

RESEARCH MASTER'S PROGRAMME
Child Development and Education
University of Amsterdam

Report on generic quality
15 April 2024

Content

1. Introduction	3
1.1 Panel	3
1.2 Assessment framework	3
1.3 Approach	3
1.4 Working method	4
2. Characteristics of the programme	5
2.1 Administrative data	5
2.2 Organisation	5
3. Summary	6
4. Strong points	8
5. Recommendations	9
6. Assessment	10
6.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	10
6.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	13
6.3 Standard 3: Student assessment	21
6.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	24
7. Appendices	26
7.1 Documents studied	26
7.2 Site visit programme	26
7.3 Curriculum	27

1. Introduction

This advisory report contains findings, considerations and judgements about the Research Master's programme Child Development and Education (ReMa CDE) of the University of Amsterdam (UvA). The Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) bases its accreditation decision on this report.

1.1 Panel

The panel conducting the assessment of the ReMa CDE of the UvA consisted of:

- Prof. Ton de Jong (chair), emeritus professor of Instructional Technology, University of Twente the Netherlands;
- Prof. Caroline Braet, professor of Developmental Psychopathology, Ghent University, Belgium;
- Dr. Peter Lugtig, associate professor of methods and statistics, Utrecht University, the Netherlands;
- Prof. Pol Ghesquière, professor of pedagogical sciences, KU Leuven, Belgium;
- Nina van Graafeiland MSc (student member), PhD student in Educational Sciences, Utrecht University, the Netherlands.

The panel was supported by dr. Jetje De Groof, who acted as secretary.

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 8 September 2023.

1.2 Assessment framework

The university had their research master's programmes assessed in accordance with the Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessment (NVAO 2018, hereafter: 'the assessment framework') and the additional criteria for the assessment of research master's programmes (NVAO 2016).

1.3 Approach

The programme, panel, and secretary have agreed on a 'development-oriented' approach to the assessment. This makes use of the opportunity offered by the assessment framework to place less emphasis on accountability and more on improvement and development. This methodology is based on trust and responds to the autonomy and ownership of the study programme as emphasised in the framework. Transparency, openness, and co-creation are key in this approach. Characteristic of the development-oriented approach is that the panel makes a preliminary statement about the generic quality of the programme on the basis of existing documentation. The subsequent site visit is – in part – dedicated to discussing the programme's own themes that are of importance to its development. This step-by-step approach aims to reduce the pressure traditionally placed on site visits. The programme knows in advance where it stands and thus experiences the opportunity to openly submit development themes to the panel. This promotes an equal dialogue between peers.

1.4 Working method

Ten weeks before the site visit, the panel received the documentation, including a reading guide, vision document and SWOT analysis, a student chapter, and a selection of fifteen recent graduation files (see appendix 7.1). These documents formed the basis for the assessment of the generic quality achieved. The panel studied the documents and organized a digital panel meeting two weeks before the site visit. In this meeting, the panel discussed its initial findings and provisional conclusions regarding the quality achieved on the four standards of the assessment framework. Part of the meeting was a (digital) consultation opportunity for students and lecturers who wanted to engage in conversation with the panel. No one took advantage of the opportunity to speak with the panel at this stage. Shortly after the meeting, the chair and secretary shared the panel's initial findings with the programme.

The site visit took place on 7 February 2024 in Amsterdam (see appendix 7.2). During the site visit, the panel spoke with delegations of students and teaching staff, the Examinations Board (EB), the Assessment Committee, the Programme Committee, alumni, and the management of the programme. The discussions were partly organised thematically around the development questions of the programme. The discussions also provided the panel with the opportunity to discuss remaining questions regarding the generic quality of the programme with those involved. At the end of the visit, the panel drew up findings and recommendations. The panel's chair presented these orally to stakeholders of the programme.

After the visit, the secretary drew up the advisory report. This report (presented here) contains the assessment of the programme's generic quality on the four standards of the framework and the additional criteria for research master's programmes. On the basis of this report, the NVAO takes an accreditation decision. After processing the panel's feedback, the secretary sent the advisory report to the programme for the purpose of fact-checking the text. The secretary has corrected factual inaccuracies identified by the programme in the final version. The executive board of the University of Amsterdam received the final report on 15 April 2024.

Representatives of the programme gathered their main findings concerning the development opportunities of the ReMa CDE and submitted their insights to the panel as input for the development report. This report is not part of the application for renewal of accreditation, but rather discusses development opportunities identified during the site visit. The programme will publish the report (on its own website) within a year of the NVAO's accreditation decision.

2. Characteristics of the programme

2.1 Administrative data

Name of the programme:	Child Development and Education
Croho:	60212
Level and orientation of the programme:	academic research master's programme
Credits:	120 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	(1) Regular Route, (2) Clinical Route 'Orthopedagogiek', (3) Clinical Route 'Forensische Orthopedagogiek'
Location:	Amsterdam
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English

2.2 Organization

The two-year ReMa CDE is hosted by the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FMG) at the UvA, more specifically by the department of CDE, which is one of the four domains of FMG. Students of the ReMa CDE are enrolled in the Graduate School of CDE. The department of CDE consists of seven programme groups, where the teaching and research is substantively organized around subdisciplines of child development and education.

The Research Master is a two-year, international programme. The language of instruction is English. Admission is selective and capped at 25 students annually. Research Master students who are interested in combining a research career with a career in clinical practice and who want to qualify for the official continuation courses and training for clinical professions in the Netherlands ('Orthopedagoog-Generalist' or 'GZ-psycholoog') can follow the Clinical Route in the programme.

The programme coordinator is responsible for the daily organization and management of the programme and staff, monitoring of the progress and well-being of the students, and providing information about the programme to prospective and current students. Decision-making occurs at the level of the director of the Graduate School, in collaboration with the programme coordinator who remains in contact with the various actors that are relevant for the programme.

3. Summary

The profile of the Research Master in Child Development and Education (ReMa CDE) of the University of Amsterdam (UvA), with its combination of the fields of education and child development, its quantitative orientation, and its option for a Clinical Route, is distinctive and attractive. The exit qualifications adequately mirror the programme's profile and objectives, and its research-intensive nature. The ReMa CDE has the necessary systems and structures in place to ensure that it stays up to date with the latest evolutions in the domains of child development and education. Nevertheless, vigilance is needed to balance attention between both components of child development and education in the programme. Additionally, topics like data science and AI may not be receiving sufficient focus going into the future, which is why the panel recommends monitoring these areas to remain responsive to evolving trends.

The ReMa CDE's curriculum, didactics, staff and facilities work together to provide student-centred and research-intensive education. Its flexible curriculum and supportive community environment are enablers for student-centred learning. The redesign of the Clinical Route following the last accreditation has been positively received by the panel, enhancing the programme's appeal. The internship and thesis components offer students ample opportunities to engage in the empirical cycle, fostering research skill development. The programme attracts a relatively large number of international students. All these elements lead to the conclusion that the programme's teaching-learning environment meets the standard.

Yet the panel has also identified areas of the teaching-learning environment that require improvement, most of which are already firmly on the radar of the programme management. The programme acknowledges the need to increase student intake, and first effective actions have already been taken. The necessary checks are in place to safeguard a better balance between theory and methods on the one hand, and education and child development on the other. Still, the panel welcomes current initiatives to improve the balance and interaction between child development and education. Also, while methodological courses predominantly focus on quantitative research, the panel emphasizes the importance of providing opportunities for students to acquire in-depth skills in qualitative and interpretative methods. Furthermore, there is room for a more focused approach to scientific integrity and open science practices, and for a deeper exploration of disciplinary theories. Finally, the internship could benefit from explicitly incorporating data collection as a learning goal, and the output requirement may be reconsidered to emphasize reflective reporting over thesis-like writing and analysis. The latter adjustments would further enrich students' research experiences within the programme, and lead to more rigor and depth in the critical and theoretical analysis in the final thesis.

