

Master of Business Administration

Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences

*Report of Standards 10 and 11 of the extensive programme assessment*

*Reference number: **007904**.*

## Table of contents

1. Executive Summary.....	3
2. Introduction.....	3
3. Programme.....	4
3.1 General characteristics.....	4
3.2 Institution.....	4
3.3 Programme.....	5
4. Assessment.....	5
4.1 Standard 10 – Student assessment.....	6
4.2 Standard 11 – Achieved learning outcomes.....	9
4.3 General conclusion.....	13
4.4 Recommendations.....	13
5. Overview.....	13
Attachment 1 Panel.....	14
Attachment 3 Documents.....	17

## 1. Executive Summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Master of Business Administration (MBA) at Wittenborg University, which has been assessed according to the NVAO Assessment Framework<sup>1</sup>.

### **Student assessment and achieved learning outcomes**

The assessment system of Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences is explained in a convincing way. Various assessment types are used and follow the University's constructive alignment very well. The assessment is suited in format and content to ascertain the intended learning outcomes of the respective module. The requirements are in accordance with the desired Master qualification level. Therefore, in the view of the panel the learning outcomes are adequately checked. Overall, the panel came to the conclusion that the assessment system of WUAS for the MBA programme is valid, reliable, sufficiently independent, and has obviously been developed well in the last years.

WUAS also prepares its students adequately for the task of the Final Project. Four different forms enable the students to choose a Project type according to their individual interest and further career/study plans. A plausible system of supervising and marking of the Projects is in place. The teaching body uses given standards and grading schemes as a daily routine. The assessment criteria is clear and differentiates (where useful / necessary) between the four Project types. It enables the markers to a proper assessment. The panel formed the view that the Final Projects of the MBA programme adequately check on the students' achievement of the programme's intended learning outcomes.

## 2. Introduction

A contract for the abbreviated accreditation (standards 10 and 11) of the Master of Business Administration (MBA) was made between FIBAA and Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences on 12 November 2018.

FIBAA appointed a review panel. The HEI agreed with the chosen experts. The panel consisted of:

### **Prof. Dr. Ed Vosselman**

Radboud University Nijmegen School of Management  
Professor of Accounting

### **Prof. Dr. Dietmar Brodel**

Fachhochschule Kaernten, University of Applied Sciences, Villach, Austria  
Former Rector and Head of Business & Management

### **Dr. Rik Reumkens**

Rabobank  
Teamleader and member of Management Team  
Rabobank Learning Center, Senior Learning Expert

---

<sup>1</sup> Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, September 2016 (extensive framework), NVAO

## **Sabine Hahn**

Hochschule Augsburg University of Applied Sciences

Student: Master of Business Administration

Ass. jur. Lars Weber (secretary) was responsible for respectively the process coordination and the drafting of the panel members' report.

This composition reflects the expertise deemed necessary by NVAO. (Annex 1). All the panel members and the secretary signed a statement of independence and confidentiality.

The panel has based its assessment on the standards and criteria (10 and 11) described in the NVAO Extensive Accreditation Framework (September 2016).

The panel members studied the programme documents (Annex 2). Their impressions were sent to the secretary, in order to outline these remarks within the accreditation framework. The first impressions were the basis for a discussion within the panel and the joint assessment of standards 10 and 11.

The report was completed on 26 February. The university's response to any factual inaccuracies in the report was received on 25 February 2019 and has been taken into account when finalising the report on 26 February 2019.

## **3. Programme**

### **3.1 General characteristics**

Institution	: Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences
Programme	: Master of Business Administration (MBA)
Type of study programme	: Master programme
Mode of study	: full-time (part-time possible)
CROHO	: 70150
Number of ECTS points assigned	: 90 ECTS points
Projected study time	: 1.5-2 years
Initial start of the programme	: 2014

### **3.2 Institution**

Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences (WUAS) was established as an educational institute in 1987, initially called Wittenborg College. In 1996, it received its degree-awarding powers, being appointed a 'Hogeschool' by the Dutch Ministry of Education. WUAS, is a privately funded (not for profit) institution for higher education that operates fully in English.

WUAS is based in the Dutch town of Apeldoorn and currently offers Bachelor and Master programmes to around 850 students a year (2018) from the Netherlands and around the world. It has also campuses in Amsterdam and Vienna, Austria. WUAS counts its student numbers based on all those registered during a calendar year, and on average 450 students are studying at any one time during the year. Its size, international (micro)

environment and the fact that it is privately funded contribute to a dynamic and continuously developing institute that enjoys bringing a global outlook to a local region.

