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1. Introduction, Goal & Structure

The Groningen Declaration has been established in April 2012 with the aim of fostering the exchange of digital student data. In this context, data means all documents that are currently available at national student clearinghouses, including but not limited to personalia, and diplomas from secondary as well as higher education. Underlying objective is to give students, graduates, and (potential) employers’ access to authentic data concerning an applicant’s educational background. Lowering informational barriers and differences as well as standardizing procedures contribute to the free movement of labor and could increase staff and student mobility.

The Groningen Declaration faces challenges in terms of conceptualizing the project, convincing new parties to participate, and therefore ultimately with realizing its goals. For that reason, the Groningen Declaration’s leadership initially asked the Careers Company to construct a business case based on existing information, projects and pilots, that should in particular focus on persuading universities to participate by means of elaborating on potential benefits. However, our student team has been granted some degree of freedom in the methodology, as long as it contributes to conceptualizing the project, convincing new parties to participate, and realizing the goals of the Groningen Declaration.

In our opinion, we have to go one step back and check, based on academic literature what the most feasible approach is for achieving the purposes mentioned. Developing a powerful business case is only possible when all stakeholders involved and the relationships among them are clear. We could not suggest who should do what without knowing who is part of the Declaration’s ecosystem first. Moreover, we cannot suggest what man should do before the actual challenges are identified.

Reducing negative externalities, defining criteria for future development, and creating commitment by stakeholders or within the developing team, can be done by means of carrying out a stakeholder analysis (Vos and Achterkamp, 2004). Motives for participating in, or contributing to the Groningen Declaration can be identified in a stakeholder analysis as well. Moreover, a stakeholder analysis allows for grouping stakeholders together, with which potential signatories can identify themselves. Such identification helps a potential participant to become aware of potential benefits stemming from the Declaration, which increases the likelihood of attracting new partners. From the perspective of those already involved in the Groningen Declaration, this helps achieving the Declaration’s goals. A stakeholder analysis therefore is an appropriate and essential element in a business case.

This research report about the Groningen Declaration has been written for the master course Business Research & Consulting at the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Groningen. The principals are Luut Kroes, the University of Groningen’s Director of Education and Students, and Herman de Leeuw from Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs [DUO], who is Secretary of the Groningen Declaration. Joanna Gusc and Gert Haanstra have provided academic guidance. The student team that carries out the research consists of four master-degree students with different educational backgrounds. The study conducted can be viewed as explorative.

The remainder of this report is structured as follows. The Organization Advice Report, that comprises analysis and recommendations for our principals, constitutes chapter 2. In chapter 3, our principals reflect on our research process. The fourth chapter consists of the slides that highlight the most important findings and recommendations, and that were used to present our work to the principals. In chapter 5 we reflect scientifically on our research set-up and dive deeper into some elements that shape the ecosystem of the Groningen Declaration, namely stakeholders and cultural factors. Moreover, that chapter provides suggestions for future research and identifies limitations of our study. In chapter 6 we reflect on the research process, what we have learned, and what skills are emerging. Chapter 7 is the list of references and chapter 8 is on accountability.

We conclude by providing several appendices from chapter 9 on, including a list of interviewees and interview questions. Additional information and data is available upon request.
2. Organization Advice Report

2.1 Problem Statement

As is written in the introduction, the Groningen Declaration faces challenges in terms of conceptualizing the project, convincing new parties to truly participate, and therefore ultimately with realizing its goals. For that reason, the Groningen Declaration’s leadership asked the Faculty of Economics and Business’ Careers Company to develop a business case for the Groningen Declaration that can be used to bind and draw together new parties to the Groningen Declaration Network and contributes concrete solutions for implementing the Declarations’ aims.

Parties can become involved with the Groningen Declaration by signing the Memorandum of Understanding [MOU]. That is a charming way of signaling that a party agrees with the aims and objectives that are set in the Declaration. The drawback of that approach is that just agreeing with what is in the Declaration does not put any obligation to actually contribute to realizing those aims.

The Groningen Declaration is an extensive project that needs support from a wide range of parties before it can become successful. We have to investigate what actually drives stakeholders in their decision to sign or not to sign, and to contribute or not to contribute to the project. Our research therefore focuses on gaining a better understanding about the position of the involved parties in the Groningen Declaration. As such, it is the very first element in the larger business case that DUO and the University of Groningen have requested the Careers Company to develop. Since we are the initial group that starts working on this issue, we need to identify first the parties that are involved in the Groningen Declaration. Explorative research is the method that best serves that purpose. In order to define where to begin, we need an instrument for identifying stakeholders first. After identification we can categorize stakeholders and assign specific roles to them. The reason for this is because we need a framework that (1) guides us in analyzing the stakeholders and their interconnectedness, (2) allows us to tailor questions to specific stakeholder groups, and (3) ensures a certain information threshold is reached and until saturation of information has been achieved.

2.2 Research Plan and Methodology

The Groningen Declaration was established in 2012 and is ‘work in progress’. Every year new parties join the Declaration by signing the MOU. The Groningen Declaration can be seen as an innovative process containing different phases in which the roles stakeholders have could change. As such, it can be seen as dynamic.

In the academic literature, several authors have developed instruments for identifying and classifying stakeholders. Following Vos and Achterkamp (2004), an instrument for identifying and classifying stakeholders must comply with three prerequisites. First, the instrument must be usable within a specific context. Second, the dynamic circumstances of an innovation process have to be incorporated in the stakeholder analysis. Third and finally, the instrument should pay attention to passively involved stakeholders, which are stakeholders that are affected by the outcomes of an innovation but do not have an active role in the design and implementation of the innovation themselves.

The Declaration itself defines as its main stakeholders “more (...) than just the digital student data depositories themselves. These (...) include, of course, first and foremost the students themselves; then education institutions at the primary, secondary and tertiary level; national ministries of education; employers; and so forth.”

1 http://www.groningendeclaration.org/media/groningen-declaration-text
In its 2014 Annual Meeting, the Groningen Declaration has defined its Digital Student Data Ecosystem as, “an ecosystem that so far escaped identification, in spite of the wide and varied use of digital student data and their impact on society”. Parties that are part of the ecosystem are educational planners, educational statisticians, funding agencies, administrators of central student data depositories, examination boards, educational testing services, HEIs, and admissions officers and registrars. However, the stakeholder page at the Groningen Declaration’s website further states the ecosystem puts the learners in the center. Starting from learners, the ecosystem would therefore include the wider world of further education, credential evaluation services, agencies dealing with academic and professional recognition, associations in the field of internationalization of (higher) education, the labor market and employers, consular services, and immigration services. That is, in short all “agents that come into play when dealing with cross border human capital mobility”.

Whereas the initial definition of stakeholders was quite narrow and concrete, with defining an ecosystem that takes learners as a point of departure, and ends with “agents that come into play when dealing with cross border human capital mobility”, the scope of the Groningen Declaration has definitely widened over time. Therefore, managing the project becomes more and more complex.

A clear distinction can be made between stakeholders that are concerned with the Groningen Declaration in a technical way, versus those stakeholders that support its objectives for other reasons (for example, to increase internationalization in higher education, or reduce overhead). Therefore, we expect that stakeholders can be assigned different roles, and that different stakeholders have different motives for contributing to the project. The same reasoning applies to perceived benefits, which also depend on the role a stakeholder serves.

As is outlined in the introduction, our stakeholder analysis follows an explorative approach. We decided to start from scratch and not to take the stakeholders as identified by the Groningen Declaration for granted, despite we take ‘learners’ (students) as our point of departure. Although we expect there is hierarchy between stakeholders, in our research we analyze them separately first (i.e. from their ‘own’ perspective and relationship with the Groningen Declaration) for two reasons. First, we assume that potential signatories of the Groningen Declaration compare themselves with parties that have already signed the Declaration. More specifically, they particularly familiarize themselves with benefits and costs as identified by parties involved that are most similar to their own. Second, we expect that if hierarchy is relevant for the design and implementation of the Groningen Declaration’s outcomes this come to light during the research process.

While taking students as point of departure, we can scale up to other parties that have a relationship with (digital) student data. Students study at universities, who keep track on and record a student’s performance. Universities are, according to the Higher Education and Research Act [in Dutch: Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek] structured in faculties and supporting services. These faculties and supporting services are both part of the same hierarchical level and fall directly under the responsibility and authority of the Board of the University, although the supporting services provide university-wide services.

Faculties have a duty to provide education and do research, supporting services support these two and take care of management. Universities inform the Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs [DUO] – that is the executive agency for educational affairs of the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science – about degrees they award for two reasons. First, degree information of individual students in the national Diplomaregister is managed by DUO. Second, universities need to inform DUO about the

---

2 HEI is an abbreviation of Higher Education Institutions
3 http://www.groningendeclaration.org/target-stakeholders-0
4 http://wetten.overheid.nl/BWBR0005682
number of enrolled students and granted degrees for reasons of funding. Both universities (at faculty, as well as university level) and DUO thus have a relationship with the exchange of digital student data. Scaling up above the national level then becomes problematic, given that no exchange of data takes place at a European or worldwide scale. The mere existence of the Groningen Declaration can be derived from this discrepancy.