The panel is convinced that CDE's student assessment is valid, reliable, transparent, and fair. The professionalism and expertise of the staff involved in assessment are evident. However, the panel identified a few points for improvement. It recommends enhancing documentation practices to provide a clearer rationale behind decisions in the assessment of theses, especially for cases that are judged as being just sufficient. Also, the panel suggests re-evaluating the balance of formative and summative evaluation in the disciplinary courses to ensure adequate emphasis on both aspects. Finally, the panel asks to consider to organize the Programme Committee at the programme level, leveraging potential advantages in governance and decision-making processes.

The quality of the capstones and the performance of alumni show that the ReMa CDE delivers high-quality graduates that are qualified for the academic and non-academic labour market.

Standard	Judgement
1 Intended learning outcomes	Meets the standard
2 Teaching-learning environment	Meets the standard
3 Student assessment	Meets the standard
4 Achieved learning outcomes	Meets the standard
Final conclusion	Positive

4. Strong points

The panel identified numerous strengths. The ones listed below stood out.

- 1. Research-intensive teaching learning environment** – The programme boasts a strong research-oriented curriculum, with a substantial part of the curriculum dedicated to individual research projects, and a direct link to research groups connected to the department of CDE. Students in the programme have ample opportunities to develop their research skills, and the programme's (quantitatively oriented) methods training is a clear strength.
- 2. Supportive Community Environment** - The programme fosters a small-scale, tight-knit community where students feel fully integrated into the academic environment. Through tutoring, symposiums, and a sense of belonging, students experience a supportive and safe learning atmosphere, characterized by a palpable research culture.
- 3. Flexible and Accessible Faculty with an excellent academic reputation** - CDE teaching staff are active researchers with an excellent track record. Faculty members are readily available to provide guidance and support, contributing to a collaborative and enriching academic experience. Students are very appreciative of their quality and level of engagement.
- 4. Flexible curriculum enabling student-centred education** – Students are offered a considerable amount of freedom to flexibly compose their curriculum, allowing them to follow a programme that is more focused on child development, or education, or a combination of both.
- 5. Integration of the Clinical Route** - Building upon recommendations from the former accreditation panel, the programme has redesigned its clinical route. This redesign ensures that students receive comprehensive training as researchers, while also developing their clinical skills. By offering a dual-profile curriculum, students can develop a versatile skill set highly sought after in contemporary clinical practice.

5. Recommendations

The panel makes a number of recommendations to aid with the further development of the programme. These do not detract from the positive assessment of the basic quality of the programme.

- 1. Focus on theory** - Ensure the prominence of substantive, state-of-the-art, advanced theory in the curriculum. Additionally, address the impression that theory-oriented courses tend to employ more formative assessments whereas methodological courses focus more on examinations, potentially reinforcing the perception of theory playing a secondary role to methodology.
- 2. Balance and interaction between child development and education** - Enhance the balance and interaction between both elements in the curriculum. Remain vigilant of the risk of one domain overshadowing the other. Consider Intervention Research and Academic Skills courses as opportunities for increased interaction between both domains.
- 3. Format of the Internship** - Consider explicitly incorporating data collection and active participation in ongoing research efforts by staff of CDE as a learning goal and rephrasing the output requirement to prioritize reflective reporting over thesis-like writing and analysis.
- 4. Review methods and statistics curriculum** – Provide students with opportunities to follow comprehensive course(s) in qualitative and interpretative methods. Consider offering students a broader and more flexible choice of methods courses in the compulsory part of the curriculum.
- 5. Documentation of decision-making of assessment and grading of thesis** - Enhance documentation practices to provide a clearer rationale behind decisions in borderline cases in the assessment of theses.
- 6. Use of the term 'scientist-practitioner'**. Reconsider the 'scientist-practitioner' as it may not fully encapsulate the intended role of students upon completion of the programme. Rather, the programme seems to prepare these students for roles as applied scientists who engage in a dialogue with practitioners.
- 7. Functioning of the Programme Committee.** Currently, the committee, which encompasses all programmes of the department, reviews a large number of courses each semester using a quick checklist format, which may not adequately address content concerns or engage with present students. Consider operating at the programme level (rather than at the department level).

6. Assessment

6.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.

Findings and considerations

The Research Master Child Development and Education (ReMa CDE) is a selective, two-year international programme. The programme is described as small-scale and intensive and is delivered in English. Its aim is to train students in the field of child development and education, and to prepare them to become fully equipped and responsible researchers. Dutch students interested in combining a research career with a career in clinical practice and seeking eligibility for the official continuation courses and training for clinical professions in the Netherlands, can opt for the Clinical Route within the programme (see Standard 2 for more details on the Clinical Route).

The ambition to combine education in child development and education offers the programme a unique and attractive focus. By choosing a particular set of courses, students can follow a programme that is more focused on child development, education, or a combination of both. The programme places a great emphasis on quantitative skills, and the panel recognizes that there is a robust market demand for junior researchers trained in these skills. From its discussions with students and alumni, the panel learned that the combination of child development and education, and the quantitative orientation, is an important reason for students to choose for this particular research master, as is the option to follow the Clinical Route. (Graduated) students highlight the importance of these skills in their future careers.

The panel acknowledges that the programme has articulated a clear mission, vision, and set of core objectives. Appropriately for a research master's programme, graduates are prepared to make a PhD or to take up research positions in either the public or the private sector. They are qualified to do fundamental as well as applied scientific research about child development and/or education. To be able to do that, they should understand the responsibilities associated with their roles in the wider academic and societal context, demonstrate a critical constructive and collaborative approach to research, be able to operate both independently and in cooperation with relevant stakeholders, and have the skills to operate in diverse environments. The panel confirms that the programme's intense research perspective corresponds to the expectations of a research master. The panel finds that the choice of English as the language of instruction is well justified. The decision to offer all educational activities and assessments in English is based on the research-intensive nature of the programme. It also shows how research is imbedded in an international environment.

On the basis of the preparatory documents, the panel raised questions on the extent of interaction between child development and education in the programme, and on education potentially playing a subordinate role to child development. The panel learned that there is indeed a tendency for students to choose for child development or a combination of both themes, with a smaller

proportion of the students focusing on educational courses or theses. Nevertheless, the programme management confirmed that the fundamental idea behind the programme is to combine child development and education. Reflecting the Department's research, ranging from prevention to psychopathology, the aim is to examine the child from various perspectives, encompassing educational as well as other contexts. This balance is also reflected in the distribution of the exit qualifications of the programme. The panel was pleased to learn that this issue is on the radar of the programme management, and that it is being monitored. Nevertheless, vigilance is required to maintain a balance where both components are given due attention and are effectively interwoven within the programme (see also Standard 2).

The programme's exit qualifications are aligned with the categories of the Dublin Descriptors. The panel considers them to be a precise and carefully considered reflection of the programme's profile and objectives. They evidently belong to an academically inclined master's-level programme that aims to train the next generation of researchers in child development and education. The intended outcomes emphasize quantitative research and encompass the programme's commitment to integrating reading, evaluating, designing, executing, and reporting research into the curriculum. Students in the programme receive comprehensive methodological training, which is one of the programme's strengths. The panel values that scientific integrity, open science practices, and critical thinking are acknowledged as fundamental goals of the programme and are touched upon in the exit qualifications, aligning with the panel's expectations for a research master.