### 3.3 Programme

The MBA programme was initially accredited by NVAO from 31 August 2015, however with conditions, which were fulfilled, and reported by letter, on 24 March 2016. NVAO gave a positive accreditation, confirming that conditions were met, on 31 August 2016.

WUAS' MBA programme was designed based on the experience of the cooperation with a UK partner (University of Brighton) to offer 4 Master of Science programmes, and therefore, as WUAS explains, has been influenced by the best quality elements of the British higher education system. Regarding the relevant standards assessment and examinations the programme combines the best of the both systems, (UK and Dutch) merged into the structure of the assessment – this leads to examination forms of assessment in semester one and paper assignment submissions in semester 2. The use of external 2nd markers as examiners for the final assignment is based on the WUAS' UK experience.

To date (1 January 2019) WUAS has 5 graduates from the MBA programme, and only since 2017 has the intake reached significant numbers.

Numbers of students:

	Total Number of Students (MBA Calendar Year 2018)					
	Block 5	Block 6	Block 7	Block 1	Block 2	Block 3
Still Studying from previous block	39	49	56	62	71	78
Started 2018	10	7	8	9	7	11
Graduated 2018	0	0	2	0	0	0
Drop-out 2018	0	0	0	0	0	0
Study in progress 2018	49	56	62	71	78	89

Totals	
Total Students 2018	91
Started in 2018	52
Graduated in 2018	2
Dropped Out in 2018	0
Still studying end 2018	89

## 4. Assessment

This chapter presents the evaluation by the panel of the two standards. The panel has reproduced the criteria for each standard. For both standards the panel presents (1) a brief outline of its findings based on the programme documents, (2) the considerations the panel has taken into account and (3) the conclusion of the panel per standard.

#### 4.1 Student assessment

**Standard 10:** *The programme has an adequate student assessment system in place.*

##### *Findings*

At WUAS, an 'executive, independent' Graduation & Examination Board (GEB) oversees the operations, quality and methods of examinations. Two members, including the Chair of the GEB are independent external members. This is to be expanded to three external members in 2019.

Examination and Assessment: All modules in the MBA programme have an examination or assessment clearly defined in the module guide, which is based on the generic assessment information provided in the Education & Examination Guide that highlights the differences between Semester 1 and Semester 2 type module assessment and what it aims to achieve.

The MBA programme is divided into two teaching phases, each with a distinctive assessment format. The different types of assessment are aligned with the type of student at WUAS, and the academic development within the vertical cohesion of the MBA programme. An Education Board ensures that there is a balance of different types of examinations across the programme, testing the aims and objectives of a module in a way that is conducive to learning and at a level in line with the academic requirements of an applied sciences MBA programme.

*Semester 1* of the MBA contains 6 modules that are assessed through formal examination, either as a three-hour closed book or a three-hour open book examination. WUAS describes the types of examination that are available to teachers to use in their modules, for instance, open-book, closed-book examinations or reports and presentations. The type of examination used per module is set by the education board, in consultation with the teaching staff and fixed in the module guide. Examinations are spread regularly throughout the curriculum.

Examinations are prepared by the module lecturers, and submitted to the Examination Manager of the programme, who reviews the format, weight and relevance of the examination and ensures that it is related to the module aims and objectives and hence the final qualifications, to which the programme is mapped.

Each module in the MBA has at least 2 co-teachers, and both are involved with the writing and maintaining of the examinations and assessments. In cases where the module is offered on both Dutch sites – Apeldoorn and Amsterdam, up to four teachers could be involved. The Module Leader is ultimately responsible for setting the examination / assessment criteria.

*Semester 2* of the MBA contains 6 modules (3 'core' and 3 'elective' specialisation modules). These are assessed through individual papers and group work projects. Each module has two assessment components – an individual academic paper, and a project report that is submitted by a small group of students. The scope of the individual papers and the project assignment are clearly defined and described in the module guide for each individual module, developed by the academic staff in cooperation with the Education Board, and approved by the Graduation and Examination Board. All module Guides are fixed well in advance of the academic year and submission times and dates follow a clear

structure outlined in the Education & Examination Guide (EEG) and the specific Module Guide, within WUAS' carousel entry block system.