For that reason, our research focuses on four levels of involvement, which are (1) the country level, (2) the university level, (3) the faculty level, and (4) the student level. Given the distinction between active and passive stakeholders as identified by Ulrich (1983) and Freeman (1984), we expect the country and university level to be actively involved. The faculty and student level are likely to be passively involved. Our motivation for these propositions is that national institutions and universities have financial means to achieve the goals of the Groningen Declaration, as well as the freedom to decide whether to spend money on the Groningen Declaration or not. Therefore, it is likely that the national and university level have a say in the design and implementation of the Declaration. On the other hand, faculties and students might benefit from (are affected by) the outcomes of the Declaration (i.e. improved data exchange) but do not bear the costs associated with the innovation. That also underlines again the need to categorize stakeholders and assign roles to them.

Our further expectations are that stakeholder roles at least differ between levels, but probably also within a level. That depends on someone’s responsibilities, the phase of adoption of the Groningen Declaration, and probably also on the potentially arbitrary distribution of tasks and responsibilities within institutions.

2.2.1 Country Level
At the country level, the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science is legislator on behalf of the Dutch government. Part of the Ministry is DUO, who is inter alia responsible for the degree certificate register (Diplomaregister) and providing National Student Aid (Studiefinanciering). For its information, DUO is dependent on students, educational institutions, and other governmental services (for example, the tax authority Belastingdienst). In the context of the Groningen Declaration, DUO is the initiator of the process on behalf of the Dutch government. In terms of Vos and Achterkamp (2004) typology, DUO serves the role of Decision Maker (via legislation, communication, and mediation) as well as Designer (by contributing expertise, for example by means of the Diplomaregister).

2.2.2 University Level
At the University Level, we distinguish between the Office of the University (inter alia responsible for comprehensive educational policy, legal affairs, and Student Information and Administration, including printing diplomas) and the Center for Information Technology (responsible for the technical part of the Student Information System, as well as for Educational Support and Innovation). We differentiate because the Groningen Declaration is an administrative project that has IT elements as well. In our analysis, we could therefore elaborate on the role of IT as an ‘enabler’ of innovation and value (cf. Wilkin and Chenhall, 2010) or as facilitator for administrative processes. With regard to the role universities play in the context of the Groningen Declaration, we expect them to be both client and designer. Client because they are not the initiator of the project but could benefit from its outcomes, and designer because they can contribute expertise and thereby help succeed the project.

---

5 https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/financiering-onderwijs/inhoud/financiering-hoger-onderwijs
2.2.3 Faculty Level
Within the Dutch educational system, faculties are solely responsible for providing education and doing research. Given the objective of the Groningen Declaration, in this research project we focus on their educational role. By providing education and examination, students are guided towards their diplomas. Faculties have the duty to register educational data and store that data in a safe environment. Faculties are therefore providers of information from the perspective of the Groningen Declaration. In Vos and Achterkamp (2004) terminology, the role of faculties is most close to that of designers. However, given the organizational structure of universities, faculties (for example admission offices) can also be seen as clients as their workload is reduced by smoothened exchange of data.

2.2.4 Student Level (including recent graduates)
Ex ante, we expect students and recent graduates to be the core clients of the Groningen Declaration according to the client definition of Vos and Achterkamp (2004), being it passive clients. The motivation for students being clients is because the objective of sharing their diplomas worldwide can serve their career paths and makes applications for further education more easy. Given the student being the ultimate beneficiary of the Groningen Declaration project, and the stakeholder analysis instrument as proposed by Vos and Achterkamp (2004) requires it, we have decided to incorporate their needs, wants, and demands in our analysis of the Groningen Declaration.

2.2.5 Interview Procedure
At every level of involvement we initially selected three persons to interview. After a first round of interviews, we found out that informational saturation was not achieved at that moment and further elaboration on specific issues was needed. Moreover, it was desirable to interview people with decision-making authority (executives) next to people ‘on the shop floor’. As a consequence, we arranged three more interviews to fill in this information gap and provide a more solid view of the situation. We have also used the opportunity to test whether our contribution to the business case was feasible during several of the second-round interviews.

The structure of the interview comprised several sections. We started by identifying each person’s tasks and responsibilities, as well as his/her relationship to digital student data. Furthermore, we asked the interviewee to describe the current process of exchange of student data (what kind of data is exchanged, which parties are involved, and what procedures govern that). After that, we have introduced the Groningen Declaration and invited the interviewee to list potential benefits and opportunities stemming from the digital exchange of student data in general, and the Groningen Declaration in particular. Finally, we asked questions that were tailored towards the interviewee, based on his/her expected role. The interviews were concluded by summarizing the main points and providing the interviewee with the opportunity of adding important elements that are relevant but not discussed so far. Lists of interview questions and interviewees are included in the appendix.

2.3 Analysis
In total we carried out fifteen interviews. We grouped the findings from these interviews on three angles: per question, per level, and per role. Our preliminary results revealed consistency and substantial overlap between the faculty and university level on the one hand, and the faculty and student level on the other hand. That has to do with the specific role (cf. Vos and Achterkamp, 2004) an interviewee serves at a specific point of time, as is explained. In what follows we therefore integrate the faculty level in other roles and distinguish between the (1) system/country level, (2) university level, and (3) student level.

In the analysis below we draw upon the ‘red line’ in interviews held, since the interviews are part of an iterative process in which the interviewing team acquires more and more knowledge, and the different interviewees all contribute different parts to the jigsaw puzzle.
2.3.1 System/country level

Process Description

For the system/country level, we considered DUO and the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Research [OCW], as representatives and main stakeholders. DUO is the executive organization for educational affairs in The Netherlands. The Groningen Declaration is hierarchically part of DUO’s Department of International Services, who runs the project on a daily basis. Supervisor is OCW that monitors the project’s progress.

Within The Netherlands, the application procedure at universities is almost completely digitalized via Studielink, which is a foundation managed by universities and universities of applied sciences. In order to login into the system, an applicant needs DigiD (for Dutch citizens only) or a Studielink account. For someone not having the Dutch nationality or a Dutch secondary education diploma, educational prerequisites needs to be verified by the university.

Enrollment, diploma, and financial information about students in The Netherlands is stored in a register called BRON-HO. Data streams are digitalized and inputs are provided by students (applicants) and educational institutions. That is contrary to for example Belgium, where the Flemish executive organization for educational affairs AHOVOS [Agentschap Hoger Onderwijs, Volwassenenonderwijs en Studietoelagen] relies on paper-based information provided by universities.

As part of international cooperation and improving processes, DUO pilots the exchange of student data together with Flanders, part of Belgium. That pilot regards the digital exchange of student data and is running between AHOVOS, DUO, and the University of Maastricht. According to one of the interviewees, the European Commission is willing to support an extended pilot from 2018 on, based on the findings of the current pilot.

At the moment, there are three more projects that are related to the Groningen Declaration:

1. A Secure File Transfer Protocol [SFTP] pilot for safely exchanging student data between DUO (The Netherlands) and CHESICC (China);
2. Improving the chain process BRON-HO [Basis Register Onderwijs Hoger Onderwijs], where enrollments and degrees of students in the Dutch Higher Education are registered in DUO systems;
3. E-enrolment, in which the (non-Dutch) student applies for Dutch education via Studielink who forwards the application to DUO. DUO then contacts the responsible authorities in the applicant’s home country to gather all the information about the student that is necessary to proceed the application. In that context, it is of great importance to stress that the student grants permission to do so upon application.

For Dutch students going abroad for their bachelor- or master program, the foreign institution generally requests a certified copy of qualifying diplomas (either a higher education or bachelor diploma). The student can send a copy of his/her diploma to DUO digitally to verify first if the document is suitable for legalization. If so, the student has to hand in the document to be legalized. This will be compared with the Dutch diploma register. If the document and the register are identical, DUO legalizes the document by applying a simple sticker to it. After that, the student can go to Dutch court to get an apostille attached to it. Finally, the approved document can be presented to the host country’s consulate in The Netherlands, who can stamp it and submit the certified document to the institution that has requested it.

Within Europe, diplomas are verified instead of legalized. DUO and comparable institutions have access to the European Internal Market Information System [IMI], which is a secure digital
environment for communication and cooperation between public bodies. The information is stored locally, for reasons of complying with (European) privacy legislation.

Advantages stemming from successful implementation of the Groningen Declaration
The transition from paper-based towards a digital environment has been characterized as a ‘logical change’ during several interviews. Main advantage stemming from this transition is a lead-time reduction, which is according to one interviewee ‘probably even a few weeks’. That lead-time reduction in Higher Education application implies ‘enormous’ cost reductions for higher education institutions. According to DUO employee Jan Otten, it turned out that the application procedure of a Dutch student costs approximately 45 euros, whereas the application procedure for international students costs about 450 euros per student. Also Sabine Venema, DUO employee, mentioned that the application process of an international student is “ten to twenty times as time consuming as a Dutch student’ application”.

More efficient (less ‘old-fashioned’) procedures reduce costs by reducing the amount of time spent on a dossier. That also limits the amount of dossiers that need to be handled multiple times due to international students applying for more than one university at the same time. That leads to multiplication of resources and therefore to less-efficient allocation of resources. When the lead-time of the application procedure is lowered, the attractiveness for students to apply for more than one university is reduced. During the interviews, a Norwegian school was used as an example. That school had 3,000 yearly applications from foreign students and therefore 3,000 admission dossiers to handle. In the end, only 200 students showed up and started their study at that specific school in Norway. No further explanation is needed to understand that enormous sums of money are being wasted by handling application dossiers multiple times, both at the national and institutional levels.