The panel learned from the preparatory documents that students in the clinical route should be able to work as scientist-practitioners in a clinical setting (after finishing an extra shortened clinical master, see standard 2). While the panel appreciates the programme's ambition to bridge the gap between research and practice, it recommends to carefully consider the use of the term 'scientist-practitioner' as it may not fully encapsulate the intended role of students upon completion of the programme. Rather, the programme seems to prepare these students for roles as applied scientists who engage in a dialogue with practitioners.

As part of the Visible Learning Trajectories Programme four learning trajectories have been distinguished in the programme: (1) Methodological and Statistical Skills, (2) Academic and Research Skills, (3) Critical and Reflective Thinking, and (4) Disciplinary Knowledge/Perspective, each with a set of goals. The panel learned that course objectives of all Research Master courses have been rephrased according to Bloom guidelines and connected to learning trajectory goals. Furthermore, the learning trajectory goals have been connected to the exit qualifications, which has led to a rephrasing of some of the exit qualifications. The review of exit qualifications will be implemented from the academic year 2024-2025 onwards. The demo of the Visible Learning Trajectories tool further substantiated the alignment between course objectives, learning trajectory goals and exit qualifications.

As a research master programme, CDE's priority lies in preparing students for a research career. Connection to the professional field's expectations comes by means of its lecturers who are all active researchers in the fields of child development and education. The programme also benefits from the insights of an Alumni Board, which includes Research Master graduates, which advises on the programme's relevance to the labour market and fosters the link between academic training and professional application. Although the panel is of the opinion that current processes are adequate, it

also found in its review of course descriptions and materials that certain timely topics such as data science and AI may not yet receive the attention warranted, considering their significance in any future (research) context (see also Standard 2). The panel asks the programme to closely monitor this.

In conclusion, the ReMa CDE's profile, with its combination of the fields of education and child development, its quantitative orientation, and its option for a clinical route, is distinctive and attractive for students. The programme's exit qualifications adequately reflect its research-intensive nature. The ReMa CDE has the necessary systems and structures in place to ensure that it stays up to date with the latest evolutions in the domains of child development and education. Nevertheless, vigilance is needed to balance attention between both components of child development and education in the programme. Additionally, topics like data science and AI may not be receiving sufficient focus as yet, despite their importance in future research. It is the panel's recommendation to monitor these areas to remain responsive to evolving trends.

Conclusion

Meets the standard

6.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Findings and considerations

Selection and admission

With the programme's capacity capped at 25 students, its admission policy is notably selective. Annually, only between 15 to 20 applicants from a pool of 35 to 37 are enrolled, in line with the high entry standards. The panel commends the programme's approach to selection, which balances academic performance with the applicant's motivation, ensuring a comprehensive evaluation beyond mere grades. The panel was pleased to learn that the selection criteria consider content knowledge of the field as well as methodological and statistical knowledge.

In the academic year 2023-2024, 21 students enrolled in the ReMa CDE, a significant increase compared to previous years, where the number ranged between 11 and 16. The programme has consistently attracted a significant proportion of international students, with their representation fluctuating between 38% and 81% throughout the reporting period. The panel was pleased to see that the need to increase student intake is clearly on the radar of the programme management, as the small cohort had raised the panel's concerns regarding the programme's viability. Actions taken in 2022-2023 seem to have resulted in an upward trend in enrolments, that evidently needs yet to be established as a consistent pattern in the coming years.

Curriculum

Structure, flexibility and coherence

The ReMa CDE consists of 120 EC and takes two years to complete. The compulsory component (42 EC) consists mainly of courses on methodology and statistical techniques. In addition, students have room to follow their own interests by picking their preferred topics for the Research Internship (18 EC) and the Research Master Thesis (30 EC), and by choosing five from eight elective courses that are offered in the programme (30 EC). The latter are disciplinary courses in the fields of child development and education. Students can submit a request to the EB to replace elective courses (with a maximum of 12 EC) with courses offered by other graduate schools or other universities. All this allows students to flexibly compose a curriculum that is more focused on child development, or education, or a combination of both. Students, both during the site visit and in the Student Chapter of the information file, expressed their appreciation for this flexibility.

In the Clinical Route, students have less flexibility. They follow the clinically oriented elective courses of the Research Master, and two courses in Diagnostics and Treatment from the master programme Pedagogical Sciences. Upon completing the Research Master's programme, these students are required to pursue an additional condensed master's programme in Pedagogical Sciences. The panel values that the Clinical Route, which has been redesigned following prior evaluations and student feedback, allows students to develop a dual profile that is increasingly valued in clinical practice. The

panel established that students opting for the Clinical Route are informed well in advance that this option provides less flexibility in the curriculum.

The panel explored how the curriculum ensures that students grow in a balanced manner towards all the intended exit qualifications. A first topic of consideration was the balance within the curriculum between education and child development (see also Standard 1). The panel learned that the eight elective courses are evenly split between both fields, but that some education-oriented courses are only offered every two years due to low student interest. Programme management and lecturers explained that the curriculum features several courses that intersect both domains, and this thematic intersection is echoed in thesis topics. Still, in its discussions with the students, the panel observed that students perceive less interaction between the two disciplines compared to faculty. The panel was pleased to learn that this issue is on the radar of the programme management. Efforts are ongoing to improve and create a more cohesive approach. Programme management and panel alike identified the courses of Intervention Research and Academic Skills to be ideally suited to enhance this integration. The panel welcomes that course coordinators are instructed to align their courses with this more integrated approach.

The panel also looked into the balance in the curriculum between methodology and statistics on the one hand, and substantive depth on the other. This inquiry was prompted not only by the programme's core objective of delivering state-of-the-art theory, but also by the panel's observation in the final theses that their theoretical depth did not match their methodological rigor. The panel noted that 33 EC of the 42 EC of compulsory courses are focused on methodology and statistics, while students select 30 EC of discipline-focused electives. Within this content-focused space, students are moreover allowed to opt from courses from other programmes (for a maximum of 12 ECTS). The students the panel spoke to seemed to be quantitatively oriented and had opted to replace one of the disciplinary courses with a statistics course from another programme, further sparking the panel's concern. The panel was however satisfied to learn from the EB, faculty, and programme management alike that most students complete their 12 ECTS within the programme. Some students do opt for substantive courses from other research masters, like Psychology. Occasionally, a student may wish to substitute a substantive course for one in statistics, but this is not the norm. Students opting for courses in other programmes have to fulfil the same requirements as the other students in this programme. As these are mostly other research masters and as this only pertains to a small part of the curriculum, the panel finds this adequate. The EB confirmed that a student's motivation is always assessed, and the achievement of the exit qualifications is systematically checked. Furthermore, students and faculty explained that achieving a proper balance between content and methodology is a recurring topic in bimonthly tutor meetings.

In conclusion, the panel values that students can to a certain level personalize their curriculum based on their own interest. It observed that the necessary checks and balances are in place to guarantee that only courses are chosen that fit the objectives of the programme, and that the balance between theory and methods on the one hand, and education and child development on the other, is guaranteed. The EB plays an active role in safeguarding this. Also, students receive effective guidance in making their academic choices. Discussions about course selection are a regular feature of tutor meetings, where students typically report positive experiences. In instances where difficulties arise, the programme coordinator is available to provide assistance.

Also, the panel established that the curriculum is aligned with the programme objectives and exit qualifications. The exit qualifications are covered by the mandatory components of the programme. The introduction of learning trajectories has further improved the vertical coherence of the curriculum. Additionally, the learning trajectory tool has allowed for closer monitoring and alignment with the exit qualifications. The panel values that there are entry requirements for both the internship and the thesis, making sure that students have acquired enough knowledge and skills before starting with these larger projects.

Content

In studying the course descriptions and the seven courses for which the panel received all course materials, the panel found the courses to be of high quality, well set up, and content-wise in line with what can be expected of a Research Master. However, there were a few points where the panel sees room for improvement.

