements at all levels. This culture is characterised by open and short communication lines and results in relatively quick responses. Moreover, the panel noticed that across the university there is a strong involvement of staff and students in both Programme Board and Programme Committee. The panel sees this as a particular strength of the university that should be cherished and maintained.

Considerations

The panel considers that overall, the educational vision 2011 has been appropriately broken down into policy actions and processes, with some actions being more concrete and structured than others. The implementation of these policies is progressing and its results are continuously monitored and improved through the different layers of the existing quality assurance system. The key principles of the current 2017 vision still need to be elaborated in policies. Given the expected growth and thus increasing complexity of the university, it is all the more necessary according to the panel to formulate these policies in a SMART way.

The panel considers that the university has some well-developed and well-articulated policies. In this regard, the panel thinks highly of the recent policy documents on assessment and on quality assurance and enhancement, which are both very clear and explicit. Moreover, the panel is satisfied with the way students with functional impairments are accommodated within the university. Services and facilities, moreover, are up to standard, although it turns out that the university had not fully anticipated the rapid and continuous growth it is experiencing.

According to the panel, Wageningen University has a complex system in terms of allocation of responsibilities. While it advises the university to clarify some of the positions, notably regarding the division of responsibilities between Programme Director and Programme Committee, the panel does consider that this complexity also reflects the quality culture of involvement, of informal networking within set structures. In fact, the panel considers that the participation of students and staff in both Programme Committee and Programme Board is exemplary and should be maintained.

Participation and bottom-up initiatives being an important element of the quality culture at Wageningen, the panel recommends to strengthen the involvement – and capacity - of the Staff and Student Council (SSC). It is important that this council is mirroring the composition of the university population as a whole. This means first of all that the SSC needs more senior academics who take up an active role. Moreover, all SSC members need to receive adequate training in order to fulfil their important tasks. According to the panel, students and staff in Programme Committees may also benefit from such training. While there is budget available for training, this is not always fully used. The university could take up a more an active role in suggesting and offering training throughout the academic year in order to maximise the effectiveness of the participation bodies.

Judgement

Based on the above-mentioned findings and considerations, the panel concludes that the university realises its educational vision in an effective manner, which is demonstrated by appropriate policy actions and processes. The panel judges that Wageningen University **meets** standard 2, *Implementation*.

4.3 Evaluation and monitoring

Standard 3 – The institution systematically evaluates whether the intended policy objectives relating to educational quality are achieved. Relevant stakeholders are involved in this process.

Findings

In the document 'Education quality assurance and enhancement', it is mentioned that "our vision for education determines our vision of the quality of education, and, in turn, our vision of quality is represented in our system for quality assurance and enhancement." Based on materials and discussions, the panel gathered that the quality assurance system at Wageningen consists of an integration of PDCA-cycles on various levels:

- At course level, lecturers have the responsibility for the PDCA-cycle for both content and pedagogical aspects; the course coordinator is responsible for the quality of the course, while the examiner is responsible for the quality of the course examination. Several parameters (such as feasibility, state of the art knowledge, pedagogical design, contribute to programme learning outcomes, etc.) are used to define whether a course is of good quality;
- At programme level, the Programme Board is ultimately responsible for the quality of the degree programme, with Programme Committee and Programme Director playing an important role. Parameters to measure if programmes are of good quality include learning outcomes, feasible structure, student inflow, international composition, etc.
- At institutional level, the Executive Board is ultimately responsible for the quality of education, and for the quality assurance system as a whole. The SSC and the Student Council are the formal interlocutors of the EB. Parameters to measure the institutional (Strategy Plan) goals include study success, staff quality, student satisfaction, etc.

According to the panel, Wageningen University is aware of the importance of evaluation and evaluation tools as part of the PDCA cycle at all three levels. Through the materials and discussions, moreover, the panel has come across numerous quality assurance instruments to check the quality of education at course, programme and/or institutional level. Some of these tools are relatively new, such as the Bottleneck Course Monitor which integrates the results of several evaluation instruments and the pass rates for each course to determine which courses are causing delays to study completion or highlight other aspects of poor performance.

Notwithstanding the extensive descriptions, the panel is struck - again - by the complexity of the internal task division and decision-making structure. Following the discussions on site, the panel wondered about the span of control of the current Examining Boards. Their task is to ensure that graduates have attained the learning outcomes of the study programmes. Moreover, the Examining Boards monitor, report and advise on the quality of the assessments and examinations. While the panel has no doubt about the relevance of their tasks or the quality of their performance, there is a concern that the number of programmes and students to be followed-up is simply too big, which in turn would mean that the Examining Boards cannot sufficiently fulfil their tasks. This situation is likely to become even more acute in the near future as student numbers are forecast to grow even further. The panel acknowledges that it is important to specify at course level how learning goals relate to the overall learning outcomes at programme level. It is the responsibility of the Examining Board to check that what the student is expected to learn,

is also effectively realised. It was not clear from the discussions whether the Examining Boards are (all) doing so.

Furthermore, the panel wondered to what extent external stakeholders are involved (systematically) in course and programme evaluations. The impression it gained from the discussions is that courses are evaluated on their scientific content on a voluntarily basis by (inter)national peers on the initiative of chair holders, while programmes are discussed in their External Advisory Committee and are evaluated once every six years in view of their reaccreditation by NVAO. The panel acknowledges that so far there has been no need for mid-term programme reviews because of Wageningen's positive accreditation record: not a single programme submitted for reaccreditation has been assessed negatively. The panel, however, suggests to ensure that external peers review programmes regularly and systematically. In this regard, the Programme Directors could be given more power towards the chair groups and ask them for a regular (external/peer) evaluation of the scientific content of programmes or programme components in addition to the NVAO-evaluation. By now it is common practice within higher education in the Netherlands for programmes to organise an external mid-term review for quality enhancement.

