

Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology

Leiden University

Contents of the report

1. Executive summary	2
2. Assessment process	4
3. Programme administrative information.....	6
4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard	7
4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	7
4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	9
4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment.....	11
4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	13
5. Overview of assessments.....	14
6. Recommendations	15

1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme of Leiden University, which has been assessed according to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, as published on 20 December 2016 (Staatscourant nr. 69458).

The programme objectives are sound. The panel values the strong research-orientation of the programme and the focus on methodology, these being unique features of the programme. The programme objectives are up-to-date, the programme monitoring new trends. The visual anthropology and digital media components of the programme are greatly appreciated and the panel suggests to further strengthen the profile in terms of non-textual forms of knowledge production and distribution.

The programme objectives meet the requirements of the Reference Framework for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology in the Netherlands. The panel welcomes the efforts by the joint programmes to draft this framework and regards this to be a sound description of this domain.

The panel welcomes the comparison to programmes in other countries and regards this programme at the same time to share important features and to have a clearly distinguishing profile.

The panel welcomes students being educated to enrol in master programmes in this domain or to be prepared to enter the labour market, acknowledging the latter option to be taken by limited numbers of students. The panel advises to state the latter objectives more explicitly, emphasising the relevance of anthropological knowledge and skills with reference to societal problems.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme correspond to the programme objectives, are well-articulated and conform to the bachelor level. The panel advises, however, to address specific anthropological knowledge and skills more explicitly.

Although the student influx numbers are adequate, the panel supports programme's intentions to try and raise these numbers. The entry requirements and admission procedures are adequate.

The panel is positive about the contents of the curriculum. The curriculum meets the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The courses are up to standard. The panel finds the curriculum to be well-organised and to be coherent. The fieldwork research in the second year is appropriate. The panel appreciates the strong research-orientation of the curriculum. The panel advises to arrange for a more transparent and more solid preparation of the Bachelor thesis in the preparatory courses.

The panel considers the lecturers to be both good researchers and skilled teachers. The panel notes that the lecturers are appreciated by students. The panel finds it very positive that additional staff has been recruited. As the Institute has impressive resources, the panel advises to communicate these more explicitly.

The panel regards the educational concept and study methods in the curriculum to be appropriate. Although study guidance is organised well, the panel advises to explain the guidance system more clearly to students. The study load is balanced. The student success rates are satisfactory.

The panel approves of the examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme, these being in line with Faculty policies. The panel welcomes the responsibilities and tasks of the Board of Examiners and finds that the Board monitors the quality of examinations and assessments appropriately. The panel considers the measures ensuring the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments to be up to standard.

The panel approves of the examination methods adopted in the programme. These are very diverse, well-organised and consistent with the goals and contents of the courses.

The supervision and assessment processes for the Bachelor theses have been satisfactorily organised. The panel recommends, however, having the examiners comment on each of the assessment criteria, and in this way aligning the text and the criteria on the assessment scoring forms. The panel also advises to clarify the relations and interactions of the two examiners, when arriving at their judgments for the Bachelor theses.

The panel regards the Bachelor theses to be satisfactory academic projects. The panel in general supports the grades given by examiners of the programme, but the panel would have given somewhat lower grades for some of the theses. The panel advises to strengthen the theoretical foundation of the case studies' analyses in the Bachelor theses.

As the examination of the intended learning outcomes has been distributed over a number of courses in the programme, the panel advises to redefine the final project of the programme, in order to better establish whether students have reached all of the intended learning outcomes. The panel does not doubt the programme graduates to have reached the intended learning outcomes and to be qualified to enrol in master programmes or to enter the labour market.

The panel appreciates the measures taken in the programme to promote the labour market orientation of students and to foster the preparation for their future careers.

The panel that conducted the assessment of the Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme of Leiden University assesses this programme to meet the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, judging the programme to be satisfactory. Therefore, the panel advises NVAO to accredit the programme.

Rotterdam, 18 February 2019

Prof. dr. T. Otto
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren
(panel secretary)

2. Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by Leiden University to manage the limited framework programme assessment process for the Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology of this University. The objective of the programme assessment process was to assess whether the programme would conform to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, published on 20 December 2016 (Staatscourant nr. 69458).