The panel noted that methodological courses within the programme lean heavily towards quantitative research, with students indicating that there is room for more qualitative methods in the curriculum, a point that aligns with recommendations from the previous assessment panel. The programme currently does assist students to follow qualitative research courses in other programmes in their elective space, but the room in the curriculum to do so is limited. Lecturers pointed out that students already possess robust research skills, which serves as a foundation for those interested in pursuing qualitative research in their thesis work. Considering the tradition of research in educational sciences and child development, the panel believes that offering students a comprehensive introduction to qualitative and even interpretative methods is essential. One avenue of thinking could be to offer students a broader and more flexible choice of methods courses in the compulsory part of the curriculum, allowing them to build a foundation in both qualitative and quantitative methods before making a specialized choice.

As regards the quantitative methods courses, the panel found them to be of high quality and level. Yet, the panel also noted these methods courses may benefit from updates to incorporate emerging areas such as data science/AI. This suggests a need to revisit and refine the learning objectives pertaining to methods and statistics.

The panel also delved into the way scientific integrity and open science practices are addressed. It became clear that these themes are offered at various points in the programme. Over the past few years, three online modules covering good research practices, data management, and research ethics have been developed, which students are required to complete before they can undertake their thesis or internship. In-depth discussions on all of these topics are a feature of the Academic Skills course. Open Science is addressed within the Intervention Research course, and ethical considerations along with data management plans are integral to the thesis. The panel observed that the themes are currently spread across the curriculum. While the foundational elements are in place, the panel thinks a critical re-evaluation may be warranted to ensure that adequate emphasis and focus is realized.

In the same vein, the panel believes there is room for improvement in how critical thinking is implemented in practice. In this regard, the panel was pleased to learn that in 2023-'24, the

Intervention Research course has been adjusted to include additional sessions to facilitate discussions and feedback. Also, the panel sees opportunities to provide more space for critical reflection in the Internship (see below). The panel's insistence on enhancing the teaching and practice of critical thinking across the curriculum is driven by its observations that the depth of critical analysis in some of the theses (see Standard 4) could be improved. The identified gaps reinforce the need for a more rigorous and concentrated approach to developing critical thinking skills to ensure that students are well-prepared for the high level of analytical rigor required in their research projects.

Aligned with this topic, the panel found that while the curriculum aims to safeguard the inclusion of comprehensive, advanced, state-of-the-art theoretical content, the in-depth examination of the course materials revealed that this extensive theoretical depth was not consistently present. The panel sees room for a deeper exploration of certain theories (for example theoretical models explaining developmental psychopathology), which will also contribute to achieving more depth in theoretical analysis in the thesis.

In discussing the above topics, the panel noted that the Academic Skills course was often referred to as the course in which these topics are discussed. The panel recognizes the Academic Skills course as a valuable part of the curriculum, yet it also asks the programme to monitor that it does not become a repository for an overly broad range of topics that only superficially can be touched.

Internship and thesis

In the current curriculum of the programme, the research internship and master's thesis are key milestones, with 18 and 30 ECTS credits respectively. The internship, positioned in the first year, immerses students in active departmental research projects, where they work with pre-existing data sets. The output of the internship is a scientific report. This structure has been updated from the previous system, which included two separate thesis components, both with data collection requirements, to eliminate the study delays seen in the previous system attributed to the data collection phase of the students' research. For their thesis in the second year, students do engage in the full research cycle, including data collection, culminating in a comprehensive report suitable for submission to an international academic journal. The panel noted that some students work with existing datasets for their thesis, but it learned that these students are required to contribute to the data collection of another project.

The panel values that students are intensively immersed in (a) research (environment), both in the first and second year of their programme, which was seconded by the students and alumni. With the internship and thesis, the curriculum offers students the necessary opportunities to engage in all stages of the empirical cycle, allowing them to develop their research skills. Yet, the panel also regrets that in the current set-up for the internship, there seems to be a missed opportunity for students to engage in hands-on data collection. Doing so could enrich the students' learning journey leading up to the thesis. This sentiment was echoed by students during interviews. The panel also learned that programme management and lecturers recognize the limitations of the current system, and some supervisors do already involve students in the data gathering process to some extent.

In line with these observations, the panel concludes that the internship could benefit from explicitly including data collection as a learning goal. The panel also suggests considering changing the requested output of the internship. Instead of focusing on thesis-like writing and analysis, the internship could culminate in a reflective report that emphasizes the documentation and contemplation of the research process, including data collection, but, due to time limitations, not necessarily always covering the full research cycle. By shifting the focus from writing another scientific report to creating a reflection report, the programme would address the fear of study delays while also providing more space for critical reflection.

During the interviews, students voiced their appreciation for the supervision quality in both internships and theses within the programme, though they recognized that supervision quality can vary among different supervisors. The panel was reassured to find that the programme has implemented thorough checks and balances to ensure the process's integrity. In the Research Internship component of the programme, students engage in two plenary meetings and participate in a Writing Support course with four sessions, along with the short online modules mentioned above. For the thesis phase, the programme organizes four plenary meetings throughout the year. These meetings are instrumental in monitoring progress, identifying potential issues early on, maintaining students' engagement with each other's work, and providing a forum to discuss any questions or difficulties they may encounter. This structure nurtures a collaborative learning environment, enabling students to offer mutual help and support.

International experiences

In discussing international experiences within the programme, it was acknowledged that while international opportunities and scholarships exist, they are not structurally embedded within the programme. However, students who would like to opt for a stay abroad, are supported to do so. Few students participate in exchanges. International students typically do not express a need for additional international experiences, although some do their data collection in their home country. Also, students following the clinical route are unable to participate due to their curriculum requirements, leaving only a small number who might benefit from such opportunities. The programme being international and small-scaled, the student group forms a tight-knit community, offering ample opportunities for international and intercultural exchange 'at home'. The panel follows the programme's argumentation that this international classroom requires English as the teaching language. It recommends to explore other formats of internationalisation (for example guest lectures).

The panel was pleased to hear that international students are well-informed prior to commencing their studies about the unavailability of the clinical route in this programme. Similarly, clinical route students are adequately advised about their limited options and inability to travel abroad for their studies, which the panel finds acceptable.

Teaching-learning environment

Teaching approach and facilities

The programme is designed to foster a secure and supportive atmosphere where students feel valued, can offer mutual support, and learn collaborative skills. To facilitate this, all students start with the same foundational courses at the start of the academic year. Structured (bi-)monthly tutor group meetings are held to maintain this supportive environment throughout the students' tenure. The programme's commitment to creating a cohesive academic community is also reflected in the organization of events such as the Research Master Symposium and Graduate School Colloquia. Students and alumni speak positively about the Research Master room, emphasizing its role as a collaborative space where they can work together. This environment is repeatedly characterized as warm and welcoming, with a low barrier to entry, fostering a sense of community and easy interaction among students.

On the basis of its review of selected course materials, the panel established that lecturers structure their courses to stay close to the research process. Fitting for the didactical concept of a research master, the programme offers a small-scale and interactive learning environment, characterized by various practical assignments, research proposals, oral presentations, and reports, including those for the thesis and internship. Students value the small group sizes during lectures, which fosters meaningful dialogue and provided opportunities for diverse perspectives to be shared.

The panel deliberated on the admission of external students to the courses of the programme. It learned that the selection process prioritizes ambitious individuals from the regular master's programme in educational sciences, assessing their track record and commitment to research. Oversight of this evaluation falls under the Research Master coordinator, ensuring alignment with the programme's research-focused objectives. Furthermore, there is a criterion in place that external students should not exceed 30% of the cohort to maintain a balanced dynamic within the group. The panel concludes this is structured adequately.

