

wo-bachelor Urban Studies Leiden University

20 oktober 2017

NVAO limited initial accreditation

Panel report

Table of Contents

1	Executive summary	3
2	Introduction	6
	2.1 The procedure	6
	2.2 Panel report	7
3	Description of the programme	8
	3.1 General	8
	3.2 Profile of the institution	8
	3.3 Profile of the programme	8
4	Assessment per standard	10
	4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	10
	4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	13
	4.3 Standard 3: Assessment	20
	4.4 Qualification and field of study (CROHO)	23
	4.5 Conclusion	23
5	Overview of the assessments	24
	Annex 1: Composition of the panel	25
	Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit	27
	Annex 3: Documents reviewed	30
	Annex 4: List of abbreviations	31

1 Executive summary

The Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) received a request for an initial accreditation procedure regarding a proposed wo-bachelor Urban Studies at Leiden University. NVAO convened a panel of experts, who studied the information available and discussed the proposed programme with representatives of the institution and the programme during a site visit on Wednesday 20th of September 2017.

In line with the standards and criteria described in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, the panel's assessment has concentrated on (1) the intended learning outcomes, (2) the teaching-learning environment, and (3) the assessment procedures.

(1) The three-year academic bachelor programme Urban Studies of Leiden University (180 EC) addresses important themes regarding urbanisation and urban processes in a relevant manner. It meets academic as well as societal needs resulting from processes of urbanization and globalisation. The panel appreciates the international scope, the comparative and interdisciplinary ambitions, the broad approach to urban studies by including science, social science and humanities perspectives and the connection of the programme to several (inter)national strategic agendas.

The discussions during the visit were informative and mostly convincing. The panel generally approves of the vision and intended learning outcomes as described. They provide an appropriate guide and inspiration for the design of the programme. The panel is also convinced that the intended learning outcomes, organised along the lines of the Dublin descriptors, comply with the level and orientation for a bachelor programme as defined in the Dutch qualifications framework. The panel suggests to further clarify the definitions of the interdisciplinary ambition and of problem solving in the intended learning outcomes.

The fact that the city is addressed from different perspectives is not only appreciated by the panel but also by stakeholders. The design of the programme corresponds to their needs for professionals who can function in multidisciplinary contexts taking into account perspectives from the humanities, the social sciences and the sciences. Given that the labour market is geared more towards masters than bachelors, the panel appreciates that the programme already made agreements with eleven master programmes to ensure entrance into education at master level.

The programme meets standard 1 (intended learning outcomes).

(2) In line with the international ambitions the programme intends to admit 35% international students. It provides a generous mentoring programme for all students, especially the first year. The students will moreover encounter a very well-structured programme. The panel fully supports the idea to start with broader disciplinary oriented courses addressing themes like governance and physical aspects of cities before offering more specialised multi- and even interdisciplinary courses. The idea to specialise gradually from four¹ via two specialisations to one specialisation in the thesis is also appreciated. The design of both the knowledge trajectory and the methodology trajectory, starting from the general level towards

¹ The multicultural city, the safe city, the healthy city and the sustainable city

the specific, is a good intention although it remained unclear to the panel how exactly this would be realised in practice.

The content of the programme raised some questions. Neither the documentation nor the discussions during the site visit provided the panel with a clear view on (1) what exactly the programme sees as the foundations of urban studies and (2) in what sense exactly the humanities perspective has a bearing on this in a conceptual and methodological sense. As to the first point, it remained unclear, for instance, how important the urban spatial dimension would be and how that would be built into the programme. Regarding the second point, discursive and visual analytical methods did not seem to receive the attention they deserve.

As a consequence, the panel experienced a lack of consistency in how the courses are embedded in the field of urban studies. Some introductory and thematic courses seem to fit better in an urban studies framework than others; for some courses, it was unclear to what extent there would be an urban dimension at all. As to the methodological courses, the panel observed that the methodologies of the social sciences receive more attention than those of the humanities, although it became clear during the visit that the humanities approach will not only be present in the four specialisations, but also in the methodological electives offered.

The interdisciplinarity of the programme was discussed on a more general level during the site visit. While the programme is presented as an interdisciplinary one, its character according to the panel is – at this moment of development – mainly multidisciplinary. Interdisciplinarity requires a clearer integrating theme or principle, or at least ideas about how to come to integration, than the panel came across. During the visit, it became clear to the panel that the long-term ambitions remain to become an interdisciplinary programme nevertheless.