Considerations

The panel considers that Wageningen University applies a quality assurance system that has been in place for a long time and has been fine-tuned regularly. At every level, goals are translated into policies and plans, which are executed and monitored using various instruments to evaluate the results and measure progress. These results are discussed and where needed further actions are undertaken to improve the outcomes.

The fact that Wageningen explicitly links quality assurance to quality enhancement demonstrates according to the panel that the university has a mature approach to quality. Moreover, the panel considers that there is a strong involvement and commitment of all internal stakeholders at Wageningen University to monitoring and evaluating quality. While the panel welcomes the involvement of external parties, in part through the External Advisory Boards or the WUR Ambassador scheme, there is still room for a more comprehensive and systematic participation of these stakeholders at all levels.

The panel invites the university to pay special attention to the position of the Examining Boards: given that the university is growing fast and the tasks of the Examining Boards will therefore increase substantially, the panel is concerned that the current number of examination boards might not fit the increasing complexity of the university.

The description of how the quality assurance system works at the three levels is clear. Although complex, the roles, responsibilities and tools for monitoring the quality of education are clearly described. Nonetheless, the system seems to be operating more effectively at the level of courses and programmes than at institutional level. The panel therefore welcomes the efforts of the university announced in the documentation and the discussions to strengthen the quality assurance provisions at institutional level by defining quality goals and indicators that make it possible to monitor the implementation of the 2017 vision. This would also enable the Supervisory Board to intensify its role in monitoring the quality assurance system, without being involved in the operation of individual programmes. From its discussion with representatives of the Supervisory Board the panel got the impression that at present it stands at a fairly large distance from quality assurance: while the Supervisory Board is discussing the results of the internal quality assurance findings, it was not much involved so far in discussing the system of quality assurance as such. According to the panel, the growing attention of the university to quality assurance at institutional level could also enable the Supervisory Board to be

more involved in the evaluation of the internal quality assurance system of Wageningen University.

Judgement

Based on the above-mentioned findings and considerations, the panel concludes that the university monitors systematically that the intended policy objectives relating to educational quality are achieved. The panel judges that Wageningen University **meets** standard 3, *Evaluation and monitoring*.

4.4 Development

Standard 4 – The institution has a focus on development and works systematically on the improvement of its education.

Findings

The panel noticed that the improvement plans for education at course and programme level follow a specific path through the Education Modification Cycle that starts every year in November and results in course and programme adjustments for the next academic year. In this process, instigated by the Education and Student Affairs department, all bodies involved in quality of education work together. In the end, it is the Programme Board to make annual integrated decisions on all courses, minors and programmes. This process has reportedly been in place for more than 25 years and is according to the panel a typical example of 'doing things the Wageningen way'.

Notwithstanding the existence of such long-standing instruments, the panel gathered from the materials and the discussions that the quality assurance system has evolved since the previous quality assurance plan of 2011 particularly with respect to the act-phase of the PDCA-cycle. There is, for instance, a shift in attention from course level to programme level: instead of primarily focusing on course evaluations and course development, new tools such as the programme evaluation report and the bottleneck course monitor now aggregate information on internal and external evaluations at programme level.

Similarly, there is a trend from pure monitoring to active enhancement: instead of asking lecturers and Programme Committees to react to individual evaluation results from internal and external sources, the committees now are asked every year which enhancements they want to implement. The interviewees indicated that the resulting discussions with the Programme Board are positive and inspiring because they are forward-looking.

The shift towards more quality enhancement at programme level is also made in terms of innovation in education: from 2017 onwards, a major part of the innovation budget is spent on projects pursuing innovation at programme level. In the last round, the Executive Board gave priority to pedagogical innovations in three areas related to Wageningen's strategic aims: didactic approaches to encourage student participation; maintaining quality of education with larger student numbers; internationalisation of course design, contents and execution in bachelor programmes. A total of 18 projects on programme level were granted and received funding for up to three years.

The panel noticed from the discussions during the trail on innovation in education that the development and dissemination of such bottom-up initiatives and projects are facilitated by the flat organisational structure of the university, with only one faculty and 90 chair groups. Many, mostly informal, channels exist to further facilitate exchange and dissemination of good practices. Since lecturers teach courses in several and sometimes very different programmes, there is a lot of informal exchange of practices and mutual learning. Innovative practices which turn out to be very successful in one course therefore do not necessarily take much time to spread widely, as it was the case of the thesis rings (students with similar thesis subjects gather in group for peer review) or the LabBuddy (e-learning tool for laboratory education). Moreover, lecturers with innovative ideas and promising practices get the floor at organised events such as education days, lunch meetings, or university teaching qualification sessions.

Considerations

According to the panel, the overall approach of the institution to enhancement and improvement is clearly reflected in its commitment to quality.

The processes within the quality assurance system have been adjusted over time to reflect the growing attention of the university to developments at programme level and to pro-active enhancements. These processes again are involving all relevant stakeholders in order to ensure ownership for the changes and developments.

Innovation in education is high on the agenda of the university. The panel considers that the university has an effective way to stimulate innovation within the university and is generating this innovation in a very genuine and bottom-up way, using – when appropriate – innovations from external sources. According to the panel, the Innovation Fund is a valuable tool to accommodate initiatives by individual staff members or groups. The budget that comes with the projects, moreover, leaves sufficient time for initiatives to grow and ensures that fore-runners are compensated for their add-on task.

Over the years, several innovations have had the time to mature and disseminate in an often informal way. The next step is to implement these developments across the university. According to the panel, there is a specific task for the Executive Board now to organise this transfer from innovation to standardisation.

