

Supervision Vision, Supervision Framework, and Assessment Framework Supervisory Board HZ

Table of contents

- 1 Introduction
- 2 Supervision Vision
- 3 Supervision Framework
- 4 Assessment Framework

Enacted by the Supervisory Board on: 16 March 2015

To be published on the website of HZ: Supervision Vision, Supervision Framework, and Assessment Framework of the Supervisory Board HZ

1 Introduction

The updated Sector Code Good Governance Universities of Applied Sciences (2013) provides, among other things, that the Supervisory Board explains its assessment framework and publishes it on the website of the university of applied sciences. The assessment framework must of course be based on the vision and supervision framework of the board.

2 Supervision Vision

The Supervisory Board of HZ monitors the Executive Board, acts as employer, and advises the Executive Board. The principle being that the Executive Board provides management as statutory management while being internally accountable to the Supervisory Board and externally to bodies who are statutorily and socially legitimised as such. Within the framework of its own social responsibility, the Supervisory Board hereby explains its vision of supervision, the supervision framework, and the assessment framework.

The core value of the management philosophy of HZ for the internal supervision is 'partnership'. That means that the Supervisory Board does not simply follow but also acts proactively, while respecting the managerial responsibility of the Executive Board as competent authority. The Supervisory Board is involved in the strategy development at an early stage and formulates the relevant performance and assessment criteria as assessment framework for the Executive Board, those criteria of course being derived from the management philosophy and that Institutional Plan HZ 2013-2017.

The Supervisory Board adapts the performance of its supervisory duties to the specific situation of the university of applied sciences at any given time. In situations that pose particular risks, for example, it

may be necessary to intensify the supervision. In doing so, the Supervisory Board primarily promotes and supports the Executive Board to ensure it remains properly in control.

The Supervisory Board functions from a social perspective and sees to it that the socially desirable objectives of the university of applied sciences are translated into contemporary quality of education, applied research, and relevant knowledge valorisation. Healthy management is a prerequisite for this. The Supervisory Board sets itself the ambition of adding value to the proper functioning of the university of applied sciences in terms of outcomes and engagement of external stakeholders, and to the proper collaboration with the Executive Board. Good interplay with the Executive Board also means good counterplay.

3 Supervision Framework

Supervision framework means the formal and social frameworks for proper supervision, as specified by the Supervisory Board itself.

The Supervisory Board follows the governance principles and governance requirements as set out in the Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek (WHW, Dutch Higher Education and Scientific Research Act) and the Branchecode goed bestuur hogescholen (okt 2013, Sectoral Code Good Governance in Universities of Applied Sciences). The Supervisory Board sees to it that the Executive Board also acts in accordance with the law and the sector code.

The Supervisory Board and the Executive Board have detailed the formal governance requirements in articles of incorporation and regulations Supervisory Board and Executive Board. These are publicly accessible via the website of the university of applied sciences. The articles of incorporation set out which management decisions require the approval of the Supervisory Board and which decisions fall within the independent authority of the Supervisory Board (such as the appointment of the accountant). Where the Supervisory Board gives approval, this may also have a proactive character. As such, it is not just 'formal approval in hindsight' but an 'approval under conditions', which means that- as previously stated, situationally - high-risk dossiers in particular are monitored so that timely course correction is possible.

In its working method, the Supervisory Board safeguards, in dialogue with the Executive Board, the current, timely, and relevant information provision via the regular, formal channels and documents, via more informal work methods and meetings, and via sources other than the Executive Board. The Executive Board is informed of any developments at an early stage. The Supervisory Board shall determine an information protocol in consultation with the Executive Board. The Supervisory Board meets regularly, four to five times per year. In addition, there shall be themed strategy meetings and various informal contact moments with academics, services, and students in the organisation. The Supervisory Board shall confer with the University Council (representation) twice per year. Both the Supervisory Board and the University Council can put items on the agenda for these meetings. There is annual contact with the external accountant. In special circumstances, impartial advice from third parties may be obtained.

For in-depth supervision but also as sounding board, the Supervisory Board has the following Committees: Audit Committee, Committee Quality Care Education, Practice-Oriented Research and Valorisation, and a Selection and Remuneration Committee. The work method is set out in regulations.

The basic test for the Supervisory Board is the assessment whether the Executive Board is 'in control'. This is given to mean that the management of the university of applied sciences is on course for achieving the strategic objectives and that the risks are being adequately managed. Which is not to say that the Supervisory Board checks everything itself (which would not be feasible). It does mean that the Supervisory Board sees to it that performance responsibility is realised - as decentralised as possible - in accordance with the management philosophy and within the frameworks of the Institution Plan HZ 2013-2017.

Besides risk management, 'soft controls' are also part of the supervision framework. This is given to include matters such as: are activities conducted with integrity, is the management of the university of applied sciences based on trust in employees, is there engagement and enthusiasm towards students.

The functioning of the Executive Board is assessed annually, both collectively and individually, in accordance with a set format or assessment framework. As part of this, information may be requested from the University Council and the management level under the board.

With regard to its own functioning, the Supervisory Board maintains a Rota of Resignations in accordance with the sector code. The articles of association state that the Supervisory Board consists of a minimum of five and a maximum of seven members. The Supervisory Board currently consists of six members. There is a general profile for the Supervisory Board. Impartiality, diversity, complementarity, and expertise (about substance and supervision) take prominent places in that profile. As for specific profiles for individual members of the Supervisory Board, the main focus is diversity of expertise. Both educational expertise and experience, and expertise and experience in business operations, as experience in the field of origin (government and business), are part of this.

The Supervisory Board operates in a team-oriented manner, with dissent, both within the Supervisory Board and in discussion with the Executive Board, are seen as a healthy indicator.

The Supervisory Board annually evaluates its own functioning and multi-annually evaluates under external guidance. Annually, in the annual report of the university of applied sciences, the Supervisory Board offers insight into its functioning.

4 Assessment Framework

The vision set out above and the general supervision framework can be translated into an assessment framework of concrete results, based on the ambitions and strategy of the university of applied sciences. Here, the primary social objective is to educate good professionals, and the level of research and knowledge valorisation for the professional practice. The strategy as set out in the Institutional Plan HZ 2013-2017 is guiding for the assessment framework.

The assessment framework is operationalised towards quality of education and research, engagement of students, professional development of employees, leadership of and efficacy of collaboration in the Executive Board, engagement of the professional field (companies and traineeships) and other stakeholders, target realisation (results), risks, and of course sound management.

The operationalising towards performance indicators in these areas is quantified and qualified and comprises both results and (desired) processes, in connection with the aforementioned primary objectives. The indicators concern the efficacy, productivity, professionalism, and efficiency of the management and the reputation of the HZ in several areas. Of course, the indicators may evolve over time.

The Supervisory Board is aware that in the formulation of concrete performance indicators (results) it must be ensured that they align with the HZ Institutional Plan 2013-2017 and do not stand alone, or form objectives in themselves.

But however important and useful those indicators might be, they never reflect the ambition and reality the HZ is committed to: a learning and working community that places co-creation with students, with employees, and with external partners at the centre. That too - or that especially - is essential in the assessment framework.