During the visit, the panel met a very enthusiastic team with substantial teaching experience. It noticed however limited experience regarding urban questions. The programme management and faculty board affirmed that in the case of lacking expertise this will be complemented. In the longer term the introduction of Urban Studies will lead to reorientation of the institutes contributing to the programme and the ensuing adjustments in focus and research of lecturers. Furthermore, when henceforth attracting junior staff expertise in urban studies will be taken into account.

Altogether the panel came across a well-structured programme with potentially good courses and very committed staff who enjoy developing the programme cooperatively. Yet, according to the panel the lack of a shared and explicit vision on urban studies from a humanities perspective makes it harder than necessary to further develop the focus and consistency of the programme. The programme therefore only partially meets standard two. The panel however is confident that this can be mended in the course of further design and implementation of the programme. As a result, the panel formulates as a condition to clarify the programme's definition of the foundations of urban studies (including the spatial dimension) as well as the value-added and specificity of the humanities perspective more explicit in a memorandum. As a condition to fully meet the standard the panel requires the proof of alignment of the courses on these aims.

The panel concludes that standard 2 (teaching-learning environment) is partially met.

(3) According to the panel, the assessment-plan is well designed with respect to: appropriate forms of assessments, the variety in form and its contribution to continuous studying and spread of study load. The panel is confident that closed question exams will be well constructed. In addition, sufficient assessment of writing and research skills is available in the programme.

The panel has confidence in the way the Board of Examiners will be composed, positioned and supported. The Exam Board fulfils its legal responsibilities in a professional and authoritative manner.

The concern regarding the feasibility of having two assessors for each paper and thesis is counterbalanced. In practice, papers will not always be assessed by two assessors, but the assessors will use rubrics or answer models and are also expected to calibrate their grading. In case of doubt and for the purpose of calibration peer-to-peer consultation will be used.

The panel supported the initiative to adjust the generic Thesis assessment form of the Faculty of Humanities to the needs of assessing theses of Urban Studies. The multi- or interdisciplinary character of the thesis and the question how to integrate and assess different perspectives require more attention.

The programme meets standard 3 (assessment).

Overall, the panel comes to the conclusion that the programme meets standards 1 and 3 and partially meets standard 2. Given these evaluations, the panel advises NVAO to take a conditionally positive decision regarding the quality of the proposed programme wo-bachelor Urban Studies at Leiden University.

The panel formulates as a condition to clarify programme's definition of the foundations of urban studies and the humanities perspective in a memorandum and alignment of the courses of the programme and the curriculum as a whole with these definitions.

The Hague, 20 October 2017

On behalf of the assessment panel convened for the initial limited accreditation assessment of the wo-bachelor Urban Studies at Leiden University,

Prof. dr. Bert De Munck
(chair)

drs. Johanneke Braaksma
(secretary)

2 Introduction

2.1 The procedure

NVAO received a request for an initial accreditation procedure including programme documents regarding a proposed wo-bachelor Urban Studies. The request was received on 11 April 2017 from Leiden University.

An initial accreditation procedure is required to be registered as a programme eligible to issue legally recognized degrees. The same standards apply as in the case of re-accreditation of existing programmes, with the exception of the standard on the realisation of intended learning outcomes. The initial accreditation however is an ex ante assessment of a programme based on the design of the programme as a whole. The design of the first year has to be well elaborated; courses descriptions have to be available to the panel.

To assess the program, the NVAO appointed an international panel of experts (see also Annex 1: Composition of the panel). The panel consisted of:

- Prof. dr. Bert De Munck (chair), Professor at the History Department of the University of Antwerp;
- Dr. Petra Brouwer, assistant Professor of Architectural History at the Department of Art History at the University of Amsterdam and coordinator of the Master's Programme Art History;
- Prof. dr. Jan Hein Furnée, Professor of European Cultural History at the History Department of Radboud University;
- Student member: drs. Patrick Pilipiec, Master Health Education and Promotion and Master Healthcare Policy, Innovation and Management at Maastricht University.

On behalf of the NVAO, drs. Frank Wamelink and drs. Johanneke Braaksma were responsible for the process-coordination and the drafting of the experts' report.

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

The panel has based its assessment on the standards and criteria described in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands (Stcrt. 2016, nr. 69458). Fundamental to the assessment is a discussion with peers regarding the content and quality of the new programme.

The following procedure was undertaken. The panel members prepared the assessment by analysing the documents provided by the institution (Annex 3: Documents reviewed). The panel organised a preparatory meeting on 19 September 2017. During this meeting, the panel members shared their first impressions and formulated questions for the site visit.