During *Semester 2*, students also complete three project weeks, in teams. These are generally directly related to a business case with a company, and results in a project week report and presentation. Clear guidelines for assessment exist, within a defined module guide, and are provided to students.

Secure & managed examining system: For all written examinations, WUAS has created an examination bank, a secure area that is only accessible by a small and highly trusted group of staff members. Teaching staff are contracted to maintain and keep updated, (at least) four different exams for their modules as all module are offered twice a year in the MBA). The above allows the exam administration team who manages the examinations to choose a different exam for primary and retake examinations, and one spare.

All examinations are held in the set exam weeks at each teaching block. The exam weeks are spread evenly throughout the year. Re-take examinations are held in two blocks at the ends of the winter and summer semesters. Deadlines for the submission of reports and projects are also set in the exam weeks, except for the reports for project weeks, which are usually set at the end of the project week in question. All papers (and the final project) are uploaded through Anti-plagiarism / reference assistance software (Turnitin).

Examination weeks in Semester 1 are facilitated by the exam administration team together with a team of external invigilators (having no other contact with students), who supervise the examinations and maintain the practical examination rules students are required to adhere to. WUAS employs a team of between five and eight examination invigilators, who are at the university eight weeks a year. The external invigilators are especially important to ensure that students are not making copies of examinations that can be used later for revision or exam preparation.

Development: In 2017, WUAS' education team has employed an external junior researcher specialised in education, on a project basis, to specifically look at the quality and balance of all examinations and assessments conducted at the institute. The report resulted in the development of a 'General Assessment Policy' described in the EEG and further development of the institute's Graduation & Examination Regulations which can also be found in the EEG. In 2018-2019 the same evaluation process of the student assessment system is being carried out. Furthermore, the Graduation & Examination board randomly (systemically) picks examinations and papers of students to review the assessment, as well as the structure of the assessment.

Attendance rates: WUAS notes that although attendance cannot influence the mark, WUAS has a strict attendance requirement for all lessons at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Students cannot take an examination or submit a paper with a module attendance rate under 75% (i.e. they can miss only 2 of the 8 taught blocks in any taught module).

### *Considerations*

The assessment system is explained in a convincing way. The respective documents like the Education & Examination Guide provide all relevant information. The two phases/two semester system with different assessment approaches seem reasonable for the MBA and fits into the overall didactical concept of WUAS. Various assessment types (written exams, presentations, business cases, group work, projects, etc.) are used and follow the constructive alignment very well. A good balance between the assessment types and

between individual and group assignments is ensured. The students' overall learning processes are supported.

The panel was able to check on the written examinations of 15 modules from the first and second semester. The assessment is suited in format and content to ascertain the intended learning outcomes of the respective module. The requirements are in accordance with the desired Master qualification level. Therefore, in the view of the panel the learning outcomes are adequately checked.

The panel members appreciate the work of WUAS' Graduation & Examination Board, especially the consultations with teachers when defining the adequate assessment form and content. Furthermore, in the opinion of the panel the random picking and checking of realised examinations by the Board is a very useful way of reviewing the achievement of the necessary disciplinary level within the modules of the MBA programme.

The organisation of assessments appears reasonable, too. The exam forms as well as exam weeks are evenly spread over the semesters. Two or more teachers are involved in the assessment of each module. However, one module leader is officially responsible. There are also measures to ensure equal quality in modules that are taught on both Dutch campuses. The formulated necessity of four different exams to be available every year guarantees equal opportunities for all students no matter if it the regular exam or a re-take. The panel also appreciates the standardised use of the plagiarism software turnitin.

Information on the assessment for students is provided in module descriptions and further material like the clearly verbalised and transparent grading schemes and transparent policies.

Overall, the panel came to the conclusion that the assessment system of WUAS for the MBA programme is clearly described and checks adequately the achievement of the learning outcomes. It seems valid, reliable, sufficiently independent, and has obviously been developed well in the last years.

### *Conclusion*

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess this Standard to be satisfactory.



## 4.2 Achieved learning outcomes

**Standard 11:** *The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.*

### *Findings*

As has been described previously, through the assessment at module level the students develop a body of knowledge, understanding and experience which demonstrates the achieved learning outcomes within the programme, and leads to the graduation part of the programme (Semester 3) which will demonstrate that the overall intended learning outcomes of the MBA have been achieved.