Having conferred with management of the Leiden University programme, Certiked invited candidate panel members to sit on the assessment panel. The panel members agreed to do so. The panel composition was as follows:

- Prof dr. T. Otto, full professor of Anthropology and Ethnography, University of Aarhus, Denmark, full professor and tropical leader, The Cairns Institute, James Cook University, Australia (panel chair);
- Dr E.D. Rasch, associate professor, Sociology of Development and Change Group, Wageningen University (panel member);
- Dr M.E. Pelkmans, associate professor in Anthropology, London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom (panel member);
- Drs E.B. Heiman, city anthropologist, organisational anthropologist, co-owner company De Staalmeesters (panel member);
- I. Corbeek, student Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Studies, Radboud University (student member).

On behalf of Certiked, drs W. Vercouteren served as the process coordinator and secretary in the assessment process.

All panel members and the secretary confirmed in writing being impartial with regard to the programme to be assessed and observing the rules of confidentiality. Having obtained the authorisation by the University, Certiked requested the approval of NVAO of the proposed panel to conduct the assessment. NVAO have given their approval.

To prepare the assessment process, the process coordinator convened with management of the programme to discuss the outline of the self-assessment report, the subjects to be addressed in this report and the site visit schedule. In addition, the planning of the activities in preparation of the site visit was discussed. In the course of the process preparing for the site visit, programme management and the Certiked process coordinator regularly had contact to fine-tune the process. The activities prior to the site visit have been performed as planned. Programme management approved of the site visit schedule.

Well in advance of the site visit date, programme management sent the list of final projects of graduates of the programme of the most recent years. Acting on behalf of the assessment panel, the process coordinator selected the final projects of 15 graduates from the last few years. The grade distribution in the selection was ensured to conform to the grade distribution in the list, sent by programme management.

The panel chair and the panel members were sent the self-assessment report of the programme, including appendices. In the self-assessment report, the student chapter was included. In addition, the expert panel members were forwarded a number of theses of the programme graduates, these theses being part of the selection made by the process coordinator.

Several weeks before the site visit date, the assessment panel chair and the process coordinator discussed the self-assessment report provided by programme management, the procedures regarding the assessment process and the site visit schedule. In this meeting, the profile of panel chairs of NVAO was discussed as well. The panel chair was informed about the competencies, listed in the profile. Documents pertaining to a number of these competencies were presented to the panel chair. The meeting between the panel chair and the process coordinator served as the briefing for panel chairs, as meant in the NVAO profile of panel chairs.

Prior to the date of the site visit, all panel members sent in their preliminary findings, based on the self-assessment report and the final projects studied, and a number of questions to be put to the programme representatives on the day of the site visit. The panel secretary summarised this information, compiling a list of questions, which served as a starting point for the discussions with the programme representatives during the site visit. Shortly before the site visit date, the complete panel met to go over the preliminary findings concerning the quality of the programme. During this meeting, the preliminary findings of the panel members, including those about the theses were discussed. The procedures to be adopted during the site visit, including the questions to be put to the programme representatives on the basis of the list compiled, were discussed as well.

On 21 November 2018, the panel conducted the site visit on the Leiden University campus. The site visit schedule was as planned. In a number of separate sessions, the panel was given the opportunity to meet with Faculty Board representatives, programme management, Board of Examiners members, lecturers and final projects examiners, and students and alumni.

In a closed session at the end of the site visit, the panel considered every one of the findings, weighed the considerations and arrived at conclusions with regard to the quality of the programme. At the end of the site visit, the panel chair presented a broad outline of the considerations and conclusions to programme representatives.

Clearly separated from the process of the programme assessment, assessment panel members and programme representatives met to conduct the development dialogue, with the objective to discuss future developments of the programme.

The assessment draft report was finalised by the secretary, having taken into account the findings and considerations of the panel. The draft report was sent to the panel members, who studied it and made a number of changes. Thereupon, the secretary edited the final report. This report was presented to programme management to be corrected for factual inaccuracies. Programme management were given two weeks to respond. Having been corrected for these factual inaccuracies, the Certiked bureau sent the report to the Leiden University Board, to accompany their request for re-accreditation of this programme.