The site visit took place on Wednesday 20 September 2017 at the Campus of Leiden University in The Hague. During this visit, the panel was able to discuss their questions and to gather additional information during several sessions (Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit). Afterwards, the panel discussed the findings and considerations and pronounced its preliminary assessments per theme and standard. At the end of the site visit, the initial findings were presented to and shortly discussed with the institution.

Based on the findings, considerations and conclusions the secretary wrote a draft advisory report that was first presented to the panel members. After the panel members had commented on the draft report, the chair endorsed the report. On 22 October 2017 the advisory report was sent to the institution, which was given the opportunity to respond to any factual inaccuracies in the report. The institution replied on 31 October 2017. All suggested corrections were adopted. Subsequently the final report was endorsed by the panel chair. The panel composed its advice fully independently and offered it to NVAO on 2nd November 2017.

2.2 Panel report

The first chapter of this report is the executive summary of the report, while the current chapter is the introduction.

The third chapter gives a description of the programme including its position within the institution, Leiden University and within the higher education system of the Netherlands.

The panel presents its assessments in the fourth chapter. The programme is assessed according to the themes and standards in the Initial Accreditation Framework. For each standard, the panel presents an outline of its findings, considerations and a conclusion.

The outline of the findings are the objective facts as found by the panel in the programme documents, in the additional documents and during the site visit. The panel's considerations consist of the panel's judgements and subjective evaluations regarding these findings and their relative importance. The considerations presented by the panel are at the basis of a concluding overall assessment.

The panel concludes the report with a table containing an overview of its assessments per standard.

3 Description of the programme

3.1 General

Country	: The Netherlands
Institution	: Universiteit Leiden
Programme	: Urban Studies
Level	: bachelor
Orientation	: (wo)
Specialisation	: -
Degree	: Bachelor of Arts
Location(s)	: The Hague
Study Load (EC)	: 180 EC
Field of Study	: Cross-sectoral

3.2 Profile of the institution

Leiden University is a university with about 26.900 students and about 6.500 staff members. The bachelor programme on Urban Studies will be offered at the campus in The Hague² under the responsibility of the Faculty of Humanities and in cooperation with four other faculties³. From these five faculties research and teaching staff of twelve institutes contribute to the programme⁴. The city of The Hague also invests in the programme as part of a broader agreement for collaboration (2012) with Leiden University, particularly focused on four themes: international law, peace and safety; politics and urban administration; urban issues and health and care. The programme on Urban Studies fits within these themes, particularly the third one.

3.3 Profile of the programme

The proposed three-year academic bachelor programme Urban Studies of Leiden University (180 EC) is in its profile and design a new bachelor programme in The Netherlands. The bachelor's programme Urban Studies aims to offer a broad and interdisciplinary approach to urbanisation and to cities and urban processes more in general.

The combination of both the focus on the city and the interdisciplinary character, from a 'humanities originated perspective' is presented as the unique characteristic of the programme. Therefore, the programme provides integration of 'disciplines such as humanities, social sciences, science, law and language studies', thus preparing graduates for analysing and addressing complex urban issues from a comparative and interdisciplinary perspective. In this way, the programme intends to prepare graduates for (inter)national positions in public and semi-public organisations as well as in consultancy firms.

The programme fits in with the general ambitions of Leiden University to educate students and PhD candidates for academic positions within and outside the academic world. It also

² +/- 3500 students and +/- 250 university staff members

³ Faculties of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Governance and Global Affairs, Law, and Science

⁴ 6 from the Faculty of Humanities, 1 of the Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs, 1 of the Faculty of Law, 3 of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences and 1 of the Faculty of Science.

matches with the ambitions of the faculties of Humanities and Social and Behavioural Sciences to offer international and broad programmes. The application documents indicate that no other institution of higher education in the Netherlands offers a programme with a similar profile at bachelor level.

4 Assessment per standard

This chapter presents the evaluation of the standards by the assessment panel. The criteria for each standard are reproduced in italics. For each standard, the panel presents (1) a brief outline of its findings based on the programme documents, additional documents provided by the institution during the site visit and the deliberations with the staff during the site visit, (2) the considerations the panel has taken into account and (3) the panel's conclusion. The panel presents a conclusion for each of the standards, as well as a final conclusion.