Based on the interview with Jan Otten, the costs of implementing a system that can serve the goals of the Groningen Declaration within The Netherlands are expected to be low, given that BRON-HO and/or Studielink could be developed further and there is no need to develop a new product. Further developing a system that is already existent also ensures that international student data is compatible with other information systems that are employed by the government, DUO, and universities. The need for cost savings is further strengthened by the Dutch’ government’s ambition to attract more international students as potential members of the labor force. Given that international students, as stated above, regularly apply for more than one higher education institution, a reduced lead-time and a faster message towards the potential student that he/she has been accepted, could improve the catch rate of international students. For higher education institutions, this implies that competition among them is fostered, given that the institution with the lowest lead-time has the highest likelihood of attracting the best and most motivated international students. The claim that ‘lead-time does not cost anything’, as put forward in one of the interviews is, according to our opinion, too shortsighted but comprehensible from DUOs position as an executive agency. The same is true for the fear of losing employment when bureaucracy is reduced due to improved administrative procedures.

No further explanation is needed when stating that implementing a Declaration in a global context, within different cultures and regulatory environments, is a complex exercise. The exchange of information is not without problems. Main problems mentioned relate to authentication and differences in interpretation of the information exchanged (confusion that follows from different definitions). Given the absence of a European standard, DUO relies on bilateral cooperation with for example Germany, Belgium and the United Kingdom.

\[^6\] It has also been argued the other way around: when the Groningen Declaration is – thanks to DUO – implemented successfully, DUO could become leading within Europe and work provision from European partners may occur. Anyway, the Groningen Declaration has been related to employment effects several times during the interviews.
Another core issue that must be tackled is privacy and differences in privacy legislation around the globe. In The Netherlands and Scandinavian countries for instance, a student is responsible for extracting his/her own information from the educational records and handing over this information to potential employers or other educational institutions. In the United States however educational records are even available via non-governmental institutions, such as the National Student Clearinghouse. Border cases being mentioned are Germany (where no personal data is stored at a federal level) and South Africa (where educational records are perceived as public property, meaning that everyone could request someone else’s data). The examples provided above are just an illustration of the difficult context in which the Groningen Declaration tries to establish cooperation and comparability, just in relation to privacy aspects. That does not even take into account that when information is exchanged, differences in interpretation still hinder comparability of data. Gray (1988), who draws on earlier work by Hofstede (1980, 1983), has researched the attitude towards privacy and seeks explanations for the relationship between culture and the use of data and information systems. We come back to the relevance from his findings for the Declaration later in this report.

Responsibility for a successful implementation
Several interviewees have stressed the importance of DUO being the driving force behind the Groningen Declaration due to its expertise and international network. Support from higher education institutions in terms of intentions and financial support from the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science, are as important. The Ministry, according to Paul van Capelleveen, would never impose or induce anything with regard to digitalizing student data, although they are willing to support ‘good initiatives’ put forward by the main stakeholders: DUO, students, and universities. According to the Ministry stakeholders must be aware of the added value of digital student data first.

Within DUO and internationally, Herman de Leeuw is in the lead of the Groningen Declaration. Almost all interviewees (except the student organizations and some faculty members) know him and appreciate his leading role. However, and although Mr. De Leeuw is supported by DUOs department for International Services, concerns are there with regard to the institutionalization of the Groningen Declaration in two ways. First, the project is highly dependent of Mr. De Leeuw in his capacity of a motivated human being, rather than that it has an institutionalized structure with a Board that has executive powers. The continuation of the project seems to be uncertain when Mr. De Leeuw once steps down. Second, seen from a legal perspective the project Groningen Declaration is non-existent since the project is not embedded into a legal entity causing all sorts problems with regard to legal acts. These acts include obtaining external funding, that is needed for a sustainable project in the long run.

Future Expectations and Recommendations
According to the Groningen Declaration website, “one of the main efforts of the Groningen Declaration Network is to engage ever more stakeholders in the Digital Student Data Ecosystem to join forces with us and to make global human capital cross border mobility a reality. And in order to be successful, the strategy of the Network has been one of slowly building up, starting with digital student data depositaries, international associations dealing with internationalization of higher education, and SIS developers. From 2012 onwards, though, the network has keenly been eying more stakeholders.” However, several interviewees stressed the urgent need for achieving concrete results, next to extending the network further. Some DUO employees are not that optimistic about a progressing Groningen Declaration because, according to two DUO employees they should stick to their core responsibilities. Also some employees relativized the importance of the exchange of digital student data, although there is widespread consensus among the other interviewees that it is important.

Footnote 7: http://www.groningendeclaration.org/target-stakeholders-0
Bilateral (i.e. between two countries) exchange of student data between comparable countries is more likely to occur than worldwide exchange, that where the Groningen Declaration aims at. However, one of the side effects of the Groningen Declaration is to bring DUO-like parties in contact with each other to exchange best practices. Scandinavia, that has also a centralized database for educational data in the Nordic countries, is an example of a ‘good partner’. China, on the other hand, has a centralized database but conflicting, incompatible legislation. That is a cultural effect.

**2.3.2 University Level**

*Process Description*

Admission procedures of EU and non-EU students greatly differ in the amount of papers that are needed. Based on the interviews with Hans Beldhuis and Luut Kroes, it can be said that the application process of EU students is almost completely digitalized and for non-EU students there is still a substantial amount of paperwork. Paper-based applications have several disadvantages, including a higher likelihood of fraud, and that it is time consuming to handle. Universities need to assure the authenticity of the application documents, and judge upon whether the applicant’s former education meets the entry prerequisites with help from EP-Nuffic [European Platform for Dutch Education – Netherlands University Foundation for International Cooperation].

The exchange of digital data also depends on the status of digitalization in a country. For example, it has been mentioned several times during interviews that The Netherlands and Scandinavian countries are among the most advanced countries in terms of digital applications. It is of no surprise that these countries intensely cooperate, share cultural similarities and therefore their educational data is quite comparable.

According to Noor van Schaik, head of the section of Student Information and Administration at the Office of the University, her department processed about 10,000 dossiers with 11 FTE employees between October and July. The distribution of international students at the University of Groningen is quite skewed. The majority has German origins, and most of them are concentrated within the university’s Psychology program. The application procedure of this select group was characterized by “administrative overkill”, especially due to legal requirements that are associated with numerus clausus. If that procedure can be set up more efficient (i.e. the administrative overkill is reduced and thereby time is saved), that would lead to “enormous” benefits in terms of time and money.

In the context of the exchange of student data in relation to mobility, a large share of students goes on exchange. The majority of these exchanges is within Europe and funded by the European Union’s ERASMUS fund. According to Ina Venhuizen, Coordinating Exchange Officer at the University of Groningen’s Faculty of Economics and Business, a serious amount of paperwork is associated with the exchanges. Whereas the Groningen Declaration focuses at degree-seeking students, side benefits in terms of exchanges, double and joint degrees are evident. When a student has gone on exchange, the ‘home’ university needs to register the grades obtained abroad in its own systems. There will always be a need to convert ‘foreign’ into ‘home’ grades, but the administrative procedure could be organized way more efficient. At the University of Groningen, all grades are registered in ProgRESS, student per student and course per course.

According to Mrs. Venhuizen, outgoing exchange coordinator at the Faculty of Economics and Business, the average of administering 25 courses in that system takes two hours. In total, around 2,100 courses have to be registered, meaning that the total workload is approximately equivalent to four weeks of full-time work (168 hours). It should be noted, however, that the Faculty of Economics and Business is just one faculty in one university, such that the potential benefits at the university and country level are underestimated (i.e. larger than presented here).
During the interviews, we became aware of a project called ERASMUS Without Papers [EWP] that aims at reducing the administrative workload that is associated with the program. When paperwork is reduced and the need to stamp each and every document diminishes, a serious amount of time can be saved. However, it was quite striking that the project was mentioned solely at the managerial level, and that the operational level was completely unaware of such efforts taking place.

Hans Beldhuis also put a more internal administrative problem to light. Faculties have ‘shadow’ databases next to the central administrative system. They have to work with the central databases, but feel the desire to complement such a standardized system with an own database. That causes duplication of work and information that is not in-sync. That is, however beyond the scope of our research regarding the Groningen Declaration, given that realizing the goals of the Declaration does not directly affect internal structures.

Advantages stemming from successful implementation of the Groningen Declaration
The implementation of the Groningen Declaration’s ideals could shorten the application process of international students and could lead to cost reductions in higher education institutions. The latter not only stems from a reduction in time that is needed to verify the authenticity of the application documents, but a digital process could also have the side benefit of removing unnecessary practicalities such as answering phone calls from applicants who are unaware of the status in their admission process. The greatest advantage of the Groningen Declaration however, is based on the premise that a shorter lead-time improves the ‘catch rate’ of universities, reducing the amount of time that is spent on dossiers from students that apply for but will never show up at the university. That incentivizes the universities to make their admission procedures more efficient as they are all willing to have the most motivated and talented students, according to Rector Sterken of the University of Groningen.

Another advantage mentioned at both national and university level, is a potential reduction in diploma fraud. When information is directly obtained from one trustful source, universities do not need to spend resources on verifying the authenticity of a diploma. When information is digitalized, graduates can also send authentic copies to employees when applying for a job. Employees do not need to contact the university to verify whether the student has indeed graduated or not, and whether or not grades are correct.