The programme boasts well-equipped infrastructure. Research Master students have access to a variety of facilities during their internship and thesis research, such as numerous test and registration rooms equipped with advanced tools for observing and recording behaviour, measuring psychophysiological and neurophysiological phenomena, eye-tracking, audio-visual events, and even fMRI capabilities. Moreover, the purpose-built family and baby lab, situated within the programme's premises, is specifically designed for observational studies, offering specialized features tailored to such research endeavours.

Research orientation and embeddedness

The panel finds that the ReMa CDE's curriculum aligns with the rigorous standards expected of a research master's programme, offering a research-intensive experience within a distinguished academic context. With the internship and thesis encompassing 48 EC, students have ample opportunity to cultivate independence as researchers. The courses are led by faculty members with PhD qualifications and extensive research backgrounds, ensuring a research-driven approach to

teaching. Both faculty and students underscored the integration of ongoing research into the classroom environment.

Integral to the programme are key components such as the Research Master Symposium, graduate school colloquia, research internship, and master thesis, which provide students with full immersion in the research community surrounding the research master programme. The active involvement of all seven programme groups of CDE at the UvA further enriches the programme by offering a diverse array of expertise and perspectives. Moreover, the most recent research review spanning from 2012 to 2017 confirms that research at CDE's programme groups is conducted at the highest standards of quality, relevance, and viability. Students also confirmed that they felt part of a research team, reaffirming that CDE succeeds in creating a culture of collaborative research.

The panel finds that the research training that students receive also benefits from English instruction. Scientific research connects researchers from various countries, and research careers often require students and researchers to spend time in different countries. Being trained in English in scientific domains makes it easier for students to cross boundaries if seeking (post)graduate employment abroad and/or if entering doctoral programmes both within and outside the Netherlands and also to work in close collaboration with other national and international universities. Instructing students in English moreover makes it easier to bring active researchers from the academic community into the classroom.

Workload and study guidance

The workload experienced by students in the programme varies depending on the courses and blocks. While methods courses are described as intense, the intensity can fluctuate across different periods. Some students find the workload challenging initially, requiring adjustment, particularly when balancing academic demands with personal life. However, students appreciate the understanding and support from teachers, who acknowledge the intensity of the programme. Programme directors prioritize student well-being, with initiatives like tutor group meetings serving as a supportive forum. These meetings occur monthly in the first year and bimonthly in the second year. Students find these gatherings helpful for both academic and social purposes. Additionally, individual meetings are available, especially during critical periods. Next to study-specific study guidance, students can also use UvA general services. As a result, few people drop-out. The panel learned that if a student does drop out, this is almost always due to personal reasons.

Staff

There are approximately 67 lecturers engaged in the programme. The panel noted that the lecturers all possess a PhD. They are accomplished researchers in their respective fields and bring extensive experience to their teaching roles. The programme benefits from a diverse range of expertise and nationalities among the staff, offering students flexibility in selecting supervisors. The panel concludes that the staff is suitable for teaching in a research master.

Dialogues with students and lecturers confirmed the panel's image of the high quality of teaching staff. Students have frequent interaction with staff members, facilitated by events like colloquia. Feedback from students highlights the accessibility of staff, including lecturers and programme

management, contributing to a supportive learning environment. The intensive guidance provided to students during thesis work is also acknowledged positively. Lecturers explained to thoroughly enjoy teaching this small, motivated student group.

The educational proficiency of the lecturers meets standard requirements, with 90% holding a Basic Teaching Qualification (BKO), and efforts underway for the remaining 10% to obtain one. Regarding the lecturers' English language proficiency, the students explained to find it satisfactory. The UvA imposes no additional requirements due to the expectation that lecturers are proficient in English given their scholarly activities. The panel concludes that the English language proficiency among all teachers is adequate, meeting programme needs.

The lecturers teach across the various programmes of the department and share office spaces in the same building, which is why there is regular informal contact. Formal coordination occurs through Research Master coordinator sessions held at least twice a year. These sessions serve as a platform for staying connected and ensuring alignment across courses. The suggestion of the panel of organizing dedicated team-building sessions was received positively.

The panel observed, both in the preparatory documents and during the site visit, an openness about the issues the ReMa CDE is confronted with. It noted that most points of improvement are firmly on the radar of the programme. The interviews highlighted that feedback from students is taken seriously and dealt with adequately. Members from the EB, the Assessment Committee and the Programme Committee noted that they work in close connection with the programme management. The teaching staff added that the programme coordinator actively reaches out to them in order to find solutions for issues that need to improve.

In summary, the ReMa CDE provides a student-centred and research-intensive environment, supported by its flexible curriculum, integrated Clinical route, and high-quality, accessible faculty. Programme management is proactive in addressing concerns, with efforts to expand student intake underway, and the necessary checks and balances in place to ensure a balance between theory and methods on the one hand and child development and education on the other. The panel strongly recommends to maintain or even intensify current efforts to enhance cohesion of child development and education in the curriculum. Also, while methodological courses focus mainly on quantitative research, there's a need for broader exposure to qualitative methods. Furthermore, there is room for a more rigorous approach to scientific integrity, open science practices, and critical thinking, and for a deeper exploration of disciplinary theories in the courses. The internship and thesis components offer students opportunities to engage in the empirical cycle, yet the internship could benefit from explicit inclusion of data collection goals and a shift towards reflective reporting over thesis-like analysis.

Conclusion

Meets the standard

6.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Findings and considerations

The ReMa CDE has developed a comprehensive assessment policy and plan that align with the university-wide assessment policy framework. Through desk research and interviews conducted during the site visit, the panel confirmed that this plan is effectively executed, ensuring student assessments are valid, reliable, and transparent. Constructive alignment, a fundamental aspect of the policy, is appropriately implemented, with course descriptions and manuals demonstrating intended learning outcomes aligned with programme-level exit qualifications. Assessment methods within each course correspond with their respective learning objectives, fostering coherence in the learning process. The Visible Learning Trajectories Tool (see also Standard 1 and Standard 2) has facilitated adjustments in assessment formats to better align with learning trajectory goals.

The programme employs a diverse range of assessment methods, as evidenced by the overview of assessment formats provided to the panel. The desk research of the course records of seven selected courses confirmed that multiple assessment methods are combined to determine the final grade. Emphasis is placed on aligning assessment formats with scientific practices, with assignments spanning from paper writing, research proposals, and presentations. Assessment appears transparent, with clear learning goals outlined in course descriptions and instructors discussing these goals at the beginning of courses. The panel also observed that written examinations and other forms of assessment have proper grading rubrics, answer keys or grading criteria. In general, students explained to find assessment at the ReMa CDE fair and transparent and expressed their appreciation for the variety of the assessment forms used. Students noted in the interviews that feedback frequency varies across courses, with some offering regular feedback, particularly those with weekly assignments, while others provided feedback only at the conclusion of the course. Overall, students expressed satisfaction with the range and depth of feedback received.

The panel discussed during the interviews how theory is assessed in the programme, considering the findings from master's theses (see Standard 4) and the aforementioned issue (see Standard 2) of whether theory plays a sufficiently prominent role alongside methods and statistics. The panel noted that theory-oriented courses tend to employ more formative assessments, with classical exams focusing on methodology, potentially further reinforcing the perception that theory plays a secondary role to methodology. This observation and potential threat was recognized by the EB. The panel sees this as an issue that needs continued consideration.

Overall, the panel is satisfied with the procedures for the assessment of the internship and thesis. The panel established that the course descriptions of the Internship and Thesis transparently detail how both projects are assessed. The thesis is assessed by the student's supervisor(s) and two additional research master staff members who were not involved in supervision (one of whom may be substituted by a subject matter expert). The panel considers the participation of three reviewers beneficial for ensuring a comprehensive evaluation of the thesis, and values the established criteria ensuring their independent assessment.