In order to graduate, WUAS' MBA students are required to write individual final projects that challenge them to use research methodology that complies with the level of a master's at a university of applied sciences. In *Semester 3*, which can be extended with an optional work experience / placement period (important for international students), students carry out the Final Project that they started to prepare during the Research Methods module, offered in Semesters 1 & 2. The Final Project can take four forms. MBA students have a choice between a business plan, a consultancy project, a multimedia project and a traditional dissertation. The final project has been carefully structured, and students are given a clear timetable of submission based around the block system.

The Final Project is always an individual piece of work, required to comply with internationally recognised standards of academic writing. The project is intended to be a culmination of the students' work in the programme, reflecting on what they have learned, using various different methods to research and explore an area of business or management within their chosen field (specialisation). WUAS requires students to use the "Harvard Method" of referencing and reporting.

Each student is allocated an Academic Supervisor from Semester 2. In contrast to the student's process tutor (who works with the student from the start of the programme), the academic supervisor focuses on guiding the student through their final project. The academic supervisor is also 1st marker of the final project and all final projects are marked by an **external** 2nd marker. Both 1st and 2nd markers adhere to the same assessment criteria, which are mapped to the Final Qualifications. Each Final Project is also approved by the Graduation & Examination Board after which the students are allowed to defend their Final project during an oral defence.

All students are expected to allow their Final Projects to be made available (anonymized) online for future students and this is done so through the online learning system Moodle.

Development: On the recommendations (conditions) of the 2015, NVAO auditing panel, WUAS improved the alignment and connection of the Final Project through Research Methods, and also the Project Weeks in Semester 2. In accordance with the conditions of the panel WUAS redefined the Final Qualifications, grouping them into 5 distinct qualification groups, which were benchmarked against other institutes, such as RSM.

Alignment of Final Projects assessment with final qualifications:

Alignment of FP Assessment Matrixes with new Final Qualifications						
	1	2	3	4	5	
Assessment criteria	Understand Body of Knowledge, apply theory & concepts to busn practice (intercult & internat)	Adopt mngt & leadersh roles to strategic policy & change (intercult & internat)	Possess communic and crit. analysis skills to improve busn	Conduct indiv. and group research	Possess personal development skills	
<b>All Final Projects:</b>						
Design & Conceptualisation						
Knowledge and understanding						
Research methodology						
Analysis & evaluation						
Structure, organisation, presentation						
Oral defense						
<b>Additional: Business Plan</b>						
Feasibility & implementation						
<b>Additional: Consultancy Project</b>						
Problem formulation						
Literature review						
Time management						
Conclusions and recommendation						

Example of Assessment Criteria for the Final Project type academic dissertation:

1: Assessment Criteria and Feedback Academic Dissertation (Please highlight appropriate criteria)						
MBA Graduation Assignment / Final Project GA41						
Name of the Student:		Student Number:		Tutor (first marker):		Second Marker:
Criteria/Grade	Design and conceptualisation of project	Intellectual engagement, knowledge and understanding	Methodology and research methods	Analysis and Evaluation	Structure, organisation and presentation	Oral Defense
55 – 64% Adequate to sound	Adequate to sound research design and conceptualisation, which engages with theory. Standard to limited attempt to expand, redefine and/ or contribute to existing knowledge/ practice. Aims and objectives are grounded in the wider literature to an adequate / sound level. Design and conceptualization of the research demonstrates an adequate to sound critical approach within the confines of the project's aims and objectives.	Adequate to sound understanding of and engagement with theory, frameworks and debates. Some contextualisation and recognition of seminal works, chronology and contested aspects of the wider literature but heavy reliance on a limited number of sources providing a standard grounding for the aims, objectives, research approach and methods of the study. Standard identification of gaps in knowledge.	A standard justification for and explanation of methods adopted with links made to the literature review and research questions. Standard recognition of limitations, potential bias and ethical issues.	Some but limited evidence of analysis, synthesis, evaluation and appraisal of the outcomes / findings of the research demonstrating some understanding of reflectivity when drawing on appropriate theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Research outcomes / findings are discussed to a standard level within the context of the original aims and objectives of the project. Sound conclusions and/ or recommendations discussed to a standard level within the context of the outcomes / findings. Standard recognition of limitations and areas for further enquiry.	Suitable organisation, structure and presentation of the project. Sound written and/or visual communication. Standard compliance and adherence to established protocols for academic writing (e.g. Harvard referencing, bibliography). Some minor grammatical errors and omissions in the references/bibliography.	Adequately structured presentation and communication of the core issues reviewed in the project. Basic delivery, clear tone, style and posture. Adequate choice of slides and slide structure. Sufficient command of the English language, leading to adequate grammar and vocabulary choices.
65-74% Good to very good	Good to very good research design and conceptualization, with potential to expand, redefine and/ or contribute to existing knowledge/ practice. Aims and objectives are grounded in the wider literature to a good to very good level and have generally been achieved to a good to very good standard. Design and conceptualisation of the research is at times ambitious with good evidence of a critical approach within the	Good to very good engagement with theory, frameworks and debates. Clear and at times insightful recognition of seminal works, chronology and contested aspects of the wider literature, providing a very good grounding for the aims, objectives, research approach and methods of the study. Good to very good identification of gaps in knowledge.	Good to very good justification for methods adopted, with clearly discussed and explained in the context of the literature review and research questions. Good to very good recognition of limitations, potential bias and ethical issues.	Good to very good quality analysis, synthesis, evaluation and appraisal of the outcomes/ findings of the research demonstrating very good level of reflectivity when drawing on appropriate theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Research outcomes / findings are discussed to a very good level within the context of the original aims and objectives of the project. Conclusions and/ or recommendations are discussed to a good to very good level within the context of the outcomes / findings. Good to very good, informed recognition of limitations and areas for further enquiry	Good to very good organisation, structure and presentation of the project. Good to very good quality written and/or visual communication. Good to very good compliance and adherence to established protocols for academic writing (e.g. Harvard referencing, bibliography). Few grammatical errors and isolated omissions in the references/bibliography.	Good structure, presentation and communication of the core issues reviewed in the project. Good delivery, clear tone, style and posture. Adequate choice of slides and slide structure. Sufficient command of the English language, leading to adequate grammar and vocabulary choices

Five students have graduated from WUAS's MBA programme (many more are expected in 2019 and beyond). Two of the five initial graduates have also have collaborated with papers / chapters written by researchers teaching on the programme and published some

of their work developed during the MBA programme. According to WUAS, this is also a reflection of the quality of the final project.

The panel assessed the five existent Final Projects during their assessment process:

Student number	grade	assessment
<b>S-GDPR1</b>	65	<p>Both markers grade the thesis with a 6.5. They agree that the student did put strong efforts in producing an extensive thesis and they both are convinced that the thesis contains important recommendations. However, they also have concerns about the lack of critical reflections in the thesis. The panel member thinks both markers convincingly assess the thesis.</p> <p>The panel member himself concludes that the paper strongly lacks focus. As a consequence, the panel member would have probably come up with a lower grade. Yet, also in the panel member's opinion it deserves the label sufficient.</p>
<b>S-GDPR2</b>	72	<p>While one marker grades the thesis with a 7.5 the other marker grades it with a 7.0. Despite feeling "sorry for the language" the first marker is convinced that the candidate has produced an "excellent", almost "perfect" thesis. The second marker does not comment in detail on the quality of the thesis but only indicates his evaluation on the pre-defined grading scheme.</p> <p>The panel member agrees that the structure of the thesis is adequate; yet it does not meet the established standards of empirical research; hypotheses are missing, the statistical analysis is poor; inferential statistics are almost missing; candidate seems to be not completely aware of established citation guidelines. The interpretation of data and the subsequent discussion lacks structure, rigour and substance. Overall, the grading seems to be overly benevolent.</p>
<b>S-GDPR3</b>	70	<p><i>Academic Dissertation:</i></p> <p>The panel member agrees with the assessment of the first and second marker in most aspects, but supposes, the examiners acted benevolent in this difficult case.</p> <p>Design and conceptualisation of the work were based on theories as well as practical findings (like new and in this context important technological aspects in the field of self-driving-vehicles). The study contains an overwhelming statistical part, but the necessary interpretation is quite limited and repetitive. The panel member also thinks, that the understanding of these academic and/or application-oriented background can only be called adequate to sound because analysis and evaluation, intellectual engagement and the whole part of reflection and recommendation – typical for MBA-programmes, application-oriented programmes or applied research is unfortunately beyond average.</p> <p>There is much effort from the student concerning statistics and a quite low achievement concerning the main desired learning outcomes like reflection, interpretation, recommendation. Summarizing, the panel member thinks that the assessment is aligned with the intended, very good standards of the institution - but quite benevolent for this individual case.</p>