A final benefit from implementing the Groningen Declaration is that it could increase mobility of students and staff, inbound as well as outbound because those who feel reluctant to go abroad because of administrative issues profit directly from demolishing bureaucratic barriers. As such, universities could benefit from a more diverse academic community, which increases educational quality and contributes to the employability of students by preparing them to work (and take part) in an increasingly globalized world.

Stakeholder responsibility
In terms of Vos & Achterkamp the university and faculties are passively involved in the process of digital student data mobility. The University has signed the agreement of the Groningen Declaration but is not actively undertaking any activities with a direct link to the Groningen Declaration. “After signing the Groningen Declaration and thereby expressing support, I have put the Declaration to light at the VSNU in the Rectors Meeting and the Steering Committee for International Affairs. Moreover, I have forwarded the Declaration to the Executive Board of the COIMBRA Group to put it on their agenda. By doing so, my assessment is that I have already done more for the Declaration than my fellow rectors”, as was said by Rector Sterken of the University of Groningen. As such, it is exemplified that the executive level supports the aims of the Groningen Declaration, but that it is doubtful whether their support is strong enough to achieve the aims.
At the managerial level, University of Groningen employees are all aware of the existence and aims of the Groningen Declaration. There is support for the ideas, but it is not clear what effectively ‘has changed’ since the University has signed the Groningen Declaration. Several managers mentioned that the VSNU could offer a platform for raising support, given that universities are not likely and willing to invest their own funds and resources into making the Groningen Declaration a success. The potential for cost reduction seems to be enormous, given the “administrative overkill” that universities seem to face at the moment.

As is mentioned above, also double and joint degree programs could benefit from improved administrative procedures due to the Groningen Declaration. At the operational level we have conducted an interview with the double degree program coordinator Wim Westerman. Dr. Westerman is responsible for the long-running bilateral cooperation between the University of Groningen and the University of Uppsala (Sweden). He acknowledges a better progress regarding digital student data mobility would potentially save his department time and costs. On an annual basis his department could save up to 40 hours of work, which is if you put in perspective not that much. Compared with the other respondents Dr. Westerman was moderately positive about the exchange of digital student data between both universities. This is partly due to the well-established relationship between the two parties. Moreover, the cultural differences between the Scandinavian countries and The Netherlands are relatively small. Both educational systems are very much alike and fit well together. However, it can be imagined that coordinating double, or especially joint degrees, becomes even more complex when educational systems and associated legislation are completely orthogonal. These orthogonal systems stem from culture and legal tradition (LaPorta et al., 1998).

Responsibility for a successful implementation
The interviewees at the university and faculty level are undivided in their opinion: the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science must support the Groningen Declaration, not only ideologically but also financially. The higher education institutions do not have the resources and the capacity to run the Declaration. Their reasoning is simple: universities should not spend funds meant for education and research on bureaucracy, especially not when bureaucracy is caused by the need to comply with national and European legislation, and not even when it might be in their direct interest. This was nicely framed by Rector Sterken, who said that “there seems to be a first-mover disadvantage for higher education institutions, which can only be overcome by governmental intervention”. The most feasible strategy might therefore be drawing the Ministry’s attention to the Groningen Declaration via Executive Committees of interest groups such as VSNU and Vereniging Hogescholen.

Future Expectations and Recommendations
The interviewees at the University and Faculty level give inconclusive answers to the question how the Groningen Declaration should continue to develop in the near future and who should be leading the movement. For example, Luut Kroes states that the Groningen Declaration team itself should be in the lead in this project. Hans Beldhuis states the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science should be in the lead because they are the ‘highest’ partner involved in this project. Noblesse oblige, so they have the responsibility and the authority to make decisions. However, an interviewee put a footnote that it desirable that employees whose daily operations are affected by potential policy changes are involved as well. That contributes to support and prevents for employees being demotivated and disappointed because they have to carry out policy determined at a high level without being heard first. That again underlines the importance of involving passive stakeholders in decision-making.

The Groningen Declaration and the European Union ultimately share the same goal, which is an increase in free movement of persons and labor. Emphasizing that joint interest raises support, and smoothing administrative procedures could help achieve that goal. As such, by reasoning the other way around, an increase in support for the Groningen Declaration’s aims could magnify the probability that the goals will once be achieved.
2.3.3 Student level
In order to get a good feeling of the needs and wants of students in The Netherlands, we have interviewed three student associations. These organizations represent students, and claim to be aware of the interests of current students and those who recently graduated:

- **NWS (Nederlandse Wereldwijde Studenten)** represents Dutch students and young professionals (with experience abroad) within the Dutch political scene;
- **ISO (Interstedelijk Studenten Overleg)**; and
- **LSVb (Landelijke Studenten Vakbond)** who both represent all students in the Dutch system.

**Process Description**
The student organizations indicate that the process of applying for foreign educational institutions is becoming increasingly digitalized. As a result this has caused a considerable reduction in lead-time. The process still leaves considerable room for improvement, for example recurring documents have to be handed in on paper whereas this could be digitalized for the sake of convenience. ISO claims the process is obsolete and causes unnecessary lead-time due to the fact that some documents have to be handed in on paper sometimes including stamps to justify its validity. According to Hilde Feddema the time consuming process causes students not to go abroad because they perceive it as an administrative barrier. Hilde Feddema (ISO) stated: “We see a decreasing trend of students going abroad. Especially the availability of the data is a bottleneck, this is a long and difficult procedure for a student willing to go on an exchange program”. Also Louis Hendrix and Marlou Slot, former and current chairman of NWS share this view. They also point out that it is hard to follow one or two courses at a different university because of the aforementioned process.

The decision to study abroad has to be made long upfront because of the sluggish process. One of the interviewees mentioned it causes uncertainty and study delays. Next to that, it is hard for students to do an exchange because of difficulties with the grading and the granting of ECTS. These difficulties add the study delays and can turn out to be expensive for all parties involved. Often students have to take initiative themselves to get the university to start the process of granting and grading ECTS. According to Hilde Feddema, the current student loan system already made costs higher for students. She continues: “Adding more delay to that will make students afraid to study abroad. Because of that delay, it will make costs even higher”.

Slot and Hendrix also wonder why foreign degrees are not added to the Dutch “diploma register”. They argue that there are large differences in the extent that instances have digitalized their student data processes and that collaboration at this point is important but not present at this moment in time.

**Stakeholder responsibility**
Students are strongly affected by the outcome of the Groningen Declaration by smoothing the administrative processes and in turn providing higher student mobility. However, as a passive stakeholder their influence in this project is rather limited. This follows from statements made by the interviewees. First of all, although NWS as an organization is familiar with the Groningen Declaration, their judgement is that the students they represent are not familiar with it. NWS was actively invited to participate in the Groningen Declaration’s activities, however they struggle with their role and responsibility towards students in the context of the Groningen Declaration. Except from raising awareness, they are unsure about the role they should play. Second, ISO has heard of the project and indicate they could have a more active role but do not consider this as a priority. Third and finally,

---

8 This claim conflicts with the mobility statistics as calculated by the EP-Nuffic in their rapport “Internationalisation pictured” of 2015.
the LSVb does nothing in regard to the Groningen Declaration and claim they are not that much involved. The latter two also explained that their boards change yearly, which makes it harder for them to keep up with all the developments. Interestingly enough, other stakeholders are willing to cooperate with student organizations. It is however a challenge to really involve them. By starting a dialogue from a more comprehensive representation of the student body could turn them into an actively involved stakeholder group.

**Advantages stemming from successful implementation of the Groningen Declaration**

The student organizations have identified several advantages for students when the Groningen Declaration is successfully implemented. The primary advantage according to all parties is the application process for studying abroad will become faster and more efficient by lowering administrative barriers. This can ultimately lead to more students willing to study abroad, which contributes to the diversity in the classroom. That could enhance quality of education. A second advantage, according to the NWS and LSVb is, that moving between bachelor and master from one university to one in another country becomes more attractive. In the most favorable case, the bureaucratic hassle is reduced due to a more transparent application and admission process, and moving to another university is almost seamlessly possible. Lastly, the LSVb thinks that realizing the aims of the Groningen Declaration could reduce diploma fraud because the authenticity of diplomas can be more easily verified by the use of the electronic data from direct sources.

A remarkable statement mentioned by the NWS is about the position of DUO, which, according to the NWS, will stand stronger in international context, would the Groningen Declaration turn out to be a success. Hypothetically, it has the opportunity to claim a leading role in the transition towards fully digitalized student data up until the point this process becomes mainstream (i.e. part of regular operations).

**Responsibility for a successful implementation**

According to the student organizations the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science and DUO should be commonly responsible for the implementation of the Groningen Declaration. Carrying out the government’s educational policies is their reason of existence. As such, projects that contribute to the quality of education and that cause a reduction in bureaucracy and administrative issues perfectly fits in their tasks. The student organizations further recommend to inform universities well, given they are a key stakeholder and have a lot to win. One way for DUO and the Ministry to ‘get things done’ by universities is, according to NWS President Marlou Slot, to bind leading universities together and let them act as excellent examples for universities that are not yet part of the Declaration’s ecosystem.