The panel was pleased to see that standardized assessment forms are used for the evaluation of the thesis, providing a detailed framework for assessing various criteria. The panel learned that the minimum passing grade is 5.5, determined by the consensus of the supervisor and two other readers. Each evaluator grades the thesis independently before engaging in discussion, which the panel appreciates. An algorithm calculates an average based on criteria assessed by each evaluator, facilitating discussion.

In the theses that were reviewed by the panel (refer to standard 4), there was a specific instance where uncertainty arose regarding the appropriateness of awarding a passing grade of 6 to a particular thesis. The evaluation process lacked clarity, particularly concerning the discussions among the assessors and the factors influencing the final decision, which is why the panel discussed how cases of uncertainty or divergent assessments are handled. The panel learned that during the discussion supervisors have the authority to adjust the grade by a maximum of 0.5 points based on their assessment of the process. If one evaluator assigns a failing grade, which is rare, consensus is sought through discussion. However, if one of the three evaluators insists on a failing grade, a revision must be made, capped at a maximum grade of 6, and considered a re-examination. While the panel acknowledges the solidity of this practice, the current documentation lacks clarity regarding the rationale behind decisions in cases that are judged as being just sufficient. The panel sees this as an area of improvement.

The panel was pleased to learn that the first assessor schedules a meeting with the student for detailed feedback, and that all three evaluations are available in Canvas. The panel emphasizes that it is crucial to ensure consistent provision of comprehensive qualitative feedback. Also, the panel noted instances where second and third evaluators suggest quick improvements to enhance the final thesis. However, the current procedure lacks space for such adjustments. The panel recommends creating room for these considerations.

The panel observed that both grades and pass rates within the programme tend to be high, both in courses and theses. Notably, many courses, including the thesis, exhibit a final 100% pass rate. The panel acknowledges that given the selective nature of the ReMa CDE, elevated grades and pass rates are anticipated. Regarding coursework, the panel inquired whether emphasis on group work might contribute to this trend. It was confirmed in the discussions with the EB that group work tends to yield less variation in grades. The panel emphasizes the importance of monitoring this aspect closely. Regarding the elevated grades and pass rates in theses, the panel learned that calibration sessions for assessors have been installed following the EB's last review round of CDE theses. The EB moreover proposes a minimum requirement of 5.5 for each thesis component, ensuring all sections meet a satisfactory standard.

The panel confirmed that robust mechanisms are in place to ensure high-quality assessment at the course level. A comprehensive test manual has been developed by the department, offering clear guidelines for lecturers throughout the assessment process, from construction to grading. Additionally, all assessments must undergo peer review before implementation. Lecturers eligible for the role of examiner must hold the BKO or equivalent.

The EB's annual reports reveal that it acts in line with its legal responsibility to safeguard the quality of assessment and end level of the programme. It meets approximately eight times a year. It

delegates its responsibility for ensuring examination quality to the Assessment Committee. The EB conducts annual audits of a random sample of theses. The Assessment Committee conducted a check of the examination quality of the programme in 2023, its findings aligning with the panel's assessment that assessment is valid, reliable and transparent. The panel was pleased to learn about ongoing efforts to revitalize the Assessment Committee following challenging years post-corona with significant staff turnover. Discussions include plans for conducting comprehensive evaluations of thirty courses every five years, a development welcomed by the panel.

The panel learned that the EB, the Assessment Committee and the Programme Committee operate at the department level. The panel was pleased to learn that communication lines between these committees and the programme management are short, ensuring feedback loops. While the panel acknowledges the benefits of having the EB and Assessment Committee at the department level to maintain sufficient distance and independence, it has reservations about whether the same applies to the Programme Committee. Currently, around 75 courses are reviewed each semester using a quick checklist format that focuses less on content and is less suited to interact with the students present at the meeting of the committee. Operating at the programme level may offer advantages for this committee.

The panel discussed how the growing concern over fraud and plagiarism risks, particularly with advancements like GenAI, is being addressed. It was informed that new policies and tools are being developed and implemented. The EB feels supported in implementing new policies, with ongoing discussions and considerations at both university and department levels regarding the ethical use of AI tools in academic work.

In conclusion, the panel is convinced that CDE's student assessment is valid, reliable, transparent, and fair. The professionalism and expertise of the staff involved in assessment are evident. However, the panel identified points for improvement. It recommends to enhance documentation practices to provide clearer rationale behind decisions in borderline cases in the assessment of theses. Also, the panel suggests re-evaluating the balance of formative and summative evaluation in the disciplinary courses. In addition, there is a need to monitor the impact of group work on grades. Finally, the panel asks to consider organizing the Programme Committee at the programme level, leveraging potential advantages in governance and decision-making processes.

Conclusion

Meets the standard

6.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings and considerations

The Research Master Thesis is the capstone of the programme that allows the programme to test the students' research competence. The panel is of the opinion that the ReMa CDE's academic research focus is certainly emphasized with this in-depth, sizable project. Taken together, the internship and thesis allow students to go in depth, and to learn a lot.

To perform a check of the achievement by the students of the programme's exit qualifications, the panel consulted the theses of a sample of 15 students that have graduated in recent years. The panel found that the capstones are, in general, of high quality. Most theses are very well written, with many being of submittable/publishable quality. They are, in general, highly academic in orientation, involving the full cycle of empirical inquiry (see Standard 2 – some students work with existing datasets for their thesis, but if that is the case they have contributed to data collection in other projects). The consulted theses also underscored the students' capacity to function autonomously as researchers, tackling topics that were not only intellectually stimulating but also held relevance to society.

Yet the panel also made a few observations that have led to the identification of points that can be improved in order to further solidify the programme's grip on students' attainment of the exit qualifications. These observations and suggestions do not detract from the positive assessment of the basic quality of the programme's achieved learning outcomes. The panel noted that, while the methodological analyses and results sections were, in general, very well-executed, the theoretical and critical elaborations were somewhat less elaborated. This led to discussion on the theoretical rigor and depth in the programme, and the room provided for critical reflection, as documented above (Standards 2 and 3).

In one instance, the panel questioned the justification for awarding a passing grade to a thesis, prompting a discussion on the handling and documentation of borderline cases, as outlined in Standard 3. The panel learned that this specific borderline case had been impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. It concludes that overall, students demonstrate proficiency at the research master level in their theses.

The panel noted that recent alumni survey results affirm that the programme's adequately prepares students for research careers, with 35% pursuing PhD positions immediately after the Research Master and 28% securing other research roles. Additionally, 11% begin their careers in clinical practice. Presently, 41% of alumni hold academic research positions, while 16% are engaged in other research-related roles, and 18% work in clinical settings. Some alumni pursue careers as policy advisors or in education. The ReMa CDE has a LinkedIn page which serves as a platform for current students and alumni to share relevant job opportunities and connect with each other.

The panel also learned that students express a desire to receive more concrete preparation for their further career (e.g., how to apply for a PhD, what are other (non-) academic job opportunities). The panel asks the programme to take the necessary measures to answer this need.

In conclusion, the panel is fully convinced that the programme delivers high-quality graduates that are qualified for the academic and non-academic labour market.

Conclusion

Meets the standard

7. Appendices

7.1 Documents studied

The panel studied a wide selection of documents relating to the programme's profile and intended learning outcomes, its teaching-learning environment, assessment and end level.