Judgement

Based on the above-mentioned findings and considerations, the panel concludes that the university has a focus on development and works systematically on the improvement of its education. The panel judges that Wageningen University **meets** standard 4, *Development*.

4.5 Final conclusion

In the previous sections, the panel has argued that Wageningen University meets each of the four standards of the evaluation framework. According to the panel, the university:

- has a clear, rich and distinctive vision on education with respect to other institutions, a vision that is fundamentally student-centred and shared by staff and students;
- has comprehensive and articulated policies, actions and processes that follow logically from the overall vision and strategy or address new challenges;
- has a well-established quality assurance system and a mature approach to quality;
- is effective in stimulating enhancement and innovation in a genuine and bottom-up way;
- has a strong quality culture valuing notably the participation of students, bottom-up initiatives and the involvement of the entire academic community in quality assessment.

In sum, the panel considers that Wageningen University has a quality culture and a quality assurance system that guarantee that education at this institution fulfils national and international requirements. Hence, the panel's overall judgement on the institutional audit of Wageningen University is positive.

4.6 Recommendations

The panel judges positively the quality culture and quality assurance system at Wageningen University. In addition to findings and considerations, the previous sections also contained a number of suggestions. The following recommendations have been discussed during the audit and aim to support Wageningen University in its further development:

- To follow a more bottom-up approach before presenting the first draft of a vision or strategic plan and take a more structured approach in developing this vision or strategy.
- To formulate a strategy that contains at institutional and programme level clear targets and more verifiable indicators that are monitored regularly and documented systematically. This approach will allow the university to assess in an objective way where it stands in the realisation of its vision / strategy and attainment of its goals and objectives
- To intensify the role of the Supervisory Board in the quality assurance system, especially since the university intends strengthening the quality assurance efforts at institutional level.
- To strengthen the involvement of the Student and Staff Council in the quality assurance system by actively stimulating senior academics to participate in the SSC and thus better mirror the composition of the university population as a whole. Moreover, to ensure that the SSC members are able to participate at the required level through training and design of the participatory trajectory.
- To ensure that the educational vision is translated into learning outcomes of the programmes. This can be enhanced by having a clear line of responsibility, by stimulating further programme development and by professionalising the training of both students and staff in Programme Committees.

- To revise some terminology related to WUR functionaries, such as personal professor and chair holder, for a better alignment with the terminology common in the Netherlands and abroad.
- To clarify and change the role and responsibility of Programme Directors.
- To delineate the independent and legal tasks and responsibilities of the Examining Boards and the Programme Committees.
- To reconsider and align the span of control of the four Examining Boards, notably but not exclusively in view of the growth of the university.

4.7 Specific aspect: Sustainability

Findings

Goals and objectives

The panel was invited to address the issue of sustainability during the institutional audit because it is a topic that reportedly touches the core of the university's mission and constitutes an important focal point for its education and research. Over the past six years, staff, students and management bodies have developed a vision for sustainability in education, in research and in terms of operational management. The university's Vision for Education 2017 wants students to acquire sustainability competencies in an international environment, and will develop new learning paths to help them achieve this. In terms of governance, sustainability is integrated in the quality assurance of Wageningen University: the existing responsibilities also apply to sustainability.

Action Plans

The panel noticed that sustainability at Wageningen University concerns education, research and operational management. In terms of operations, the university is at the forefront of sustainable operational management in the Netherlands and aspires to lead on sustainable operations. It takes an integrated approach to implementing sustainability internally and incorporates it into its dealings with external parties by setting requirements for clients and suppliers.

Sustainability is also an important theme in research at WUR. In the period 2015-2018, Wageningen University invested in sustainable solutions in promising research themes, such as resilience or synthetic biology. Moreover, Wageningen Research is focusing between now and 2021 on eight topics having sustainability as a common thread. The panel observed that much of the research in chair groups and institutes contributes to the Strategic Development Goals and that the large majority of individual SDG's is addressed through this research.

According to its mission statement, Wageningen University is educating students to contribute to sustainable solutions for current and future challenges. The panel noticed that sustainability is incorporated in study programmes and in many individual courses but that this integration often happens in a rather implicit way.

The panel learned that Wageningen University is doing very well in specialist national and international rankings such as SustainaBul, Green Metric and Transparency Benchmark. Interviewees informed the panel that it is not an objective of the university to be / become number one in all rankings, but that there is an explicit intention to stay in the front group of universities worldwide and exchange practices with these peers.

Results

Over the past few years many programmes and courses have been addressing sustainability. Some programmes also formulated sustainability competencies in their learning goals / outcomes. Moreover, the university created modules that allow students to study sustainability issues in a more explicit way. In many cases, however, sustainability is present but not yet visible in courses and programmes. Further to its vision on education, the university plans to have the sustainability competency integrated in all programmes and their learning outcomes.

The university is raising awareness on sustainability issues in different ways, such as the debate programme 'Wageningen Dialogues' or lecture evenings, WURtalks. The panel appreciates these initiatives and thinks that these are key to work towards a better awareness of the topic. The Green Office is a bureau within the university consisting of

students and an administrator who promote the sustainability links between education, research and operations at Wageningen University. The panel was struck by the enthusiasm of the team who are advocating for sustainability within a forerunner university. However, the panel was surprised to notice that the office does not seem to get the 'policy' support it deems to be entitled to.

Improvement measures

Over the last six years sustainability has become more prominent within the academic community of Wageningen. However, the panel also heard that it is still possible to finish university without having taken a single course on sustainability while, on the other end of the continuum, students who are motivated to take many sustainability-related courses want to have this reflected on their diploma. The panel therefore welcomes the intention of the university to make sustainability explicit in learning outcomes and study programmes, and to develop instruments for monitoring and evaluating sustainability in courses, study programmes, research projects and partnerships.