The panel will substantiate one off three evaluations for each of the standards: (1) satisfies the standard, (2) partially meets the standard or (3) below standard. In conclusion, the panel comes to a final evaluation for the programme as a whole. This final evaluation derives from the evaluations on the standards, following decision-rules. Also, three grades are available: (1) positive, (2) positive with conditions or (3) negative.

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.

Outline of findings

The application document and other information on the programme describes how the programme aims to respond to a rapidly urbanising (and globalising) world. In these documents, a comparison with similar or related bachelor programmes is presented. Based on this, it is argued that the programme's 'humanities originated perspective' and its multi- and interdisciplinary approach of the city (taking into account humanities, social sciences and sciences) is unique and distinguishes the programme from comparable programmes.

The so called 'macro efficiency analysis' stresses that the new programme meets the expectations of the professional field as well as both a societal and an academic need. The programme connects to several national and international strategic agenda's, like the Dutch 'Agenda Stad', the 'Urban Agenda for the EU' and the 'Sustainable Development Agenda of the UN'. From a scientific point of view there is the connection to two research routes in the 'Nationale Wetenschapsagenda'⁵.

In the application document, 21 intended learning outcomes are formulated. These are related to the main headings of the Dublin descriptors: knowledge and understanding (2), applying knowledge and understanding (4), judgement (8), communication (2) and learning skills (5). Structuring and formulating the intended learning outcomes according to the Dublin descriptors corroborates that the intended learning outcomes are at bachelor level.

The intended learning outcomes reflect both an academic character and a more practical problem-solving perspective with an emphasis on a comparative and interdisciplinary approach. The learning outcomes state that graduates will acquire 'basic knowledge of the state-of-the-art methods and techniques used in at least two disciplines' (specified as humanities, social sciences, and sciences). Another important learning outcome is that

⁵ Resilient Communities and Smart and Liveable Cities

students will acquire a general understanding and orientation of the foundations of Urban Studies and its specialisations (the multicultural city, the safe city, the healthy city and the sustainable city). When applying their knowledge and understanding, students will be 'able to formulate coherent solutions for urban problems based on existing scientific theories and contemporary research'.

In its discussions with the programme management and teaching staff, the panel has raised several questions regarding the formulations and the specific content of the learning outcomes. Central topics in the discussion were (1) the definition of urban studies as a scholarly field (and the role of the Humanities in it), (2) the concept of 'disciplines', (3) the interdisciplinary dimension, and (4) problem solving as intended learning outcome.

(1) The panel agreed that students need to have an understanding and orientation of the foundations of Urban Studies and its specialisations. Yet, according to the panel the application document was not entirely clear and consistent as to how the programme exactly defines the field of urban studies and its foundations. In some passages, the application document suggests that Urban Studies – both the programme and the field – focuses mainly on the topic of 'urbanisation', while other (according to the panel more convincing) passages suggest a broader definition, focussing on 'the city, urbanisation and urban processes'. The panel raised the question which disciplines are envisaged as the foundational disciplines of urban history: do these include urban geography and urban sociology, which are currently not strongly represented in the curriculum? Following from this, the panel questioned the importance of the dimension of space in the programme's definition of urban studies. Third, the panel wondered, as urban studies is usually conceptualised as an interdisciplinary field within the social sciences, how exactly the programme conceptualises the foundational contribution of the humanities in this field.

In the discussion, the programme management and teaching staff agreed that it is necessary to work towards a more comprehensive and shared understanding of urban studies as a field, to further consider the dimension of space and the added value of the humanities. The panel favourably supported the initiative of the programme management to create more conceptual focus within the teaching staff, for example by jointly discussing a handbook on urban social geography⁶.

(2) The panel was critical about the use of the term 'disciplines' to refer respectively to the humanities, the social sciences and sciences. According to the panel, it would be better to designate these as e.g. 'scientific domains' and to reserve the term disciplines for traditional fields of knowledge such as history, philosophy, literary studies, psychology, sociology etc. The programme management acknowledged the need to change the terminology in order for students to recognize the disciplinary richness within the humanities, social sciences and sciences.

(3) In this context, the panel also asked whether a multidisciplinary approach would be more realistic than the intended interdisciplinary approach as a core feature of the learning outcomes of the programme. The interlocutors agreed that in the near future a multidisciplinary approach would probably be more realistic, but they still have the ambition to realise an interdisciplinary approach in the more distant future.

⁶ P. Knox and S. Pinch (2006) *Urban social geography, an introduction*.