<b>S-GDPR4</b>	80	<p><i>Business Plan:</i> Both markers grade the thesis with an 8. Both do not really explain their assessment. Particularly the first marker hardly provides an explanation. The second marker is more explicit, but reading the assessment one would not think that this would result in an 8. Perhaps some more effort might be put in providing sound arguments for the grades. However, the panel member's own reading of the thesis leads to concur with the two markers. The panel member thinks it is a good thesis, with a well specified research question, a fine methodology and focused results.</p>
<b>S-GDPR5</b>	61	<p><i>Academic Dissertation:</i> The first marker evaluated this Final Project with a 5,8; the second with a 6,4. End result: 6,1. The panel member agrees for a great part with the remarks that were made by the first marker which led to a 5,8. Summarized the remarks of the first marker/teacher: "weak problem statement, significance of the research was not ideal and student couldn't rework the topic, research is uncritical and not properly justified, research instruments confuse respondents, description of sample and population inadequate, reference list not in proper order with Harvard style reference, data collection and analysis confusing for the reader, answer to research question unclear, ..." Why the second marker evaluated this project with a 6,4 is unclear. In the panel member's opinion the remarks of the first marker are very generous for this student. For the panel member it was a real confusing and partly unreadable piece of work. This project added no value and a more multifaceted approach to the subject would certainly have been possible. The panel member would have evaluated this Final Project as inadequate as the student couldn't rework the feedback of teachers into an acceptable piece of work.</p>

### *Considerations*

In the view of the panel WUAS prepares the students adequately for the task of the Final Project via the module assessment (see Standard 10) and a Research Methods module. It is ensured that each student has to work on his/her Project individually. The four different forms enable the students to choose a Project type according to their individual interest and further career/study plans. Regulation regarding the preparation time of the Project and further organisational aspects is given.

The system of Academic Supervisors, who guide the students in the process and mark the Project as first marker complemented by a second external marker seems reasonable and benefits the quality of the assessment process. The involvement of the Graduation & Examination Board is another hint on WUAS' wish to achieve the required quality level and ensure fair and transparent assessment.

According to the panel, the provided Final Projects and the respective assessments by the first and the second marker showed that the teaching body uses the given standards and grading schemes as a daily routine, because their assessment of the Final Projects was

pragmatically based on them (by quickly encircling and writing on copies of these documents). Nonetheless, with regard to the assessed Final Projects (S-GDPR4 and S-GDPR5), the panel **recommends** WUAS to make sure that each marker gives clear and comprehensible explanations for his/her assessment of the Final Project. In its statement WUAS explained that measures to ensure a clear justification of the final mark from both first and second marker have already been taken and the results shall be visible in the assessment of the upcoming Final Projects of WUAS' graduates. The panel appreciates that.

The assessment criteria is clear and differentiates (where useful / necessary) between the four Project types. It enables the markers to a proper assessment. The presented alignment of the Projects with the final qualification was convincing, too.

The panel formed the view that the Final Projects of the MBA programme adequately check on the students' achievement of the programme's intended learning outcomes.

Besides, in the view of the panel the provided chance for interested students to publish results from their final projects is worth mentioning as it fosters the students' employability. The panel learned that many of WUAS' international students study the MBA-programme to find employment within the Netherlands. The opportunity to publish seems to be an additional stepping stone for such students, which benefits this learning outcome in a broader sense as well.

### *Conclusion*

Altogether, these considerations have led the assessment panel to assess this Standard to be satisfactory.

### **4.3 General conclusion**

Given the findings and considerations, the panel concludes that Standard 10 and 11 of the NVAO extensive framework are assessed as satisfactory.

### **4.4 Recommendations**

Standard 10: –

Standard 11: With regard to the assessed Final Projects (S-GDPR4 and S-GDPR4), the panel recommends WUAS to make sure that each marker gives clear and comprehensible explanations for his/her assessment of the Final Project.