**Future Expectations and Recommendations**

Given the passive stakeholders of the student organizations it is difficult to create expectations about the future. Student organizations should be emphatically aware of their own role and responsibilities and, to what extent this surpasses raising awareness among the groups they represent. It is therefore advisable that DUO clearly defines what they expect from the student organizations (i.e. what their role is or what they could contribute). With regard to further implementing the Groningen Declaration, all student organizations stressed the need to pay attention to privacy aspects. Given that the Groningen Declaration is about student data, it is of no surprise that their interest groups raised this point. Apart from that, other stakeholders have put the privacy issue to light as well.

**2.3.4 Stakeholders in their environmental context**

Having identified and classified the main stakeholders we need to examine them in the environmental context. The environmental context is defined as laws and regulations, institutions, processes and procedures. All these factors are influenced by culture (LaPorta et al., 1998).
Differences between countries are one barrier that needs to be overcome in order to reach the goals and objectives of the Declaration, especially those of comparability and portability of digital student data. An exemplary case that has been mentioned several times during the interviews is that of Datenschutz. Germany is, due to World War II, extremely reluctant of administering and storing personal data at a federal level. The availability of that data has smoothened the execution of the Nuremberg Laws and the detailed administration has contributed to the scale of the Holocaust. Given that neither personal information, nor data concerning education and degrees is stored federally, it seems that Germans still fear misuse of data. That implies difficulties in coordinating the exchange of digital student data between countries, for example when Germany is involved.

An example at the other end is that of South Africa. In South Africa data concerning educational background is considered public rather than private property. Transparency is extremely high and anyone can request someone else’s data, as was mentioned during the interview of DUO’s head of International Services Dik van der Wal.

As an illustration of cultural differences, we compare the German and South African case by means of the Gray framework (1988). Bearing in mind that two prerequisites for the exchange of digital student data are portability and comparability, this is a useful and necessary task. We apply a framework that is tailored to the design of accounting systems to this specific case, based on the idea that while accounting is a specific type of information, information is not necessarily accounting-based. Information systems can be perceived as a higher order system of the same family (Wilkin and Chenhall, 2010), which we will apply to an information system that is at the same level as accounting.

The cases above make clear that Germany and South Africa have totally different attitudes towards ownership and disclosure. In Gray’s terminology, Germany values secrecy over transparency whereas South Africa attributes greater weight to the latter. That has implications for the possibility of exchanging student data in general, or in other words, the portability is influenced by culture.

The exchange is also affected by two other Gray contraries, namely uniformity versus flexibility. If data is already exchanged, the data could be interpreted differently by the ‘sender’ and ‘receiver’ and therefore could lead to confusion. Comparability is therefore also an issue. Implementers of the Declaration should also take these differences into account in the design of the exchanging system, and should acknowledge that this might influence countries’ or institutions willingness to participate.

2.4 Review and Recommendations
As is written in the introduction, the Groningen Declaration faces challenges in terms of conceptualizing the project, convincing new parties to truly participate, and ultimately with realizing its goals. These challenges are all interrelated and should therefore be addressed in harmony. This section reviews the challenges, and provides recommendations for how to play the game.

Challenge 1 – Conceptualizing the project
The Groningen Declaration is a hybrid project with stakeholders that have a different role, responsibility, and reason to support the project. Although all parties support increasing human capital mobility, different stakeholders have different perspective on how to achieve that goal and who should pay for it. With hybrid project, we mean that a wide range of parties is connected to the Groningen Declaration, but also that it lacks a juridical personality, because of which it has no legal capacity. It therefore has funding as well as governance issues.

DUO is the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Research’ executive office for a multitude of educational affairs. It can be argued that, although DUO is an executive office, a successful implementation of the Groningen Declaration can be directly related to its core responsibilities. It is
inter alia responsible for (1) recognition and legalization of diplomas, (2) running the process of selection and placement of higher education, (3) and enriching educational data towards information products. As such, and only as long as, the Groningen Declaration contributes to (1) a more efficient registration of students, (2) a reduction of university overhead, and (3) a more efficient educational system, the Groningen Declaration is completely in line with DUO’s core responsibilities.

Given that using DUO funds and resources for the Groningen Declaration is not unchallenged and uncontroversial while examining the Declaration and DUOs core (legal) responsibilities reveals that it has the potential of being perfectly in line with those responsibilities, the Groningen Declaration should ensure that it should integrate or affiliate itself more with DUOs processes. That is mere a matter of presentation, than a fundamental funding or governance problem.

A governance problem that came to light is the lack of a juridical personality. That is not solved when the Groningen Declaration is more integrated in DUO processes, given that this will only legitimize the use of Dutch education funds for the Groningen Declaration. There are issues related to international cooperation in general, which have to do with culture. For example, countries differ in values (Hofstede), their perception of privacy, or public-private cooperation (who owns the data). These cannot be changed, at least not easily, but must be taken into account when further developing the Groningen Declaration. These perception differences are also exemplified in LaPorta et al. (1998), who mentions differences in legal origin and tradition as important to incorporate.

Within Europe, we recommend a role for the European Commission to carry out the Declarations’ aims and ensure a proper legal embedding. The Dutch Minister of Education, Culture, and Science, whose policy aims at increasing mobility and attracting bright minds to The Netherlands, could put this on the agenda. The European Union has already institutions that foster cooperation across borders, diplomatic relationships with other continents, and specific policies tailored to increasing free mobility of people. As such, the European Union can become an enabler for the Groningen Declaration and its aims, and an opportunity to ‘mainstream’ the goals of the Groningen Declaration by embedding it in the wider educational and institutional framework.

Challenge 2 – Convincing (new) parties to truly participate
During the interviews, we became aware of concrete actions to connect more university networks to the Groningen Declaration. Examples mentioned are tempting the COIMBRA group and Universities Australia to promote the Declaration. Such an approach has the serious threat that a multi-speed Groningen Declaration arises with partners that are highly and actively involved (such as the inner circle at DUOs department for International Services) versus partners that support the ideals but that do not practice (they are just paying lip service to the Declaration). We therefore advocate that organic growth by means of partners that are willing to contribute to achieving a clear vision is preferred over rapid growth by connecting more partners via university networks. It is not in the interest to increase the number of passive stakeholders, rather the challenge to ‘active’ the ‘passive’ body has to be addressed expeditiously.

There are several suggestions by which those potential partners can become aware of the advantages and benefits of signing the Groningen Declaration. For example, the importance of the project rises from a university-level perspective, when is considered that (1) student mobility figures are increasing, (2) the project could incorporate exchange students by linking it to the Erasmus Without Papers initiative, and (3) the responsibility for the selection procedure for new applicants is completely transferred from DUO towards higher education institutions, due to the abolition of the centralized degree program lottery from the academic year 2017-2018 on. Moreover, universities are part of an environment that has substantially changed over the past couple of years. They have, for example, signed performance agreements with the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science. One such a performance indicator is the percentage of overhead staff. By smoothening administrative
procedures, the Groningen Declaration can reduce overhead and administrative overkill, implying that less educational funds have to be spent on administration. That is in the direct interest of students, staff, and universities. Moreover, as the Ministry demanded the universities to reduce their overhead, they have a moral responsibility to facilitate universities in that overhead reduction. Institutions for tertiary higher education (Hoger Beroepsonderwijs) can derive similar benefits from the Groningen Declaration, but only at a smaller scale because education is internationalized to a lesser extent.

It has been mentioned several times during the interviews that the Groningen Declaration also needs to be known at other ministries than just the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science, given the relationships international student (mobility) has with those ministries. Examples are the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (for reasons of working permits), and the Ministry of Security and Justice (where immigration services agency IND belongs to). Next to that, political support is also a prerequisite for a successful implementation of the project. We recommend those who are in charge of the Groningen Declaration to organize this lobbying via student organizations and university interest groups, who can definitely benefit from a successful implementation, but are not willing to contribute (significant) resources. The feasibility of this approach stems from those parties having meetings with the Minister of Education, Culture, and Research at regular intervals. The Groningen Declaration must be aware that those lobby organizations can work in the interest of the Declaration by virtue of the power of their Executive Boards. The game should be absolutely played at that level, despite that contacts with civil servants are useful for exchanging best practices.

**Challenge 3 – Realizing goals**

The key to success for the Groningen Declaration is to clearly define the roles and responsibilities within the project, ensure that funding is sustained, and most importantly that passive stakeholders are ‘activated’ and no new passive stakeholders are added to the initiative.

The Groningen Declaration has ambitious goals, which can only be achieved when stakeholders cooperate and contribute actively. In that context, prioritization is of crucial importance. First, the Groningen Declaration has to ensure that funding is sustained. Therefore it is important that the Declaration becomes more integrated or more affiliated with DUOs core businesses. In the longer run, the Ministry of Education, Culture, and Science must pay the Dutch share, given that this is legitimized by students, staff, and universities benefiting from the implementation and these parties do not have the means or will to invest in smoothening administrative procedures themselves. Their executive bodies can however put pressure on the Ministry by means of lobbying. It is in their direct interest to do so, because the importance of internationalization in higher education is increasing. It should neither be neglected that for longer run funding the Groningen Declaration has to come up with some concrete achievements or a success story that can convince the Ministry of the added value of the Groningen Declaration. Legitimacy not only stems from support, results are of equal important (and in the short run even more important).

Second, the optimal juridical personality is an avenue for further research. We have already done some suggestions for integrating the Groningen Declaration within the European bureaucracy.