3. Programme administrative information

Name programme in CROHO: B Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology (B Culturele Antropologie en Ontwikkelingssociologie)
Orientation, level programme: Academic Bachelor
Grade: BSc
Number of credits: 180 EC
Specialisations: None
Location: Leiden
Mode of study: Full-time (language of instruction Dutch, with courses in English)
Registration in CROHO: 50035

Name of institution: Leiden University
Status of institution: Government-funded University
Institution's quality assurance: Approved

4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard

4.1 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

The Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology and the Master Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology are programmes of the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of Leiden University. The dean of the Faculty has the responsibility for all programmes of the Faculty. The scientific director of the Institute is responsible for both the research and educational activities of the Institute. The director of studies of the Institute is in charge of the coordination and organisation of both programmes. The director of studies is advised on the quality assurance of the programmes by the Programme Committee, being composed of three lecturers and three students. The Board of Examiners for both programmes has the authority to monitor the quality of examination and assessment processes and products.

The Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme of Leiden University is a three-year, broad, research-based, academic bachelor programme in this field. The programme, in general terms, studies culture and cultural diversity in human societies, from holistic and comparative and dynamic perspectives. The programme is, more specifically, directed towards the study of the themes Diversity, Sustainability and Digitalisation. The themes are derived from the research programme *Global Vulnerabilities and Social Resilience* of the Institute. Trends in these themes are closely monitored. The programme is strongly focussed on the methodology in this field to study these themes, encompassing qualitative, quantitative and visual research methods. Qualitative research methods are predominant, but quantitative methods are studied as well.

The objectives of the programme conform to the Reference Framework for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology in the Netherlands, which has been drafted by the joint programmes of this assessment cluster in the Netherlands.

Programme management compared the programme to programmes in this field abroad. The programme differs in some respects from programmes in France and Germany. The programme may be compared to the programmes in the United Kingdom and the United States through the emphasis on analytical reflection and critical assessment of social sciences research methods.

Students are primarily educated to continue their studies at master level in this field. Students may enter the Master Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme of Leiden University, but they may also enrol in programmes of other universities in this field, either directly or after having taken specific courses in the programme. Students are prepared for the labour market as well. One of the objectives of the programme is to guide students in their professional orientation. Programme management regularly discusses the programme with the Advisory Board, being composed of professional field representatives.

The programme objectives have been translated into intended learning outcomes. The intended learning outcomes address, as the main points, general knowledge and understanding of dominant theories and debates in this domain; knowledge and understanding of research methods and techniques in this field; research skills; critical and reflective thinking competencies, and communication skills in this domain; and self-directed learning skills.

Programme management presented the comparison of the intended learning outcomes to the Dublin descriptors for the bachelor level.

Consideration

The panel considers the programme objectives to be sound. The panel values the strong research-orientation of the programme and the focus on methodology, these being unique features of the programme. The programme objectives are up-to-date, the programme monitoring new trends. The visual anthropology and digital media components of the programme are greatly appreciated and the panel suggests to further strengthen the in terms of non-textual forms of knowledge production and distribution.

The programme objectives meet the requirements of the Reference Framework for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology in the Netherlands. The panel welcomes the efforts by the joint programmes to draft this framework and regards this to be a sound description of this domain.

The panel welcomes the comparison to programmes in other countries and regards this programme at the same time to share important features and to have a clearly distinguishing profile.

The panel welcomes students being educated to enrol in master programmes in this domain or to be prepared to enter the labour market, acknowledging the latter option to be taken by limited numbers of students. The panel advises to state the latter objectives more explicitly, emphasising the relevance of anthropological knowledge and skills with reference to societal problems.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme correspond to the programme objectives, are well-articulated and conform to the bachelor level. The panel advises, however, to address anthropological knowledge and skills more explicitly.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 1, Intended learning outcomes, to be satisfactory.

4.2 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

The student influx remained rather stable during the last five years, being little over 60 incoming students per year, with the exception of one year of lower intake. The programme wants to attract more students. The entry requirements for the programme are the pre-university (vwo) diploma. Applicants having the higher professional education (hbo) propaedeutic diploma without the vwo-diploma are admitted, if they meet specific requirements. Prospective students are informed about the programme by study advisors and lecturers. They may also participate in lectures and tutorials. In addition, the programme offers study compatibility checks. These procedures and facilities allow students to make informed choices for the programme.