(4) The panel appreciated the aim to train students in formulating concrete and coherent solutions for urban challenges, but formulated one comment. The intended learning outcomes seem to run the risk of undervaluing the broad array of perspectives characteristic for the humanities and various social sciences approaches by suggesting – in its formulation - a social engineering approach ('Students are able to formulate coherent solutions for urban problems based on existing scientific theories and contemporary research.'). In the discussions with the programme management and the teaching staff this potential field of tension was generally acknowledged.

In its meeting with representatives from the professional field the panel discussed (1) the aim of the programme to offer students 'professional orientation' with special projects and internships and (2) the fact that the programme expects graduates to find employment in (inter)national positions as consultants or policy advisors in a broad area covering urbanisation.

The representatives (from the city of The Hague, the Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment and a consultancy firm) confirmed the need for academically trained professionals who are able to function in multidisciplinary contexts taking into account humanities and social sciences perspectives. They also indicated that, although bachelor graduates are welcomed for internships, a master's degree is a prerequisite for more permanent jobs and career development.

The programme management displayed an awareness of this point as the application document gives an overview of master programmes in The Netherlands and abroad that will accept graduates from Urban Studies⁷ under the condition that specific study trajectories have been followed. When asked whether these arrangements would hold in practice, the programme management informed the panel that these arrangements are backed up by formal agreements.

The programme management considers installing an advisory board in order to get input on relevant developments in the field. The stakeholders showed a twofold interest in such an initiative. On the one hand, they would like to follow and evaluate developments in the programme. On the other hand, they look forward to get a feeling of what students and graduates will be able to bring to their respective organisations. Some suggestions for the programme have already been made, such as the recommendation to also pay attention to longer term trends alongside the four actual themes that are central in the curriculum.

Considerations

The application document and additional written information have convinced the panel that the new BA programme meets a societal as well as an academic need and will in various ways offer an important, new addition to the existing BA programmes in the field of the humanities, social sciences and sciences, in The Netherlands and even beyond. The panel appreciates the international ambitions, the comparative and multidisciplinary approach, the extension of the field of urban studies by including humanities and science approaches and the connection of the programme to several (inter)national strategic agenda's.

The intended learning outcomes will provide an appropriate guide and inspiration for the design of the programme. According to the panel the intended learning outcomes, organised

⁷ Appendix 5 of the application documentation

along the lines of the Dublin descriptors, comply with the level and orientation for a bachelor programme as defined in the Dutch qualifications framework.

The focus on the city from different perspectives is not only appreciated by the panel but also by stakeholders. It corresponds to the needs of the latter for professionals who can function in multidisciplinary contexts. Stakeholders also expressed their willingness to contribute to the programme, for example by offering internships and participating in an advisory board. Taking into account the fact that they also expressed the need for masters in urban studies in particular, rather than bachelors, the panel appreciates that the programme already made agreements with eleven master programmes to ensure a smooth entrance into education at master level.

The panel also has confidence in the ability of the team to make the next step in the translation of the learning outcomes in the design of the programme. By positively appraising Standard 1, the panel acknowledges the team's efforts to intensively discuss the learning outcomes in relation to the content of (parts of) the programme; for instance, the four themes that are central in year 2 are well chosen.

The panel discussed some worries regarding the formulation of the intended learning outcomes. They concerned the interdisciplinary and problem-solving character, the conceptualisation of urban studies as a research field, and the apparently missing attention for spatial aspects. The panel also pointed at the need to clarify the distinction between disciplines, specialisations and sub fields (and, first of all, to not call Humanities, or Natural Sciences, a discipline).

Having heard the arguments of the programme management and teaching staff, the panel is convinced that further elaboration and editing of the formulation of the intended learning outcomes will remove their concerns.

Conclusion

The programme meets standard 1.

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.

Outline of findings

Curriculum

The programme has a well-designed structure providing both 'disciplinary' (two of three) and thematic (two of four) specialisations in several combinations which prepare students for various possibilities for further study at MA level (see: standard 1). In addition, there are two learning trajectories; the first one is knowledge based and is related to the specialisations, the second one concentrates on methodological and professional skills. As a consequence, the 3 year BA programme consists of a 90 EC common core and a 90 EC differentiated programme.

The programme's design takes into account the university's educational philosophy regarding structure, the link between education and research, teaching methods, standardisation of courses at 5 or 10 EC and distinguishing levels in bachelor courses building upon each other⁸. In the first year 40 EC are at introductory level, 15 EC require independent study and one 5 EC course is positioned in between these levels⁹. Seven first year courses consist of larger lectures and working groups, two courses have only lectures and one course has lectures and assignments. The first-year addresses 13 of the 21 intended learning outcomes.