Third, the Groningen Declaration must ensure that signatories take concrete actions after signing the Declaration and contribute to realizing its goals. In other words, passive stakeholders have to be activated and no new passive stakeholders shall enter the initiative.

When the suggestions above are carried out, the Groningen Declaration in our opinion has a good probability of achieving its goals: increasing mobility and fostering internationalization in higher education by means of reducing administrative barriers that (may) hinder these aims.
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1. Doel en opzet van het onderzoek

2. Stakeholderanalyse op drie niveaus: systeem, instelling, student

3. Stakeholders en de rol van hun omgeving

4. Drie concrete aanbevelingen

5. Vragen en antwoorden
Doel & opzet

› Bijdrage aan business case voor de Groningen Declaration
› Meer specifiek: Identificeren en vergelijken van de behoeftes en opinies van de verschillende betrokken stakeholders van de Groningen Declaration

Aanpak:
› Formulering Plan van Aanpak
› Exploratief onderzoek met semi-gestructureerde interviews
› Interviews op vier niveaus: identificatie en roltoewijzing van stakeholder op basis van Vos & Achterkamp (2004)
Systeem/nationaal niveau

Procesbeschrijving
› Inschrijven in Nederland gaat bijna geheel digitaal via Studielink
› Van de groep zonder Nederlandse vooropleiding dient niveau bepaald te worden, alsook echtheid diploma
› Binnen Europa worden diploma’s geverifieerd i.p.v. gelegaliseerd, waarbij DUO gebruik maakt van het European Internal Market Information System [IMI]
› Nederlanders die een volledig programma buiten Europa gaan doen volgen een uitgebreid proces voor diploma-erkenning

Voordelen
› Verkorting duur inschrijfproces
› Meer efficiency, minder tijd per aanmeldingsdossier benodigd
› Minder dubbel werk door afname aanmeldingen bij meerdere instellingen

Gevolgen:
› Potentiële kostenbesparingen
› Meer internationale studenten in Nederland als gevolg van kortere doorlooptijd (hogere ‘catchrate’)

Universitair niveau

Procesbeschrijving
› Inschrijvingsproces van niet EU-studenten omvat veel papierwerk
› Internationals inschrijven kost veel meer tijd dan Nederlanders
› Fraude mogelijk met diploma’s, zelfs binnen de Europese Unie
› Verschillende faculteiten voeren een schaduwadministratie, hetgeen leidt tot asynchrone informatie, dubbel werk en fouten

Voordelen
› Authentieke en geverifieerde studentdata verbetert ingaande en uitgaande mobiliteit van studenten.
› Minder fraudegevoelig doordat data verkregen wordt uit directe bron
› Efficiencyslagen (verlaging kosten administratie en inschrijving door kortere doorlooptijd)
› Lange termijn: verhoogde diversiteit van studenten en verbeterde onderwijskwaliteit
Studentniveau

**Procesbeschrijving**
- Huidige proces bestaat met name uit papier, stempels, tijd en moeite
- Lange doorlooptijd van aanmeldingsproces creëert onzekerheid
- Het toekennen van cijfers/ECTS tussen universiteiten gaat langzaam en vraagt volgens ISO geregeld initiatief van de student
- Groeiende bezorgdheid: mogelijke dalende trend van studenten die naar het buitenland gaan
- Potentiële bedreiging van (dure) studievertraging door komst leenstelsel

**Voordelen**
- Korter en goedkoper inschrijvingsproces voor studenten
- Minder bureaucratische rompslomp en meer transparentie in het aanmeldingsproces
- Betere benutting van bachelor-masterstelsel door vrije beweging van universiteit A naar B (nagenoeg naadloze overgang)
- Verlaging administratieve barrière om in het buitenland te studeren

Rol van de omgeving

**Wat is de omgeving?**
- Wet- en regelgeving
- Instituties
- Werkwijzen

Die elk gedreven worden door cultuur en verschillen daarin!

**Afhankelijkheidsrelaties:**
- Uitwisselbaarheid (Transparency versus Secrecy)
- Vergelijkbaarheid (Uniformity versus Flexibility)
Rol van de omgeving: de casus Nederland

- De omvang van overhead bij universiteiten en hogescholen is een prestatieafspraak. Instellingen worden hierop afgerekend.

Complicerende factoren én kansen

- Internationale samenwerking, binnen én buiten Europa
- Publiek-private samenwerking (wie is eigenaar van de data?)
- Interpretatieverschillen
Aanbevelingen

**Korte en middellange termijn:**
(1) Behalen concrete resultaten noodzakelijk voor financiering  
(2) Integreren Groningen Declaration in hoofdtaken DUO, of  
(3) Verbinding zoeken met deze hoofdtaken (presentatie!)

**Lange termijn:**
Aantrekken nieuwe deelnemers op basis van visie en concrete voordelen (organische groei versus netwerkaanpak)

---

Aanbeveling: Stel financiering veilig!

› Studentenorganisaties en universiteiten onderschrijven meerwaarde Declaration  
› Hbo kan identieke voordelen behalen als universiteiten, hetzij op een andere schaal  
› De bereidheid van universiteiten om financieel bij te dragen is gering
Aansluiting/integratie hoofdtaken DUO

Over DUO
- Missie
- Missie
- Hoofdtaken
- Partnerorganisaties
- Ondersteuningsstelsel
- Voetbaanstrijd
- Verkenning
- Informatie voor medewerkers

Bron: https://duo.nl/organisatie/over_duo/hoofdtaken.asp

Voorkom een GD op twee snelheden...

Maar gebruik wel uitkomsten van succesvolle pilots om meerwaarde te tonen en financiering veilig te stellen!
Een toenemend belang?

Het belang van het project kan effectiever onder de aandacht worden gebracht door koppelingen met:

› Toenemende mobiliteit
› Erasmus Without Papers
› Het afschaffen van de centrale loting per 2017-'18
Samengevat

› Focus op de toegevoegde waarde van de Groningen Declaration voor specifieke stakeholders, benadruk het toenemende belang en stel zodoende de financiering veilig

› Verkies organische groei boven de netwerkaanpak, zeker op korte termijn → de erkenning van meerwaarde is er al!

› Houd bij vervolgacties rekening met de omgeving van stakeholders, incentives en culturele verschillen

› Bepaal welke stakeholder wat kan bijdragen aan het project

Vragen?
5. Scientific Reflection

In the scientific reflection we first elaborate on the research methods employed. Thereafter, we focus on two scientific issues in our project, which are (1) the instruments we used for identification and classification of stakeholders and the underlying literature, and (2) the interaction of culture with stakeholder behavior (i.e. we elaborate further on our analysis of stakeholders in their environmental context). The third part of the scientific reflection is the potential contribution to the literature.

We conclude by addressing the limitations of our findings and provide some starting points for further research by other groups, and list elements that we perceive to be important to include in the overarching business case.

5.1 Research set-up

The study mainly used qualitative data. In order to gather information we made use of semi-structured interviews with selected stakeholders. Semi-structured interviews consist of a set of predetermined open questions, with other questions emerging from the dialogue between interviewer and interviewees (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006).

We started by creating a long list of individuals that potentially had a relationship with the exchange of digital student data. In doing so, we made use of suggestions by our DUO principal, the list of stakeholders at the Groningen Declaration’s website, and our own knowledge about the University of Groningen. We initially put 3 interviewees per stakeholder level at a shortlist, because this was thought to deliver enough depth and richness. However, during the interviews interviewees came up with other potential stakeholders that could be included to enrich our research. We actually actively invited them to name other potential stakeholders, also to gain an understanding of the interviewees’ perception of the Groningen Declaration ecosystem.

Selecting interview participants was thus based on an iterative process referred to as purposeful sampling that seeks to maximize the depth and richness of the data to address the research question (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006). In our invitation, we did not mention the Groningen Declaration rather we told the interviewee that the interview would be about digital student data. By doing so, we prevented interviewees would prepare for the interview by doing research on the Groningen Declaration and its goals. Our aim was to get an objective and unbiased view about how familiar the interviewee was with the ideas of the Groningen Declaration, and to what extent these were part of someone’s daily business.

The interviews were held with at least two student team members present, because team members often have complementary insights which adds to the richness of the data, and differences in perspectives increases the likelihood of capitalizing on any novel insights which may be in the data (Eisenhardt, 1989). This project can be considered as a single case study, given that although the Groningen Declaration is a supranational project, only one country and its institutions are examined in detail. The project can be extended to a multiple case study when more countries and institutions are included in the future.

During the interviews, one person was assigned the role of interviewer and the other the role of secretary. The secretary had the task to keep track on the interview and take notes. When things were unclear or we struggled with how to write things down, the interviewee was generally asked for clarification or was granted the opportunity to comment on what was written down. After the interview, the “raw” notes taken during the interview were rewritten into transcripts and reviewed by both the interviewer and the secretary.
For the analysis of the data, codes were assigned to the answers given by the interviewee. The reasoning of Miles et al. (2014) was followed, in the sense that coding can be used to get a better understanding and interpretation of data’s meaning. We have used descriptive coding to summarize, categorize and indexing the base context of a given answer and therefore provide us with a simple overview of all subjects talked about. In addition to descriptive coding, simultaneous coding was applied, which encompasses the giving of more than one code to clarify the multiple subjects in the responses of our interviewees.