Considerations

The panel considers that sustainability is indeed a topic that touches the core of Wageningen's mission and constitutes an important focal point for its education and research. It appreciates the efforts of the university to address sustainability in an all-encompassing way covering education, research and operations. The panel gathers that sustainability is well embedded within research, that it is broken down in objectives and indicators in so far as the sustainability vision on operations is concerned, and that there is a lot of work in progress regarding sustainability in education.

The panel suggests that the university translates the sustainability component of its vision on education in SMART goals, and includes these in the quality assurance system. The panel also encourages the university to pay specific and priority attention to transferring sustainability into the intended learning outcomes of the respective degree programmes.

Furthermore, the panel had the impression that sustainability is more present in written documents than it is already in the minds of the broader student and staff community in Wageningen. Hence the advice to communicate sustainability more effectively, making good use of the existing knowledge and enthusiasm of staff, students and alumni in promoting and implementing the sustainability agenda of the university internally and externally. In this respect, the panel suggests to make optimum use of the services of the Green Office.

The panel appreciates that Wageningen University is a forerunner in terms of sustainability. In order to remain in the front group, the university could strengthen its ties with these front group institutions, for instance in view of mutual benchmarking. Alternatively, or additionally, it could create a network of like-minded universities to exchange good (and less good) practices in a more systematic way.

Advice

The above-mentioned findings and considerations allow the panel to advise positively on sustainability as a valuable and distinctive specific aspect of Wageningen University. This positive advice, however, should not refrain the university from incorporating sustainability even more explicitly in its activities.

4.8 **Specific aspect: Internationalisation**

The panel also looked into the quality of internationalisation as a specific aspect at Wageningen University. The panel's findings and considerations are reported in a separate document, in accordance with the CeQulnt procedure for the assessment of quality in internationalisation at institutional level. The panel considers that Wageningen University fulfils each of the five standards of the CeQulnt assessment framework: intended internationalisation, action plans, implementation, enhancement, and governance.

Advice

The panel's advice on the quality of internationalisation at Wageningen University is **positive**.

Appendix 1 – Panel

Professor Frank van der Duijn Schouten, Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, Erasmus University Rotterdam, former Rector of Tilburg University and VU Amsterdam, and Professor Emeritus in Mathematics of Operations Research, Netherlands (chair)

Frank van der Duijn Schouten studied mathematics and physics at the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam. He received his PhD degree in mathematics from the University of Leiden in 1979. In 1987, he was appointed professor of mathematical decision making at Tilburg University. From 1999 to 2008 he led this University as a rector magnificus. He served the Vrije Universiteit as rector magnificus from 2013-2015. He was guest researcher at Bell Labs (US), INSEAD (Paris) and at the universities of Berkeley and Haifa. He was General Manager of Netspar, vice-chairman of the Dutch National Educational Council, member of the NWO Social Affairs and Management Sciences Board, Chair of the Supervisory Board of the Protestant Theological University, Chair of the Supervisory Board of Fontys University of Applied Sciences and Board member of the Supervisory Board of Publishing Company Jongbloed BV.

Professor Lisa Sennerby Forsse, president of the Royal Swedish Academy of Agriculture and Forestry, Stockholm, and former vice-chancellor, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU), Uppsala, Sweden

Lisa Sennerby Forsse holds a PhD in plant biology. Her academic fields cover forest and agricultural related issues, including plant physiology, agroforestry and silviculture as well as the environmental aspects of land use, and the utilization of bioenergy from trees. She has been research director at the Swedish Forestry Research Institute and deputy director at the Swedish Environmental Protection Agency. Between 2001 and 2006, she was Director General of the Swedish Research Council for Environment, Agricultural Sciences and Spatial Planning (Formas). In 2006 she became vice-chancellor of SLU, the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, a position she held until 2015. Currently, professor Sennerby Forsse is president of the Royal Swedish Academy of Agriculture and Forestry and vice chair of the World Agroforestry Centre.

Professor Mag. Eva Werner, hon. prof, rector of the IMC University of Applied Sciences Krems, and certified assessor for ECA (CeQInt), Austria

Eva Werner holds a degree from the University of Vienna in languages, and studied also at the Sorbonne and at the University of Concordia in Canada. She has taught at the College of Tourism in Vienna, at the University of Business Administration in Vienna and at the Danube University in Krems. Since 2002, professor Werner has assumed several Board positions at the University of Applied Sciences in Krems: Deputy Head of the Academic Board, Vice-Rector (2005) and Rector (2010). In her work, Eva Werner has been particularly focused on issues of internationalisation and quality assurance in higher education. She has been presiding the International Committee of the Austrian Universities of Applied Sciences since 2008, and Chair of the Board of the Australian QA Agency THE-ICE since 2012. Furthermore, she fulfils several functions in national and international QA bodies.

Dr. Colja Laane, CEO T&E Product Development / T&E Advice, Netherlands

Colja Laane graduated in biochemistry from the University of Groningen and did a PhD at Wageningen University on the bioenergetics of nitrogen fixation. He worked for Unilever, Quest International, DSM and the Netherlands Genomics Initiative. In 2012 he set up the office of the Top Sector Life Sciences & Health in the Netherlands, and was

interim director from 2012 to 2015. Afterwards he moved to the Eyehospital in Rotterdam and to Medical Delta. Colja Laane is engaged in several life sciences and industrial biotech activities and is (co)author of over 120 papers and about 10 patents, mostly in the area of industrial biotechnology. Since 1996 he has his own company T&E Product Development, which was extended recently with T&E Advice.