These included:

- Reading guide, SWOT-analysis
- Student chapter
- Course files of:
 - Academic Skills
 - Developmental and Parenting Problems
 - Educational Innovation
 - Family Systems
 - Intervention Research
 - Multilevel Data Analysis
 - Structural Equation Modelling in Educational Research
- Capstones of fifteen graduates (student numbers available on request)

7.2 Site visit programme

9:00	9:15	Welcome panel
9:15	10:00	Meeting with programme management
10:00	10:45	Meeting with students and alumni (in English)
10:45	11:15	Break
11:15	12:00	Meeting with lecturers / course coordinators (in English)
12:00	12:45	Meeting examinations board / assessment committee / programme committee
12:45	13:30	Lunch break / internal meeting panel
13:30	13:45	Preparation meeting programme management
13:45	14:15	Meeting with programme management (remaining questions)
14:15	15:15	Internal meeting panel
15:15	16:00	Theme session
16:00	16:30	Report of preliminary findings
16:30	17:00	Closure and drinks

7.3 Curriculum

SCHEDULE RESEARCH MASTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION (REGULAR PROGRAM) 2023/2024

(For clinical program please see next schedule)

YEAR 1 (REGULAR PROGRAM)

Semester 1 Period 1, 4 Sept. till 27 Oct.	Semester 1 Period 2, 30 Oct. till 22 Dec.	Semester 1 Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.
Intervention Research* (7055R107AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	Developmental and parenting problems** (7055R016AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h. (course can be followed next year)	Research Internship* (7055R456HY) 18ec (till June)
Methods and statistics in educational Research* (7055R090BY) 12ec Tuesday 9-12h. & Friday 9-12h.		
Philosophy of education** (7055R146AY) 6ec Friday 14-17h. (course can be followed next year)	Academic skills* (7055R083DY) 3ec Wednesday 13-15h. October 11, December 13, February 7, March 6, April 10, April 17, May 15 (12-16h), May 29, June 5 & June 12 (12-16h)	
	Critical debates in Education** (7055R160AY) 6ec Thursday 15-18h. (course can be followed next year)	Multilevel data Analysis* (7055R057CY) 9ec Tuesday 10-13h. & Friday 10-13h. (till 1 April)

* compulsory / ** elective course

Semester 2 Period 1, 5 Febr. till 28 March	Semester 2 Period 2, 2 April till 31 May	Semester 2 Period 3, 3 June till 28 June
Family systems** (7055R027AY) 6ec Monday 9-13h. (course can be followed next year)	Criminal behaviour of juveniles** (7055R136AY) 6ec Wednesday 9-12h. (course can be followed next year)	
Learning & social-emotional disorders in educational contexts** (7055R036AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h. (course can be followed next year)	Micro-proces at school and learning ** (7055R046AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h. (course can be followed next year)	
Multilevel data Analysis* (7055R057CY) 9ec Tuesday 10-13h. & Friday 10-13h. (continuation period 3)		

Academic skills* (7055R083CY) 3ec

Wednesday 13-15h.

February 7, March 6, April 10, April 17, May 15 (12-16h), May 29, June 5 & June 12 (12-16h)e 12

Research Internship* (7055R456HY) 18ec

(continuation period 3)

* compulsory / ** elective course

SCHEDULE RESEARCH MASTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION (REGULAR PROGRAM) 2023/2024

(For clinical program please see next schedule)

YEAR 2 (REGULAR PROGRAM)

Semester 1 Period 1, 4 Sept. till 27 Oct.	Semester 1 Period 2, 30 Oct. till 22 Dec.	Semester 1 Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.
Philosophy of education** (7055R146AY) 6ec Friday 14-17h. (course can be followed next year)	Developmental and parenting problems** (7055R016AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	
	Critical debates in Education** (7055R160AY) 6ec Thursday 15-18h. (course can be followed next year)	
Structural equation modeling* (7055R070BY) 12ec Monday 10-13h. & Wednesday 10-13h.		
Research Master Thesis* (7055R301KY) 30ec		

* compulsory / ** elective course

Semester 2 Period 1, 5 Febr. till 28 March	Semester 2 Period 2, 2 April till 31 May	Semester 2 Period 3, 3 June till 28 June
Learning and social-emotional disorders in educational contexts** (7055R036AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	Criminal behaviour of juveniles** (7055R136AY) 6ec Wednesday 9-12h .	
Family systems** (7055R027AY) 6ec Monday 9-13h.	Micro-proces at school and learning ** (7055R046AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	
Research Master Thesis* (7055R301KY) 30ec (continuation)		

* compulsory / ** elective course

SCHEDULE RESEARCH MASTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

CLINICAL "ORTHOPELAGOGIEK" 2023/2024

(For clinical program For. Orthopedagogiek) please see next schedule)

YEAR 1 (CLINICAL ROUTE "ORTHOPELAGOGIEK", ONLY DUTCH STUDENTS)

Semester 1 Period 1, 4 Sept. till 27 Oct.	Semester 1 Period 2, 30 Oct. till 22 Dec.	Semester 1 Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.
Intervention Research (7055R107AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	Developmental and parenting problems (7055R016AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	Research Internship (7055R456HY) 18ec (till June)
	Academic skills (7055R083DY) 3ec Wednesday 13-15h. October 11, December 13, February 7, March 6, April 10, April 17, May 15 (12-16h), May 29, June 5 & June 12 (12-16h)	
Methods and statistics in educational Research (7055R090BY) 12ec Tuesday 9-12h. & Friday 9-12h.		Multilevel data Analysis (7055R057Y) 9ec Tuesday 10-13h. & Friday 10-13h. (till 1 April)

Semester 2 Period 1, 5 Febr. till 28 March	Semester 2 Period 2, 2 April till 31 May	Semester 2 Period 3, 3 June till 28 June
Learning and social-emotional disorders in educational contexts (7055R036AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.		
Multilevel data Analysis (7055R057CY) 9ec Tuesday 10-13h. & Friday 10-13h. (continuation period 3)		
Academic skills (7055R083CY) 3ec Wednesday 13-15h. February 7, March 6, April 10, April 17, May 15 (12-16h), May 29, June 5 & June 12 (12-16h)		
Research Internship (7055R456HY) 18ec (continuation period 3)		

SCHEDULE RESEARCH MASTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

CLINICAL "ORTHOPEDEGOGIEK" 2023/2024

(For clinical program For. Orthopedagogiek) please see next schedule)

YEAR 2 (CLINICAL ROUTE "ORTHOPEDEGOGIEK", ONLY DUTCH STUDENTS)

<i>Semester 1</i> <i>Period 1, 4 Sept. till 27 Oct.</i>	<i>Semester 1</i> <i>Period 2, 30 Oct. till 22 Dec.</i>	<i>Semester 1</i> <i>Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.</i>
Van Diagnostiek naar Behandeling - 1 (7014A407AY) 6ec Lecture: Tuesday 9-11h and Tutorial: Tuesday 11-13h	Van Diagnostiek naar Behandeling - 2 (7014A408AY) 6ec Lecture: Tuesday 9-11h and Tutorial: Tuesday 11-13h	
Structural equation modeling (7055R070BY) 12ec Monday 10-13h. & Wednesday 10-13h.		
Research Master Thesis (7055R301KY) 30ec		

<i>Semester 2</i> <i>Period 1, 5 Febr. till 28 March</i>	<i>Semester 2</i> <i>Period 2, 2 April till 31 May</i>	<i>Semester 2</i> <i>Period 3, 3 June till 28 June</i>
Research Master Thesis (7055R301KY) 30ec (continuation)		
Elective (6 ec):		
Family systems* (7055R027AY) 6ec Monday 9-13h.	Criminal behaviour of juveniles* (7055R136AY) 6ec Wednesday 9-12h	
	Micro-proces at school and learning * (7055R046AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	

* elective: instead of one of above elective courses, it's possible to choose one other disciplinary course scheduled in semester 1:

- **Philosophy of education 7055R146AY**, sem. 1, period 1, Friday 14-17h
- **Critical debates in education 7055R160AY**, sem. 1, period 2, Thursday 15-18h.