## **5. Overview**

<b>Standard</b>	<b>Assessment</b>
<i>10. The programme has an adequate student assessment system in place.</i>	Satisfactory
<i>11. The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.</i>	Satisfactory

## Annex 1 - Panel

Name panel (incl. titels)	Short description of the panel member (e.g. current position; 1-3 sentences)
Professor Dr. Ed Vosselman	Professor of Accounting at Radboud University Nijmegen. Program Director of the Executive Master in Finance and Control. Responsible for developing programs and courses at bachelor level and at master level in Accounting and Control.
Professor Dr. Dietmar Brodel	Head of Business & Management Department at Fachhochschule Kaernten, University of Applied Sciences, Villach, Austria. Programme Director International business management. Former Rector of Fachhochschule Kaernten (2006-2014). Responsible for transformation of former Diploma-Programmes into Bachelor and Master Programmes.
Mr Rik Reumkens	Last position at Rabobank Utrecht (retired at 01 January 2019): Lead Academy Management-, Leaderschip- & Talent Development, Human Resources
Ms Sabine Hahn	Student Hochschule Augsburg, University of Applied Sciences in the Programme Master of Business Administration Education- and Science Management (MBA).

### Secretary / coordinator:

Name	Certified?	Email address
Mr Lars Weber, Programme Manager FIBAA	yes	<a href="mailto:Weber@fibaa.org">Weber@fibaa.org</a>

**Panel composition:**

Name	Role	Expertise							Participating in visit to		
		Subject matter	Education	Testing	International	Professional field	Review and audit	Student-related	Name of programme / university	Name of programme / university	Etc.
Prof. Ed Vosselman	Chair	X	X	X	X		X		Wittenborg University of Applied Sciences: MBA (Standards 10 and 11 of the NVAO framework)		
Prof. Dietmar Brodel	Member	X	X	X	X		X				
Mr Rik Reumkens	Member				X	X	X				
Ms Sabine Hahn	Student member	X					X	X			
Mr Lars Weber	Secretary										

**Overview of expertise within the panel (argumentation)**

Expertise	Expertise apparent from ...
a. Subject-matter expertise	<p>Prof. Vosselman: Accounting, particularly management accounting and control, Accounting and trust, Performance management, Management and Organization (currently)</p> <p>Prof. Brodel: Business Management, International management; Corporate governance &amp; organization; Environmental management (currently)</p>
b. Educational expertise	<p>Prof. Vosselman: Program Director of the Executive Master in Finance and Control, designer of multiple courses in Accounting and Control, Teaching in MBA's, Chartered Accountants and Controllers, PhD-students</p> <p>Prof. Brodel: Currently responsible for the Master course</p>

	International Business Management and teaching in the Master course Business Development & Management, next to two Bachelor courses Business Administration (since 2003)
C. Testing expertise	<p>Prof. Vosselman: Chair/membership of the exam committee HOFAM (a post-graduate course of high reputation for Higher Financial Management)</p> <p>Prof. Brodel: Since 15 years chair of the exam committee of the Business &amp; Management Department at Fachhochschule Kaernten.</p>
d. International expertise	<p>Prof. Vosselman: Visiting professor at Aston Birmingham, many international scientific conferences.</p> <p>Prof. Brodel: Advising international universities on organizational development and quality management (Kazakhstan, Montenegro, Namibia).</p> <p>Mr Reumkens: As a chairman of the European training programme of Rabobank Academy (2005-2017) responsible for the development and execution of a training programme for 6 cooperative banks in Europe under which Credit Agricole (France), DZ Bank AG (Germany) and OP Bank Group (Finland). July 2007: Short term deployment for Rabo International Advisory Services, PBDAC, Egypt</p>
e. Professional field expertise	<p>Mr Reumkens: Broad experience at different stations of his working life, e.g. Manager Facilities &amp; Control, Interpolis Insurance Company; Manager Training and Employment Agency, Interpolis; Teamleader and member of Management Team Rabobank Learning Center, Rabobank Netherlands, Rabobank Academy, Senior expert managementtraining and – development; Developing and executing training and development programmes for the 4.000 top level executives and professionals within Rabobank Group for example Rabobank MBA, Rabo Leadership Development Programme, Rabo Young Management Programme; Rabobank Netherlands, Rabobank Learning Center (RLC), Teamleader and member of Management Team RLC; 2009 – 1-1-2019 (date of retirement) Rabo Bank Lead Academy Management-, Leaderschip- &amp; Talent Development, responsible for design and delivery of all management training programmes for the department Human Resources Rabobank. Design of a new Rabobank Management Curriculum which is the backbone of the Management Development activities within Rabobank Group. Design and delivery of the Rabobank Professional Curriculum</p>