Lennart van Doremalen MSc, PhD candidate in Subatomic Physics, Utrecht University, Netherlands (student member)

Lennart van Doremalen is a PhD candidate at the institute of Subatomic Physics at Utrecht University. He studied the research master 'Experimental Physics' and the bachelor 'Physics and Astronomy' at the same university. During his studies, he was co-founder of the student party Lijst Helder and student representative for this party in UU's University Council. From 2009 until 2010 he was the student board member of the Department of Physics. In 2012, he organised the International Conference of Physics Students (ICPS) in collaboration with fellow students. In addition, Lennart was an active member of the national student union LSVb, the local student union VIDUIS, and fulfilled several functions as board member or advisor next to his studies. He is also co-founder of the Utrecht municipality council party Student & Starter.

The panel is assisted by:

- Mark Delmartino MA, secretary;
- Michèle Wera MA, NVAO process coordinator.

All panel members and the secretary have completed and signed a declaration of independence and confidentiality.

Appendix 2 – Accreditation Record

This document gives an overview of the accreditation outcomes of all 43 applications that Wageningen University submitted over the period 2011-2016.2. The NVAO decisions are taken in the second phase of the accreditation system³ i.e. before 1 January 2017.

The accreditation record (or 'portrait') shows the results as they have been retrieved from NVAO's documentation and information system. The data have also been verified by the university.

The data presented are based on the accreditation decisions and the underlying external assessment and advisory reports. The NVAO framework for limited assessments of programmes is applicable for Wageningen University given the positive outcome of the institutional audit in 2012.

The programme assessment focuses on the following quality standards: the intended and achieved learning outcomes, the teaching and learning environment, and the students' assessment. The existing programmes are usually assessed within an assessment group by expert panels approved by NVAO. Expert panels convened by NVAO peer review the new programmes. All panels are assisted by secretaries trained by NVAO.

Panels judge the quality of an existing programme on a four-point scale: unsatisfactory, satisfactory, good or excellent. New programmes and until 2012 also existing programmes are assessed as either positive or negative. All the applications for accreditation submitted by Wageningen University in the period under review have resulted in positive accreditation decisions. One application for initial accreditation has been withdrawn.

The Hague, 9 October 2017

Annex 1 – Accreditation applications

Annex 2 – NVAO decisions chronologically

² Excluding the NVAO decisions taken within the first phase of the accreditation system.

³ The second phase of the accreditation system per 1 January 2011 (decision 21 December 2010, Stb. 2010, 862).

ANNEX 1 – Accreditation applications

Institution	Wageningen University
-------------	-----------------------

Sum of number		Year			
Type application	Final total and decision	2013	2014	2016	Final total
Accreditation (existing academic programmes)	Good	23		2	25
	Satisfactory	12	3	1	16
Total Accreditation		35	3	3	41
Initial Accreditation (new academic programmes)	Application withdrawn			1	1
	Satisfactory	1			1
Total Initial Accreditation		1		1	2
Final total		36	3	4	43

Table contains data until 12 June 2017.

ANNEX 2 – NVAO decisions chronologically

<i>Accreditation (existing academic programmes)</i>					
Year of decision	Name academic programmes	Final decision	total and Comments	Total	
2013	B Biosystems Engineering	Satisfactory		1	
	B Management and Consumer Studies	Satisfactory		1	
	B Biotechnology	Good		1	
	B Soil, Water, Atmosphere	Satisfactory		1	
	B Forest and Nature Conservation	Good		1	
	B Animal Sciences	Satisfactory		1	
	B International Land and Water Management	Good		1	
	B International Development Studies	Satisfactory		1	
	B Landscape, Architecture and Planning	Satisfactory		1	
	B Food Technology	Good		1	
	B Molecular Life Sciences	Satisfactory		1	
	B Plant Sciences	Good		1	
	B Nutrition and Health	Good		1	
	M Animal Sciences	Good		1	
	M Bioinformatics	Satisfactory		1	
	M Biosystems Engineering	Good		1	
	M Biotechnology	Good		1	
	M Climate Studies	Good		1	
	M Development and Rural Innovation	Satisfactory		1	
	M Earth and Environment	Satisfactory		1	
	M Food Quality Management	Good		1	
	M Food Safety	Good		1	
	M Food Technology	Good		1	
	M Forest and Nature Conservation	Good		1	
	M Geo-information Science	Good		1	
	M International Development Studies	Satisfactory		1	
	M International Land- and Water Management	Good		1	
	M Landscape, Architecture and Planning	Good		1	
	M Leisure, Tourism and Environment	Good		1	
	M Management, Economics and Consumer Studies	Good		1	
	M Molecular Life Sciences	Good		1	
	M Nutrition and Health	Good		1	
	M Organic Agriculture	Good		1	
M Plant Biotechnology	Satisfactory		1		
M Plant Sciences	Good		1		

2014	B Environmental Sciences	Satisfactory	1
	M Environmental Sciences	Satisfactory	1
	M Urban Environmental Management	Satisfactory	1
2016	B Biology	Good	1
	M Aquaculture and Marine Resource Management	Satisfactory	1
	M Biology	Good	1
Final total			41

Initial Accreditation (new academic programmes)

Year of decision	Name academic programme	Final total and decision	Comments	Total
2013	M Water Technology (joint degree)	Satisfactory		1
2016	Application withdrawn			1
Final total				2

Table contains data until 12 June 2017.