During the interview it became clear that some questions were perceived harder to answer than others. Especially questions about shortcomings involving other parties, who is in the lead and privacy issues caused a longer interval before and were accompanied with doubt when answered. This may affect the quality of the answers due to response biases such as given socially desirable responses, or feeling reluctant to put failures of hierarchically higher parties at the table.

It could be perceived that our findings are bound by the set of interviewees we selected. However, in our research plan outlined in the organization advice report we described that achieving saturation of information determines how long the interviewing phase of our research would continue. For that reason, we extended our initial target date of September 1, because we concluded that more information about the university level was needed to draw proper and powerful conclusions. As a comprehensive university that offers a variety of disciplines (including beta and engineering), we perceive the University of Groningen as representative for other universities within the country. Since we interviewed the relevant interest groups at the other two levels, the country/systemic level and student level, in our opinion our findings are only to a limited extent bound by the selection procedure of interviewees.

Given that we gathered an enormous amount of rich data, we discussed the feasibility of making use of quotes in our organization advice report. We convincingly decided not to do that, even not in an anonymized form. The reason for that is threefold. First and foremost, we have not discussed the option of citing or paraphrasing interviewees with the interviewees themselves. They felt free to discuss a lot of issues in all honesty. As such, some interviewees said some things about other stakeholders, which might be interpreted as controversial or simply untrue by that stakeholder. Second, the Groningen Declaration is a political project that floats on support and commitment. We noticed that almost all stakeholders are convinced about the added value of the Groningen Declaration and support its goals. Support could fall when controversial matters can be directly linked to an individual or group of individuals that has raised it. Full publicity is therefore not desirable. Third and finally, although the number of interviews gives a proper insight in processes in and opinions on the Groningen Declaration, it is too small to ensure anonymity for the interviewees. We could have mentioned for instance the position of a quoted interviewee. However, given that the number of interviews does not allow for that, we felt not comfortable to use quotes without caption. Without knowing who has said something, or what position the quoted person occupies, man could easily question whether the quoted person has authority to say something over the controversial matter. No further illustration is required to understand that using quotes then becomes completely meaningless, and that the objective of making use of quotes is completely undermined. For that reason, we have not provided the interviewees with an opportunity to see and review transcripts.

We have learned from our approach. Apparently, we could have assimilated and codified the interviews more efficient. We conducted the interviews in Dutch, our raw notes were in Dutch, and our processed transcripts were Dutch. We codified the transcripts making use of a spreadsheet, identified the storyline thereafter, and finally translated the storyline into English. Actually we did plenty of duplicative work, and time could have been saved when the interviews were held in English and raw notes were directly codified without making a separate transcription first. That would have
been defensible as well as responsible, given that we emphasize the red line in our story rather than make use of literal quotes.

5.2 Stakeholder identification and classification
As is outlined in the organization advice report, there is a need for carrying out a stakeholder analysis before a business case can be set up. This paragraph elaborates on the framework used for that.

According to Freeman (1984, p. 46) stakeholders are “(...) (by definition) any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives (...)''. Based on that definition, Ulrich (1983) identifies two reasons based on which someone can be considered as a stakeholder. They either have some kind of resource to contribute to the system (actively involved) or they are actually affected by the outcome of the system (passively involved).

Vos and Achterkamp (2004) have developed an instrument for identifying stakeholders within a specific (innovation-)project. They start with categorizing stakeholders based on the legitimacy, urgency and power the stakeholders possess. By doing so for every stakeholder, a classification of stakeholders emerges. That makes it possible to assign roles to different stakeholders, whereas they notice that stakeholders can serve several roles simultaneously. Among the actively involved stakeholders, Vos and Achterkamp (2004) distinguish between clients, decision makers, and designers. The fourth role, which is representative, includes the more passively involved stakeholders. In line with Ulrich (1983) and Freeman (1984), Vos and Achterkamp (2004) state that the level of affection of stakeholders towards a specific project is an important differentiator.

Stakeholders can thus be classified based on their level of involvement (active or passive), as well as on the role they serve (client, decision maker, designer, and representative). Another way of differentiating refers to the dynamics of the situation for which stakeholders need to be identified. The classifications mentioned before do not take into account the dynamics of the process under consideration, which basically means that in different phases of a project a different stakeholder is actively involved. These phases are (1) initiation, (2) development, (3) implementation / termination, and (4) maintenance (Vos and Achterkamp, 2004). Currently, the Groningen Declaration is still in the development stage. The goals and aims are set and are supported, but the embedding in the Higher Education ecosystem is still lacking. The inner circle around Groningen Declaration Secretary Mr. De Leeuw has been in the lead all the time, and one of their achievements to be proud of is the support they have raised. However, as the project develops, other stakeholders should become more leading. These include universities that must implement concrete actions to contribute to achieving the goals of the Declaration, and executive powers such as the European Commission when it comes to maintenance (i.e. when the Groningen Declaration becomes mainstream in the educational system).

5.3 The role of culture
LaPorta et al. (1998) have investigated the relationship between culture and the institutional framework. Their findings reveal that culture influences legislation, and that legal origin and tradition matters for effective governance. In the context of the Groningen Declaration, this explains the why countries differ, and why cooperating with country A is more feasible than with country B, at least in the short run. In the longer run, the framework can be used to study cultural differences and think about solutions how to address these differences.

In the context of accounting systems, financial management and disclosure, Gray (1988) hypothesized four factors that might explain differences in attitude between countries. In that analysis, he relates environmental factors such as culture (reflecting societal values) to accounting values. Culture is proxied by the five Hofstede value dimensions (1980, 1983): Individualism versus Collectivism, Large versus Small Power Distance, Strong versus Weak Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity versus Femininity, and Short versus Long-Term Orientation. The accounting values are,
according to Gray, reflected along the dimensions of Professionalism versus Statutory Control, Uniformity versus Flexibility, Conservatism versus Optimism, and Secrecy versus Transparency. Gray (1988) found that accounting systems are influenced by (1) accountants’ accounting values, and (2) a country’s institutional framework. Both are influenced by cultural values.

In the context of the Groningen Declaration, Uniformity (versus Flexibility), and Transparency (versus Secrecy), are factors that are most important to address, because Uniformity could contribute to the comparability and portability of digital student data, and Transparency refers to the ‘outcome’ of this exchange. In other words, what data is produced, how that data should be valued, and who has access to that data. Gray (1988) hypothesized positive relationships between uniformity on the one hand, and power distance and uncertainty avoidance on the other hand. He argues in favor of a negative relationship between uniformity and individualism. In terms of secrecy, Gray (1988) expects positive relationships with power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and long-term orientation; and negative relationships with individualism, and masculinity. The Groningen Declaration can use these relationships to identify countries and regions that have a comparable mindset and use these countries to build a success story that can be used to legitimize the project. Examples are already there, with The Netherlands cooperating with Flanders [AHOVOS] and Scandinavia.

5.4 Possible contribution to literature
Although the analysis carried out is a practical exercise that serves a clear purpose and is highly influenced by context, our research has several contributions to the existing literature. First of all, to the best of our knowledge this project is the first one in which exchanging student data internationally and digitally is researched in an academic way. In order to do so, we have employed models that are tailored to accounting standards and information systems, but that to our opinion could be used in a more general way. We are also the first group that investigated who the relevant stakeholders in the field of exchanging student data are. In a more general way, we provided suggestions on how to activate passive stakeholders and let them truly contribute to the aims they support. Second, we have elaborated on public-private cooperation across borders. We have acknowledged that cultural differences shape the nature of that cooperation and highly influence the likelihood of the Groningen Declaration project to become successful. Third, we provided several points of departure for a feasible coordination of an international project, including suggestions on how to fund those projects sustainably. Fourth, we have set-up a research design that can be used to replicate our study in other countries whose institutions participate in the Groningen Declaration. As such, we made use of the detailed insights that a case study approach provides. Finally, we have reached our objective of contributing a solid part to the greater business case of the Groningen Declaration, all with the aim of making the projects desires mainstream.

5.5 Limitations
The stakeholder analysis is used to assess how the interests of the identified parties could be addressed or are affected. This project focuses on the analysis part and does not provide solutions or improvements for the Groningen Declaration itself. However, the information can be used to foster further research. In addition, the Groningen Declaration is still seeking common ground worldwide in order to fulfill its goals. Therefore this study can be seen as “ongoing” and is not completed after the stakeholder analysis has been finished; rather it provides the necessary inputs for further stages of research. Moreover, the analysis is likely being context-specific and should therefore be repeated in a different context (i.e. Germany, U.S., or China). Furthermore, there should eventually be a more in-depth (detailed) or quantitative study of the business case. The latter is because our analysis only comprises one country, one educational institution, and one faculty.

We have already outlined the role of culture and stressed the importance of investigating how different stakeholders operate in their specific environment. As mentioned earlier repeating our research in another country is wise, given that the results and recommendations we provided
interact with culture. The question then is to what extent it is justified to draw our conclusions and state, our Dutch and institution-level, recommendations based on the information obtained. Given the clarity and consistency among the answers to our questions, the project team believes that it can be presumed that investigating multiple institutions and/or faculties will not lead to different conclusions and that additional research not necessarily leads to additional insights in terms of benefits or problems.

5.6 Suggestions for further research
As explained in the introduction to this advice report, our work contributes to a larger business case about the Groningen Declaration. Our part provided a stakeholder analysis and offers several starting points for further research by another group.