The curriculum of the programme takes three years, the study load being in total 180 EC. Programme management presented a table, showing the mapping of the intended learning outcomes to the courses. The curriculum has been organised in four teaching-learning trajectories, these covering the theory of cultural anthropology, also in relation to sociology, social science research methods and techniques, scientific and professional orientation, and skills and attitude. The trajectories span the three years of the curriculum. Within the trajectories, courses build upon each other. For all courses, levels of complexity have been indicated, ranging from introductory (level 100) to specialised (level 400). The theoretical trajectory covers introductory courses in the first year, key issues in the second year and specialised courses in the third year. The research methods and techniques application addresses various social sciences research methods throughout the years. In the scientific and professional orientation trajectory, students do fieldwork research in the second-year *Veldwerk NL* course and are offered labour market orientation in the *Expert Seminar* course. The courses *Onderzoekvoorbereiding*, *Veldwerk NL* and *Multivariate Analyse* cover the empirical research cycle. In the skills and attitude trajectory, the *Academic Skills* courses teach students academic writing and presentation skills and introduce them to scientific integrity issues. At the conclusion of the curriculum, student complete the Bachelor thesis. The first year of the curriculum consists of compulsory courses. In the second year, students may choose courses out of a range of restricted options. In the third year, 30 EC of elective space is scheduled. Students may specialise in subjects of their preference or may do internships in the Netherlands or abroad.

The lecturing team is composed of 14 permanent staff members and 12 temporary staff members. Staff members are employed at the Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology. All permanent staff are engaged in both education and research, have PhD degrees, and are BKO-certified. Two of them have SKO-certificates as well. Temporary staff members are only involved in teaching, mostly in the first-year tutorials. About 42 % of them have BKO-certificates. In the last years, no less than 30 % new permanent staff were recruited. Lecturers regularly meet to discuss the programme. Students appreciate the lecturers and their being very accessible.

The educational concept of the programme is research-based and student-centred learning. The number of hours of face-to-face education is over 12 hours per week in the first year and about 9 hours per week in the second year. The study methods adopted in the programme are mainly lectures and tutorials. Lectures may include interactive teaching methods. Tutorials include presentations, debates, discussions and practical assignments. Courses are lectured by pairs of lecturers. Class sizes in the tutorials are about 10 to 15 students. In the first two years, tutorship meetings are scheduled. Junior lecturers inform students about the curriculum and guide students in their study planning. Students may contact the programme study advisor in case of questions or problems. The study advisor checks study plans and monitors study progress. In the first year and in line with the Binding Study Advice, students must obtain 45 EC. The study load of the curriculum is experienced by students to be manageable. The student success rates are on average about 70 % after four years (last five cohorts; proportion students re-entering in second year).

Considerations

Although the student influx numbers are adequate, the panel supports programme's intentions to try and raise these numbers. The entry requirements and admission procedures are adequate.

The panel is positive about the contents of the curriculum. The curriculum meets the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The courses are up to standard. The panel finds the curriculum to be well-organised and to be coherent. The fieldwork research in the second year is appropriate. In general, the panel appreciates the strong research-orientation of the curriculum. The panel advises to arrange for the more transparent and more solid preparation of the Bachelor thesis in the preparatory courses.

The panel regards the lecturers to be both good researchers and skilled teachers. The panel notes that the lecturers are appreciated by students. The panel considers the newly recruited staff to be a valuable addition. As the Institute has impressive resources, the panel advises to communicate these more explicitly.

The panel regards the educational concept and study methods in the curriculum to be appropriate, allowing students to complete the curriculum. The panel appreciates the small-scale and student-activating education. Although study guidance is organised well, the panel advises to explain the guidance system more clearly to students. The study load is balanced. The student success rates are satisfactory.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 2, Teaching-learning environment, to be satisfactory.

4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

The examination and assessment rules and regulations for the programme are laid down in the Course and Examination Regulations and in the Rules and Guidelines for the Board of Examiners. Both documents meet Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences policies.

As has been indicated, the Board of Examiners has the authority to monitor the quality of programme examination and assessment processes and products.

The examination methods for the courses are selected in line with the courses' goals and contents. In all of the courses, multiple examinations are scheduled. The examination methods adopted in the courses are quite diverse and include multiple-choice examinations, written examinations with open-ended questions, take-home examinations, written assignments, papers, oral examinations, practical examinations, and in-class participation. Examination methods in the second and third years are geared towards the testing of understanding. In these years, examinations are examinations with open-ended questions, assignments or reports. Plagiarism and fraud regulations are communicated to students. The Board of Examiners handles cases in line with the seriousness of the offences. The number of serious offences is limited.