Appendix 3 – Visit Programme

Day 1 – Monday 29 January 2018

Location: ATLAS building, WUR Campus

10.30 Preparatory panel meeting

13.30 Presentation about the organisation structure and quality assurance

- Prof. dr. Arthur Mol, Rector Magnificus
- Prof. dr. ir. Arnold Bregt, Dean of Education
- Dr. Frank Bakema, Manager Department Education and Student Affairs (ESA)

14.00 Meeting Wageningen University – open session

- Prof. dr. Arthur Mol, welcome
- Dr. ir. Ernst van den Ende, How the Netherlands Feeds the World pitch
- Ms. Jurwitha Nirmala Sari, student experience
- Prof. dr. Sander Koenraad, mosquito radar project pitch

14.45 Executive Board

- Prof. dr. ir. Louise Fresco, chair Executive Board
- Prof. dr. Arthur Mol, Rector Magnificus
- Rens Buchwaldt MBA, member Executive Board

15.45 Standard 1: Vision and policy

- Prof. dr. Arthur Mol, Rector Magnificus
- Prof. dr. ir. Jan van Tatenhove, member Programme Board
- Prof. dr. Bas Zwaan, former member Programme Board
- Dr. ir. Hank Bartelink, external stakeholder, Director Landschappen NL
- Dr. ir. Karin Horsman, programme manager, Corporate Strategy & Accounts (CSA)
- Ir. Eva Verschoor, policy advisor CSA

17.30 Supervisory Board

- Prof. mr Job Cohen, chair Supervisory Board
- Prof. dr. ir. Siem Corver, member Supervisory Board
- Ir. Mariënne Verhoef, member Supervisory Board

18.30 Transfer to hotel

19.00 Open consultation with stakeholders

Day 2 – Tuesday 30 January 2018

Location: ATLAS building, WUR Campus

08.15 Breakfast session with students

- Arno Traa, master Nutrition and Health
- Teun Brandhoff, bachelor Landscape Architecture and planning
- Katinka Blom, bachelor Nutrition and Health
- Britt Besemer, bachelor Biology, Chair study association Biologica
- Wout Blankenstijn, bachelor Environmental Sciences, study association Aktief Slip

- Hanna van den Heuvel, bachelor Communication and Life Sciences, Ipso Facto
- Manon de Visser, master Biology, assessment tenure track candidates
- Sjoerd van Dongen, master Molecular Life Sciences, honours programme
- Thalisa Slier, master Earth and Environment, internship project
- Erna Jonsdottir, student master Food Safety, Iceland
- Lea Norena Ilgeroth, student master Organic Agriculture
- Paulina Schmitz, master Leisure, Tourism and Environment, Germany
- Gijs Eijgenraan, bachelor Bodem Wateratmosfeer

09.15 Internal panel meeting

10.15 Standard 2: Implementation

- Prof. Bert Holtslag, member Programme Board
- Dr. Brank Bakema, manager ESA
- Dr. Anja Kuipers, Programme Director
- Dr. ir. Otto Hospes, member Programme Committee
- Dr. ir. Thomas Lans, coordinator master track Entrepreneurship
- Ir. Ruur Boersma, student dean ESA
- Ir. Marca Gresnigt, trainer University Teaching Qualification and assessments, ESA
- Ir. Joris Fortuin, Head Integrated facility management

11.45 Standard 3: Evaluation and monitoring

- Ir. Rolf Martijn, Programme Director
- Ir. Stijn Heukels, policy advisor ESA
- Douwe van der Leest, student member Programme Board
- Dr. Harm Biemans, chair Education and Competence Studies
- Dr. Milena Holmgren, member Programme Committee
- Ir. Coco van der Wolk, policy advisor ESA
- Drs. Peter Haring, member External Advisory Committee

13.00 Internal panel meeting + lunch

14.30 Standard 4: Development

- Prof. dr. ir. Arnold Bregt, Dean of Education
- Tessa Canoy, student member Programme Board
- Ir. Jan Philipsen, Programme Director
- Dr. ir. Arend Ligtenberg, member Programme Committee
- Dr. Jet Vervoort, lecturer
- Prof. dr. ir. Huub Savelkoul, chair holder
- Ellen Torfs, Educational consultant and trainer ESA
- Ir. Meike Sauter, policy advisor CSA

16.00 Executive Board, Dean of Education & Programme Board

- Prof. dr. Arthur Mol, Rector Magnificus
- Prof. dr. ir. Arnold Bregt, Dean of Education
- Prof. dr. ir. Harry Bitter, member Programme Board
- Prof. dr. ir. Hans Komen, member Programme Board
- Prof. dr. Bert Holtslag, member Programme Board
- Prof. dr. ir. Jan van Tatenhove, member Programme Board

17.00 Internal panel meeting

Day 3 – Wednesday 31 January 2018

Location: LUMEN building, WUR Campus

08.30 Preliminary feedback exploratory visit

- Prof. dr. Arthur Mol, Rector Magnificus
- Prof. dr. ir. Arnold Bregt, Dean of Education
- Dr. Frank Bakema, Manager ESA
- Ir. Eva Verschoor, Policy advisor CSA
- Ir. Coco van der Wolk, Policy advisor ESA

Past performance trail: Internal quality assurance

09.00 Internal panel meeting

Study programmes Bachelor and master International Land and Water Management

10.00 Management

- Ir. Erik Heijmans, Programme Director
- Prof. dr. Bert Holtslag, member Programme Board, Professor
- Prof. dr. Fulco Ludwig, member Programme Committee, Professor
- Dr. ir. Jeroen Vos, member programme Committee, associate Professor
- Maria-Franca Dekkers, master student, member Programme Committee
- Ir. Mieke Hulshof, member External Advisory Committee

10.45 Staff

- Didi Stoltenborg MSc, study advisor
- Prof. dr. Carolien Kroeze, chair holder
- Prof. dr. ir. Petra Hellegers, chair holder
- Dr. ir. Pieter van Oel, assistant professor
- Dr. ir. Erik van Slobbe, associate professor
- Dr. Jerry Maroulis, lecturer
- Ir. Bert Bruins, lecturer and study advisor