	Design new talent development programme, Future Leadership Journey.
f. Review and audit expertise	<p>Prof. Vosselman: Chair of accreditation committees of NVAO: three times, both MSc and MBA, Member of accreditation committees of NVAO: two times., Chairman of the Quality Assurance Committee of Dutch Chartered Controllers courses (RC-courses)</p> <p>Prof. Brodel: Broad experience as a panel member in accreditation procedures with FIBAA (at least 14 national and international accreditation procedures since 2013), for AQA (Austrian Quality Agency) and for the Kazakh Quality assurance agency Karagandi.</p> <p>Mr Reumkens: Participating several times a year as expert member or chairman in the accreditation process for Universities of Applied Sciences for more than 15 years.</p> <p>Ms Hahn: Has attended several accreditation procedures at the side of the Higher education institution.</p>
g. Student-related expertise	Ms Sabine Hahn, currently enrolled as student in a Master of Business Administration Programme at Hochschule Augsburg, University of Applied Sciences.

## Annex 2 – Documents

- Semester 1:

Written examination – Management Accounting & Finance  
Written examination – Marketing Management  
Written examination – Human Resource Management  
Written examination – Operations Management  
Written examination – International Management  
Written examination – Information Management

- Semester 2:

Written examination – International Hospitality Development  
Written examination – Entrepreneurship  
Written examination – Corporate Sustainability  
Written examination – Innovation, Creativity & Entrepreneurship  
Written examination – Business Statistics  
Written examination – Critical Perspectives in Hospitality Management  
Written examination – Globalisation, Society & Culture  
Written examination – Consultancy  
Written examination – Strategic Management

- Programme related information:

FIBAA MBA Approval Report Decision 2014

Initial NVAO Decision Report with Conditions 2015

WUAS Report to meet NVAO Conditions 2016

Final NVAO Approval 2016

The Programme Final Qualifications

The Professional Profile

Professional Profile versus Final Qualifications

MBA Final qualifications in relationship with the Dublin Descriptors

Programme Final Qualifications versus WUAS Domain Competencies

MBA Final qualifications in relationship with aims and objectives of indiv

MBA Detailed Aims and Objectives of Modules versus Programme Final Qualifi

Alumni - Examples of Positions and Sectors

The MBA Programme Curriculum

MBA Education and Examination Guide

Balance and Vertical and Horizontal Cohesion of the Programme

Internationality of Student Body - MBA Programme

Internationality and Diversity of Staff Body MBA Programme 2018

Example Work Placement Companies

Example of Module Handbook - MO41

Teaching and Learning Methods

The Modular Construction of the Programme

Work Placement Handbook for Master Students

Marking Criteria Final Projects

Didactic Approach

Dublin Descriptors versus HBO and WO profiles from the NVAO

Statistical Charts of Cohort Development - MBA

- **Institute related documents:**
  - Current Programme Fact Sheet
  - The Development of 5 Schools
  - WUAS Basic Organisation Chart
  - Statistical Charts of Student Registrations WUAS
  - Programme Development Process
  - Admissions Selection Criteria
  - The Admissions Process
  - Transparency of Admissions Decisions and Success Rates
  - 2nd Foreign Language Modules in the (Programme) Curriculum
  - Report into the Quality of the Examination System at WUAS
  - Introduction to the Quality System update 2018
  - Quality Handbook update 2018 - complete
  - The Graduation and Examination Board
  - The Education Board
  - Role and Responsibilities of the Head of School
  - Examples of Peer Reviewed Publications WUAS Lecturers 2014-2019
  - The Role of the Vice President Academic Affairs
  - The Role of the Director of Education
  - Role of the Head of Wittenborg Research Centre
  - WUAS Advisory Board and Advisory Bodies
  - Overall Staffing Figures at WUAS 2017
  - All WUAS Teaching Staff Overview
  - P - Overview of Teaching Staff MBA Programme 2018-2019
  - Internationality of Student Body
  - Internationality and Diversity of Staff Body - Institute
  - Current Academic Partnerships and Memberships
  - Plagiarism Detection Software at WUAS
  - 2nd Foreign Language Modules offered at WUAS
  - Examples of Study Agreements at WUAS
  - Overview of Internationalisation at Wittenborg University
  - Strategy Policy Internationalisation
  - ECA Accreditation Report Internationalisation