The first starting point is that we assigned roles to stakeholders. One reason to that is a financial one. The Groningen Declaration is a project that provides benefits to an extremely large, but passive group. The financial burden is borne by only a limited group of signatories and is, at least within The Netherlands, project-based. It would therefore be interesting to develop a sustainable funding model for the Groningen Declaration initiative.

In line with the first starting point, a second one refers to the ‘first-mover disadvantage’ for universities. The benefits that are outlined in the Declaration are likely to occur, but are not proven. The only possible way to overcome such a disadvantage might be governmental intervention. The government needs, on the other hand, a justification for funding the initiative. Therefore, it might be an idea to calculate the potential overhead reduction and increase in student mobility to give the project more legitimacy.

Another point of departure is the transnational profile of the Groningen Declaration. That has implications for the funding of the project, as well as for the optimal organizational structure (meaning both the legal as well as the internal structure). It can be questioned whether or not a national government, in this case the Dutch government, should be ultimately responsible for the funding of the Groningen Declaration. This is due to their trans boundary profiling in which not only national institutions benefit from participating with the project but also cross-border institutions since the real benefits can be found in numbers. Moreover, within The Netherlands (and also in Scandinavia) the exchange of student data is regulated and processed above average. We could therefore argue that this in not a case of national interest but rather one of supranational interest. In that sense there is an important role for the Education, Youth, Culture and Sport Council configuration [EYCS] part of the Council of the EU, who could express intends to the European Commission of carrying out the Groningen Declarations’ aims. Future research could determine if there are possibilities of setting up a supranational entity who can bear ultimately responsibility for the goals, funding and legal affairs of the Groningen Declaration.

A fourth and final point of departure is in achieving strategic congruence (cf. Nilsson and Rapp, 2005). All governments have policies and strategies for higher education and research that aim at educating the most talented people, delivering excellent research performance, and fostering international cooperation. Mobility of students and staff is an essential part in achieving those strategic objectives. With strategic congruence, it is meant that all policies and strategies are aligned with each other. Therefore, exchanging student data digitally is in line with policies that for example (1) focus on a reduction of university overhead in order to leave more funds available for education and research (which is one of the performance criteria of Dutch universities), (2) focus on attracting and retaining international talent for the Dutch society in general and the economy in particular, and (3) focus on increasing mobility of staff and students around the globe. From that point of view, it can be motivated that the Groningen Declaration touches upon the core business of universities.
research can outline how strategic congruence among educational policies can be achieved concretely.
6. Students Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>1 point</th>
<th>0,5 point</th>
<th>0 points</th>
<th>Points (0:0,5:1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of group process/group dynamics.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building trust and rapport with the client– safe place.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving authority from group.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with fear and anxiety.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of motivation, encouragement, support.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to keep the group on time, on task and productive</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to manage conflict and “dynamics of difference”.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going critique of self and process.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to identify the appropriate consulting role needed. (Coach, Expert, Facilitator, Teacher/trainer)</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to “fire” a client.</td>
<td>☑ DO WELL</td>
<td>☑ EMERGING SKILL</td>
<td>☑ INACTIVE</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total – input total score under V. on page 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Groningen Declaration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project duration</td>
<td>July, 2015 – October, 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Student participants (Names and s-numbers) | M. Dijk, s1766481  
R. Homan, s2014777  
J.M. Ottens, s1926659  
R.M. de Vries, |
| Contact person Organisation | H. de Leeuw |
| Supervising Lecturer | dr. J.S. Gusc  
G. Haanstra, MSc |

Final statement
This course has provided us with useful insights in conducting research and writing a professional consultancy report. We perceive it as an excellent opportunity for labor market preparation and connecting academia to practice.

We are thankful to everyone that was willing to be interviewed and who has provided insightful comments on our work. In particular, we would like to express our gratitude to Joanna Gusc and Gert Haanstra for their useful feedback, nice metaphors, and coffee. It was our pleasure!
7. Literature


8. Accountability
9. Appendices

List of interviewees


Feddema, H. (Hilde). Treasurer at Interstedelijk Studenten Overleg.


Kroes, L.B. (Luut). Director of Education and Students at the University of Groningen.

Leeuw, de H. (Herman). Secretary Groningen Declaration at Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs.


Schaik, E. van (Noor). Head of Section of Student Information and Administration, Department of Education and Students at the Office of the University, University of Groningen.


Sterken, E. (Elmer). Rector at University of Groningen.


Venhuizen, A.J. (Ina). Coordinator Exchange Officer at the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Groningen.

Wal, D. van der (Dik). Manager International Services at Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs.

Werf, R. van der (Rooske). Manager of the Department of Diploma Legalization at Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs.


---

\(^9\) Basis Register Onderwijs is the Dutch national register for educational data.
Interviewvragen

[Start Interview - Algemeen deel]

Onderdeel A: Introductie geïnterviewde
- Functie
- Verantwoordelijkheden en taken
- Relatie met betrekking tot de student data mobility

Onderdeel B: Huidige situatie

Procesbeschrijving
- Algemeen beeld datastromen
- Worden er studentgegevens uitgewisseld met andere instanties (vb. zuster- of partner universiteiten, of instanties zoals DUO/Min. v. O
  - Wat voor gegevens en waarom?
  - Hoe gebeurt dit? → deelvraag papier of digitaal?
  - Hoe kwalificeert u dit proces?
- Mogelijke verbeteringen of problemen? (indien niet aan bod gekomen deze vraag stellen)
- Welke stakeholders zijn er in uw ogen met betrekking tot student data mobility?
  - Welke rol spelen deze stakeholders? (vraag wordt gesteld om vast te stellen of het een client, designer of decision maker is)

Onderdeel C: Introductie Groningen Declaration

- Korte samenvatting van de GD(N):
  - Ziet u voordelen met betrekking tot wereldwijde uitwisseling van digitale student gegevens?

Indien geen of onvoldoende input vragen naar:
  → Vergelijkbaarheid (verschillende instanties, data, taal, ECTS en becijfering)
  → Toegankelijkheid (waar kan ik de data vinden en uitwisseling)
  → Veiligheid van data (waar wordt het opgeslagen, certificering)
  → Privacy (compliance met privacy wetgeving)
  → Kostenbesparingen (efficiency, werkbaarheid)

Leiderschap
- Welke partij is naar uw oordeel ‘in de lead’ als het gaat om de implementatie van de Groningen Declaration? Waaruit blijkt dit en hoe wordt rekening gehouden met de belangen van andere stakeholders?
- Op welke wijze wordt er tot nu toe geprobeerd meer (buitenlandse) partners te binden? Hoe succesvol is die aanpak?

[Specifieke vragen afhankelijk van de rol van de stakeholder (o.b.v. Vos en Achterkamp, 2004):

Afnemer
- Wat zijn de voordelen van de Groningen Declaration voor de tot dusver genoemde stakeholders?
- Zijn er anderen die voordeel uit de Groningen Declaration (kunnen) halen? Zien zij dat zelf ook?
- Zijn er andere voordelen die misschien nog onderbelicht zijn, maar er uwen inziens toe kunnen leiden dat de Groningen Declaration breder bekend of gedragen wordt?

Beleidsmaker
- Wie is over het algemeen beslissingsbevoegd voor de implementatie van het project? Op welke terreinen of onderwerpen kan dit orgaan wel/geen beslissingen nemen? Wie kan dat dan wel?
- Welke middelen worden er tot dusverre ingezet om de implementatie tot een succes te maken?
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• Zijn er andere besluitbevoegden/wetgevers met vergelijkbare (machts)middelen?
• Zijn er andere relevante resources? Wie maakt gebruik van en wie kan deze resources leveren?

**Designer**
• Welke relevante kennis of expertise heeft uw organisatie om de Groningen Declaration tot een succes te maken?
• Zijn er andere betrokkenen met vergelijkbare kennis of expertise?
• Wat zijn uw inziens de relevante probleempunten en –onderwerpen?
• Wie zouden kunnen of moeten bijdragen aan het oplossen van deze problemen? Bestaat de bereidheid daartoe?

**Passief betrokken – vertegenwoordiger**
• Wat zijn de effecten van de Groningen Declaration voor zij die passief betrokken zijn? Dat wil zeggen, wel profiteren of hinder ondervinden maar niet meebeslissen?
• Zijn er andere (negatieve) effecten? Zo ja, voor wie?
• Zijn de belangen van passief betrokkenen voldoende in het project geadresseerd? Zo ja, hoe? Of zo nee, waarom niet?

**Specifieke vragen**
Afhankelijk van de organisatie en positie van de geïnterviewde en het verloop van het interview.
Business Research & Consulting is a course that can be chosen within several MSc programmes. In this course, groups of students examine a real managerial issue. They translate the issue into a problem statement that can be addressed within the time frame of this course. Inherent parts of this course include students visiting an organization in the private, public or non-profit sector, carrying out research, analyzing the results, drawing conclusions and proposing a feasible solution including implementation steps for the company. Use of innovative methods and data sources, such as e.g., social media, meta data analysis, are strongly encouraged.

The course is offered as a specific career service by the FEB Careers Company that offers FEB students comprehensive career information and helps them prepare for the (international) labour market and get introduced to the corporate industry. In order for them to develop, achieve and maintain career success and to distinguish themselves in a manner that best fits their ambitions and competences. The FEB Careers Company supports students with career guidance, personal development, skills training, as well as a variety of specific career events, courses and programmes.