11.45 Students and alumna

- Anne Oerlemans, bachelor student, member Programme Board
- Ron Bruijns, bachelor student, member Programme Committee
- Pippi van Ommen, master student
- Lina Dilly, master student, Germany
- Kas Blok, master student, chair study association NITOCRA
- Ir. Jessica van Grootveld, alumna 2016

12.45 Examining Board Environment and Landscape

- Dr. ir. Ron van Lammeren, chair
- Dr. Sophie Rickebusch, secretary
- Dr. ir. Henk Ritzema, member
- Dr. ir. Pieter van der Meer, external member

13.15 Internal panel meeting + lunch

Study programmes Bachelor and master Animal Sciences

14.30 Attending a Programme Committee meeting

15.30 Management

- Prof. dr. ir. Hans Komen, member Programme Board
- Dr. ir. Rene Kwakkel, Programme Director
- Prof. dr. ir. Jaap Keijer, chair Programme Committee, chair holder
- Alyssa van der Linden, bachelor student, member Prog.Cttee and study association
- Ir. Jan-Paul Wagenaar, member External Advisory Board
- Prof. dr. ir. Gerdien van Schaik, member External Advisory Board

16.30 Staff

- Dr. Inge Palm-van Oosten, study advisor and lecturer
- Prof. dr. Martien Groenen, professor
- Dr. ir. Guido Bosch, assistant professor
- Dr. ir. Herman Mulder, associate professor
- Prof. dr. ir. Marc Naguib, chair holder
- Dr. Maria Forlenza, assistant professor

17.30 Students and alumnus

- Lars van de Bovenkamp, master student, chair study association
- Anne van Wijk, master student, member Prog. Cttee and study association
- Ilaria Minussi, master student, Italy
- Abby-Ann Redman, master student double degree, Canada
- Tsuyoshi Tadano, master student, Japan
- Ir. Emily Frehen-van Calmhoudt, alumna 2012

18.15 internal panel meeting

Day 4 – Thursday 1 February 2018

Location: ORION building, WUR Campus

Audit trail: Growth

08.45 Internal panel meeting

09.45 Management

- Prof. dr. ir. Arnold Bregt, Dean of Education
- Dr. Raoul Bino, Managing Director Science Group
- Drs. Ingrid Lammerse, Corporate Director Human Resources
- Ir. Tjitske Geertsema, PhD student, member Student Staff Council
- Drs. Sylvie Deenen, Director Idealis student housing
- Wim Verhagen, student member Programme Board
- Ir. Joris Fortuin, Head Integrated facility management

10.45 Staff

- Ir. Rolf Marteijn, Programme Director
- Dr. ir. Rudi van Etteger, member Programme Committee
- Dr. ir. Julia Diederens, lecturer
- Ir. Saskia Burgers, lecturer
- Prof. dr. ir. Niels Anten, Professor
- Ir. Fred Jonker, Policy advisor scheduling ESA
- Ir. Eva Verschoor, Policy advisor CSA
- Ir. Rob Verhagen, External Advisory Board

11.45 Students

- Steven Kerssies, bachelor Biotechnology, member Programme Committee
- Lars Spekschoor, bachelor Biology
- Melanie Koumendea, master Forest and Nature Conservation, Greece
- Jaap Kerr, member Student Council 2017-2018
- Jan van der Pol, member student Council 2017-2018

12.30 Staff and student council

- Jaap Kerr, member Student Council 2017-2018
- Jan van der Pol, member student Council 2017-2018
- Guido Camps, PhD student, member Student Staff Council
- Ir. Tjitske Geertsema, PhD student, member Student Staff Council

13.00 Internal panel meeting + lunch

Audit trail: Innovation in Education

14.00 Management

- Prof. dr. Jan van Tatenhove, member Programme Board
- Dr. Anja Kuipers, Programme Director online master Plant Sciences
- Dr. Frank Bakema, Manager ESA
- Prof. dr. ir. Lisette de Groot, Professor, Chair Examining Board
- Prof. dr. Ellis Hoffland, Director Honours programme
- Prof. dr. Perry den Brok, Chair holder Education and Competence Studies

14.45 Staff

- Dr. ir. Arnold Moene, Associate professor, developer thesis rubric
- Dr. ir. Arjen Schots, Associate professor
- Prof. dr. ir. Gert Spaargaren, Professor
- Ir. Carlijn Wentink, lecturer
- Dr. ir. Cora Busstra, lecture and education developer
- Dr. ir. Lammert Kooistra, Associate professor
- Ilse Markensteijn MSc, project manager Education Project Services ESA

15.45 Students

- Marijn Hooghiem, master student, member Programme Committee
- Tessa Schoones, master, evaluating knowledge clips
- Gijs Lysen, bachelor graduate, now MSc Business Administration at VU
- Jeffrey Verhoeff, master student and teaching assistant
- Simone Loohuizen MSc, alumna 2015
- Marijn Ton, bachelor student, Honours Programme
- Christina Kothes, student online master, Germany

Location: IMPULSE building, WUR campus

Audit trail: Sustainability

16.30 Internal panel meeting

17.30 Management

- Dr. ir. Sonja Isken, Programme Director
- Ir. Joris Fortuin, Head Integrated facility management
- Ir. Eva Verschoor, Policy advisor CSA
- Mark van der Poel, Chair RUW Foundation

- Ir. Jan Karel Mak, Ambassador WUR, CEO Deerns Groep BV
- Marc Lamers, Director Corporate communications & marketing