The final project of the programme is the Bachelor thesis. Students have to select subjects for their thesis in line with the programme themes Diversity, Sustainability and Digitalisation. Students are guided in finding suitable topics. For the third-year course Capita Selecta, students select literature from an extensive list, provided to them. They elaborate on the selected literature in an oral examination for this course. For the Bachelor thesis, they take literature from this selection and add other literature. Together, this is the basis for the Bachelor thesis. Bachelor theses are geared towards explaining academic debates, comparing authors' positions and relating theory to case studies. The theses do not include empirical research. Bachelor theses are assessed by the supervisor and the second examiner independently. For their assessments, both examiners use assessment scoring forms with assessment criteria and boxes for written comments. For some assessment criteria, such as language skills and literature referencing, threshold values have been set. The examiners discuss their assessments and the grade. In case of major differences in judgments, one of the members of the Board of Examiners will review the thesis as well. The final grade will be the result of this process.

Programme management as well as the Board of Examiners have taken measures to promote the quality of examinations and assessments. The Board of Examiners appoints examiners. Examinations including test matrices and answer models or assessment scoring forms are peer-reviewed by fellow examiners. Every year, the Board of Examiners inspects several course dossiers, which include course goals, examinations and answer models of courses. Also yearly, the Board invites independent examiners to review Bachelor theses. This has led to the Bachelor thesis assessment scoring forms being to some degree adapted.

Considerations

The panel approves of the examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme, these being in line with Faculty policies. The panel welcomes the responsibilities and tasks of the Board of Examiners and regards the Board to monitor the quality of examinations and assessments appropriately.

The panel approves of the examination methods adopted in the programme. These are very diverse, well-organised and consistent with the goals and contents of the courses.

The supervision and assessment processes for the Bachelor theses have been satisfactorily organised. The panel recommends, however, having the examiners comment on each of the assessment criteria, and in this way aligning the text and the criteria on the assessment scoring forms. The panel also advises to clarify the relations and interactions of the two examiners, when arriving at their common judgment for the Bachelor theses.

The panel considers the measures ensuring the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments to be up to standard.

Assessment of this standard

The considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 3, Student assessment, to be satisfactory.

4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.
--

Findings

The panel reviewed 15 Bachelor theses of programme graduates of the last two years. The average grade for these projects is about 7.2.

To prepare for their future careers, students are offered the tutorship meetings in the first two years and the *Expert Seminar* course in the third year. Guest lecturers from the professional field participate in the latter course.

Most students proceed to master programmes in the anthropology field of Leiden University or of other universities in the Netherlands. Students are, however, also admitted to master programmes in domains, close to anthropology or development sociology.

Considerations

The panel regards the Bachelor theses to be satisfactory academic projects. The panel in general supports the grades given by examiners of the programme, but the panel would have given somewhat lower grades for some of the theses. The panel advises to strengthen the theoretical foundation of the case studies' analyses in the Bachelor theses.

As the examination of the intended learning outcomes has been distributed over a number of courses in the programme, the panel advises to redefine the final project of the programme, in order to better establish whether students have reached all of the intended learning outcomes. The panel does not doubt the programme graduates to have reached the intended learning outcomes and to be qualified to enrol in master programmes or to enter the labour market.

The panel appreciates the measures taken in the programme to promote the labour market orientation of students and to foster the preparation for their future careers.

Assessment of this standard

The considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 4, Achieved learning outcomes, to be satisfactory.

5. Overview of assessments

Standard	Assessment
Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes	Satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	Satisfactory
Standard 3: Student assessment	Satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	Satisfactory
Programme	Satisfactory

6. Recommendations

In this report, a number of recommendations by the panel have been listed. For the sake of clarity, these have been brought together below. These panel recommendations are the following.

- To further strengthen the profile of the programme in terms of non-textual forms of knowledge production and distribution.
- To state the objectives to prepare students for the professional field more explicitly, emphasising the relevance of anthropological knowledge and skills for addressing societal problems.
- To address anthropological knowledge and skills more explicitly in the intended learning outcomes of the programme.
- To arrange for a more transparent and more solid preparation of the Bachelor thesis in the preparatory courses.
- To explain the guidance system in the curriculum more clearly to students.
- To have the Bachelor thesis examiners comment on each of the assessment criteria, in order to align the text and the criteria on the thesis assessment scoring forms.
- To clarify the relations and interactions of the two examiners, when arriving at their common judgment for the Bachelor theses.
- To strengthen the theoretical foundation of the case studies analyses in the Bachelor theses.
- To redefine the final project of the programme, in order to better establish whether students have reached all of the intended learning outcomes.