YEAR 3 (CLINICAL ROUTE "ORTHOPEDEAGOGIEK", ONLY DUTCH STUDENTS)

Semester 1 Period 1 and 2, 4 Sept. till 22 Dec.	Semester 1 Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.
Stage klinisch Orthopedagogiek (7014A456RY) 21ec	

SCHEDULE RESEARCH MASTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

CLINICAL "FORENSISCHE ORTHOPEDEAGOGIEK" 2023/2024

YEAR 1 (CLINICAL ROUTE "FORENSISCHE ORTHOPEDEAGOGIEK", ONLY DUTCH STUDENTS)

Semester 1 Period 1, 4 Sept. till 27 Oct.	Semester 1 Period 2, 30 Oct. till 22 Dec.	Semester 1 Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.
Intervention Research (7055R107AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	Developmental and parenting problems* (7055R016AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	Research Internship (7055R456HY) 18ec (till June)
	Academic skills (7055R083DY) 3ec Wednesday 13-15h. October 11, December 13, February 7, March 6, April 10, April 17, May 15 (12-16h), May 29, June 5 & June 12 (12-16h)	
Methods and statistics in educational Research (7055R090BY) 12ec Tuesday 9-12h. & Friday 9-12h.	Multilevel data Analysis (7055R057Y) 9ec Tuesday 10-13h. & Friday 10-13h. (till 1 April)	

* In addition to Criminal behaviour of juveniles, choose at least one of the two clinical courses (*Developmental and parenting problems OR Learning and social-emotional disorders in educational contexts*)

Semester 2 Period 1, 5 Febr. till 28 March	Semester 2 Period 2, 2 April till 31 May	Semester 2 Period 3, 3 June till 28 June
Learning and social-emotional disorders in educational contexts* (7055R036AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	Criminal behaviour of juveniles* (7055R136AY) 6ec Wednesday 9-12h	
Multilevel data Analysis (7055R057CY) 9ec Tuesday 10-13h. & Friday 10-13h. (continuation period 3)		

Academic skills (7055Ro83CY) 3ec

Wednesday 13-15h.

February 7, March 6, April 10, April 17, May 15 (12-16h), May 29, June 5 & June 12 (12-16h)

Research Internship (7055R456HY) 18ec

(continuation period 3)

* In addition to Criminal behaviour of juveniles, choose at least one of the two clinical courses (*Developmental and parenting problems* OR *Learning and social-emotional disorders in educational contexts*)

SCHEDULE RESEARCH MASTER CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

CLINICAL "FORENSISCHE ORTHOPEDAGOGIEK" 2023/2024

YEAR 2 (CLINICAL ROUTE "FORENSISCHE ORTHOPEDAGOGIEK", ONLY DUTCH STUDENTS)

Semester 1 Period 1, 4 Sept. till 27 Oct.	Semester 1 Period 2, 30 Oct. till 22 Dec.	Semester 1 Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.
Forensische diagnostiek (7014B436AY) 6ec Lecture: Wed. 15-17h. and Tutorial: Wed.. 11-13h. OR 13-15h. (tutorial: week 2, 3, 5 and 6)	Forensische behandeling (7014B443AY) 6ec Lecture: Wed. 15-17h. and Tutorial: Wed.. 11-13h. OR 13-15h. (tutorial: week 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7)	
Structural equation modeling (7055Ro70BY) 12ec Monday 10-13h. & Wednesday 10-13h.		
Research Master Thesis (7055R301KY) 30ec		

Semester 2 Period 1, 5 Febr. till 28 March	Semester 2 Period 2, 2 April till 31 May	Semester 2 Period 3, 3 June till 28 June
Research Master Thesis (7055R301KY) 30ec (continuation)		
Elective (6 ec):		
Family systems* (7055Ro27AY) 6ec Monday 9-13h.	Micro-proces at school and learning * (7055Ro46AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h.	
Learning and social-emotional disorders in educational contexts * (7055Ro36AY) 6ec Monday 15-18h. (if followed <i>Developmental and parenting problems</i>)		

* elective: instead of one of above elective courses, it's possible to choose one other disciplinary course scheduled in semester 1:

- **Philosophy of education 7055R146AY**, sem. 1, period 1, Friday 14-17h
- **Critical debates in education 7055R160AY**, sem. 1, period 2, Thursday 15-18h.
- (if followed Learning and social-emotional disorders...) **Developmental and parenting problems 7055R016AY**, sem. 1, period 2 (see schedule year 1)

YEAR 3 (CLINICAL ROUTE "FORENSISCHE ORTHOPEDAGOGIEK", ONLY DUTCH STUDENTS)

<i>Semester 1 Period 1, 4 Sept. till 27 Oct.</i>	<i>Semester 1 Period 2, 30 Oct. till 22 Dec.</i>	<i>Semester 1 Period 3, 8 Jan. till 2 Febr.</i>
Stage klinisch For. Orthopedagogiek (7014B456RY) 21ec		
For. orthopedagogiek & recht (7014B474DY) 3ec Thursday 13-15h.		



NVAO

Onderwerp

Bij accreditatie bestaande opleiding aan te leveren administratieve gegevens.

Datum

2018

Versie

1.0

De NVAO verzoekt u onderstaande gegevens in te vullen en bij de aanvraag in te dienen.

Instelling

Naam instelling	Universiteit van Amsterdam
BRIN-code CROHO	21PK
Status instelling	x bekostigd 0 rechtspersoon voor hoger onderwijs
Resultaat instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg	0 n.v.t. x positief 0 positief onder voorwaarden 0 negatief 0 nog niet afgerond

Opleiding

Naam opleiding in Centraal Register Opleidingen Hoger Onderwijs (CROHO)	M Child Development and Education (research master)
ISAT-code CROHO	60212
Oriëntatie en niveau opleiding	0 hbo x wo
Niveau opleiding	0 associate degree 0 bachelor x master
Voor opleidingen in het hoger beroepsonderwijs de te hanteren toevoeging aan de graad. Zie de ministeriële regeling en de daarin vervatte referentielijst Stert. 2013, 35337) en de uitwerking daarvan door de NVAO (. Afwijkingen moeten worden gevalideerd door het visitatiepanel	n/a
Aantal studiepunten	120

Variant(en) incl. een evt. 3 jarig traject voor VWO bij een hbo-bacheloropleiding	voltijd
Eventueel nieuwe naam	n/a
Afstudeerrichtingen	n/a
Eventueel nieuwe afstudeerrichtingen	n/a
Opleidingslocatie(s)	Amsterdam
Joint programme (indien van toepassing), met opgave van de betrokken partnerinstellingen en het type graadverlening (joint/double/multiple degree)	n/a
Onderwijstaal	Engels
Bijzonder kenmerk (indien van toepassing)	n/a

Overig

Contactpersoon aanvraag

Voornaam	Annette
Tussenvoegsel(s)	van
Achternaam	Maanen
Telefoonnummer	06 5540 2937
E-mailadres	a.vanmaanen@uva.nl

Factuuradres (indien anders dan postadres instelling)

Factuuradres	Universiteit van Amsterdam, Postbus 19268
Postcode factuuradres	1000 GG
Plaats factuuradres	Amsterdam
Referentie instelling (nummer/inkoopbon/afdeling etc.)	factuur@uva.nl UvA t.a.v. crediteurenadministratie/Roos Eggers met vermelding kostenplaats: 10001 (Academische Zaken UvA)
E-mailadres bij digitale facturering	factuur@uva.nl

Eventuele opmerkingen

--