18.15 Staff

- Dr. ir. Ignas Heitkönig, Assistant professor
- Dr. ir. Sietze Vellema, Associate professor
- Ir. Janine Quist, Programme manager Wageningen Academy
- Dr. Stefan Wahlen, Assistant professor, Academic Consultancy Training, Germany
- Ir. Erna Maters, policy advisor CSR
- Drs. Angela Lewis, Education Innovation Coordinator, Studium Generale
- Prof. dr. Bas Arts, chair holder
- Ir. Jelle Maas, senior advisor SDG, Corporate communications & marketing

19.15 Students and alumna

- Marta Egers, Coordinator Green Office
- Joar Nilssen, master student, entrepreneur Tiny Foods
- Chris Berendsen, bachelor student
- Natalia Giner Laguarda, iGem Team 2017, Spain
- Isa Vroom, bachelor student, member Student Council
- Sanne Evers, alumna 2013, trainer and project leader Moviera
- Machteld Vergouw, master student

20.00 Internal panel meeting

Day 5 – Friday 2 February 2018

Location: FORUM building, WUR campus

08.30 Internal panel meeting

Audit trail: Internationalisation

10.00 Policy plans, governance and support

- Prof. dr. ir. Arnold Bregt, Dean of Education
- Prof. dr. ir. Harry Bitter, member Programme Board
- Dr. ir. Ralf Hartemink, Programme Director
- Ir. Nynke Post Uiterweer, Policy advisor ESA
- Jeroen Ouburg, Policy advisor international relations CSA
- Dr. Ingrid Lammerse, Corporate Director Human Resources
- Drs. Janneke Hermans, Team coordinator International Student Support and Finance

11.00 Implementation and enhancement

- Dr. ir. Karen Fortuin, Chair Programme Committee
- Drs. Marjo Lexmond, Programme Director
- Ir. Dine Brinkman, lecturer intercultural skills
- Prof. Dr. Ken Giller, chair holder
- Drs. Astrid van den Heuvel, policy officer International Community
- Ir. Renske van Dijk, international recruitment officer
- Drs. Sylvia van der Weerden, Head of Wageningen in'to Languages

12.00 Students and alumnus

- Philomena Darku, master student, chair ISOW, Ghana

- Sanne Knoppers, master student, Introduction Days
- Nina Zaadnoordijk, master student, Chair IxESN
- Koen Manusama, research assistant, Sport Association Thymos
- Amit Choudhary, master student, member Student Council, India
- Floor van Elsacker, master student, member Programme Committee
- Santiago Rodas, alumnus 2012, PhD student, Ecuador
- Sanchali Bose, master student, India

12.45 Internal panel meeting + lunch

15.30 Executive Board, Dean of Education and Manager ESA

- Prof. dr. Arthur Mol, Rector Magnificus
- Rens Buchwaldt MBA, member Executive Board
- Prof. dr. ir. Arnold Bregt, Dean of Education
- Dr. Frank Bakema, Manager ESA

16.00 Final panel meeting

17.00 Plenary feedback

17.30 End of site visit

Appendix 4 – Documents

Basic documents

- Self-Evaluation Institutional Audit 2018 Wageningen University, August 2017
- Vision for Education, Wageningen University & Research, 2017
- Strategic Plan 2015-2018, Wageningen UR
- Education assessment policy, Wageningen University, December 2017
- Education quality assurance and enhancement. Policy and System, October 2017
- Quality Culture at Wageningen University, KBA Nijmegen, July 2017
- Education Governance at WUR, presentation Rector Magnificus

Additional documents

- Policy document for students with disabilities, April 2017
- “Studeren met een handicap”, Gebruikerstoets 2016, C.H.O.I. Leiden, 2016
- Quality assurance Dashboard Education, ESA, January 2018
- Factsheets National Student Survey 2016 and 2017
- Report on the profile and performance agreements, June 2014
- Kritische Prestatie Indicatoren Strategisch Plan 2015-2018, Rapportage 2016
- HR Rapportage Q4 2017
- Tenure Track development: overview of different career stages

Audit trail past performance

- Recommendations accreditation MSc Plant Biotechnology: actions and reflections
- Materials related to Programme Committee meeting Animal Sciences Group
- Summary judgement of previous accreditation BIL/MIL programmes
- Actions taken following accreditation report BIL/MIL programmes

Audit trail Sustainability (specific aspect)

- Sustainability in education and research, Self-evaluation report - appendix 5

Audit trail Internationalisation (CeQuInt)

- Internationalisation, Self-evaluation report - appendix 4

Appendix 5 – Abbreviations

ba	bachelor's degree
BSA	binding recommendation on the continuation of studies (Bindend Studie Advies)
EB	Executive Board
EC	European credit point
ESG	European Standards and Guidelines
hbo	professional higher education (hoger beroepsonderwijs)
ma	master's degree
NVAO	Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders
OCW	Education, Culture and Science (Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap)
OER	Teaching and examination regulations (xxx)
PDCA	Plan, Do, Check, Act
SER	Self-Evaluation Report
SSC	Staff and Student Council
WUR	Wageningen University & Research



NVAO

The carefully established independent judgment by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) strengthens higher education institutions in their quality culture. On the basis of the judgments of NVAO higher education programmes are recognized and students receive a legally recognized degree. NVAO is a binational organisation and works together internationally.

NVAO. Confidence in Quality.

Colophon

Wageningen University
Institutional Audit
Advisory Report

16 March 2018
Composition: NVAO Department The Netherlands

NVAO
Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and
Flanders
Parkstraat 28/2514 JK The Hague
Postbus 85498/2508 CD The Hague
The Netherlands
T 31 70 312 23 00
E info@nvao.net

www.nvao.net