

WP 9 National reports Stakeholders and Quality

CHEPS

The Netherlands

Template of a WP9 National Report

1. Introduction
2. Methodology
3. Findings

Question 1: *What are the national rules that govern higher education institutions' inclusion or exclusion of stakeholders in/from decision-making or advisory bodies that have a say about quality-relevant issues and have they changed in the past five years? If so, which stakeholders, which bodies, which numbers/proportions of total members?*

- answering the question + analysis of similarities and differences between the four cases.

Template of a WP9 National Report

Question 2: *What are the institutional rules that govern higher education institutions' inclusion or exclusion of stakeholders in/from decision-making or advisory bodies that have a say about quality-relevant issues and have they changed in the past five years? If so, which stakeholders, which bodies, which numbers/proportions of total members.*

- answering the question + analysis of similarities and differences between the four cases

Question 3: *What is nominal and real stakeholder's representation in institutional decision-making bodies? Has it changed and why?*

- answering the question + analysis of similarities and differences between the four cases.

Template of a WP9 National Report

Question 4: *Do different units in the institution (faculties) or programmes have stakeholder representation on decision-making or advisory bodies that have a say about quality-relevant issues, beyond what is prescribed? If so, which stakeholders, which bodies, which numbers/proportions of total membership?*

- answering the question + analysis of similarities and differences between the four cases.

Question 5: *To what extent are stakeholder's views (and from which stakeholders?) taken into account and why?*

- answering the question + analysis of similarities and differences between the four cases.


Question 6: *Are stakeholder viewpoints filtering into the standard undergraduate curriculum and requirements*

- answering the question + analysis of similarities and differences between the four cases.

4. Conclusions


- Summary of findings (answers to the questions)
- Identification of barriers (European, national, institutional levels) and institutional good practices
- Recommendations for institutional managers and for policy makers

5. References



Timeline of WP 9

Partners	Submission of national reports WP9	1 September 2012	Send the national reports to Liudvika
CHEPS	Contacting partners for clarifications and revisions	27 September 2012	Liudvika sends comments to partners
Partners	Revisions/answers to the questions	5 October 2012	Send the answers to Liudvika
CHEPS	Comparative report sent out for feedback	30 October 2012	Report sent out to a partners
Partners	Sending the feedback on comparative report to CHEPS	7 November 2012	Feedback on comparative report sent to Liudvika
CHEPS	Final WP9 comparative report	15 November 2012	Final report sent to project coordinators



For more information and questions contact

Liudvika: l.leisyte@utwente.nl