The 5 EC courses in the first semester of the first year offer the students introductions in various – especially economic, social and cultural – aspects of and disciplinary approaches towards cities and urban societies in long term and comparative perspective: 'The city in long term perspective'; 'Urban economics'; 'Individuals, groups and urban institutions'; 'Cultural diversity in urban contexts'. This semester also includes an 8 EC course on academic writing and presenting and 2 EC mentoring. In the second semester 5 EC thematic courses concentrate on governance, physical aspects and the representation of cities. In addition, there is a 5 EC course on 'Philosophy of science and the city', a 5 EC introductory course on methodology and a 5 EC course on data collection methods.

At the moment of the site visit, the first-year program was in an advanced stage of development. Outlines of the courses were available, the lecturers were known and literature was selected. An Assessment policy plan was designed although actual assessments could not be provided yet. Lecturers had already in various earlier stages discussed and commented upon each other's courses. This stage of development was sufficient for the panel to evaluate the programme design, the coherence in the learning environment, the qualifications of the staff and most importantly the alignment of the content and delivery with the vision and intended learning outcomes.

The second year introduces four thematic courses of 5 EC that are followed by all students: 'The multicultural city', 'The safe city', 'The healthy city' and 'The sustainable city'. These four themes jointly form the heart of the BA programme, and are linked to current key issues regarding cities, urban development and urbanisation processes. After these four courses students choose two 10 EC electives, which are connected to a specialisation. Students thus acquaint themselves with two out of the four specialisations. In the second year, they also follow a professional orientation course (5 EC), a 5 EC course in which they set up a field project, and two 5 EC methodological electives¹⁰ tying in with their specialisations.

The third year consists of 30 EC where students are free to choose their own programme, with electives, a minor, or a stay abroad. In the second semester students further develop their knowledge of their two specialisations, with two 10 EC research seminars. These research seminars prepare students for their thesis (10 EC).

The documentation that had been provided to the panel included schematic overviews which demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are addressed systematically in the

⁸ Introductory, introductory requiring independent study and specialised.

⁹ Individuals, groups and urban institutions.

¹⁰ Exploring archival sources, methodology and statistics 1 inferential statistics, learn a language (set one to choose from), spatial analysis and modelling in the urban environment, text mining and big data, advanced qualitative methods in urban studies, methodology and statistics 2 quantitative research designs (set two to choose from).

courses. In addition, information had been provided on the modes of instruction and assessments, the lecturers and literature. The more detailed course descriptions for the courses in the first year, which were made available the day before the site visit, gave ample information on the course objectives and forms of assessments, modes of instruction and reading lists. The course descriptions for the second and third year were still to be designed, but they are not yet obligatory for the initial accreditation procedure at this stage of development of the programme.

During the site visit the panel firstly discussed the general outline of the curriculum. As already mentioned under standard 1 the panel experienced difficulties to grasp how some of the main aspects of the general profile and the learning objectives have been translated in the programme. In the discussions with the programme management and the staff the panel has in this respect particularly focused on the concrete elaboration in the curriculum of the programme's programmatic vision of urban studies as a scholarly field, especially (1) the contribution of the humanities, (2) the attention paid to the dimension of space, (3) the focus on problem solving, (4) the interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary character more generally.

(1) Humanities

As indicated in 4.1 the panel supports the programme's ambition to include and indeed integrate research perspectives from the Humanities in the field of urban studies, which is traditionally dominated by the Social Sciences. This ambition is already achieved to quite some extent in the first year curriculum, especially in the courses 'The city in long term perspective' (history), 'Urban economics' (with a lecturer from history), 'Cultural diversity in urban contexts' (history and social linguistics), 'Academic writing' (taught by a lecturer from humanities), 'Imagining the city' (literary and visual studies), 'Philosophy of Science and the city' (philosophy) as well as in the descriptions of the four specialisations (application document p.19).

Regarding the methodological courses, it is, however, far less clear to what extent a Humanities perspective is really integrated. The two first year courses on methodology as well as the methodological electives in the second year appear to almost exclusively focus on social science methodologies (with 'Learning a language' raising questions about the methodological research character of this particular elective). For a BA programme stressing its unique focus on humanities approaches, the panel would have expected more explicit attention for e.g. semiotics, discourse-analysis, visual analysis; not only in the second-year electives, but also and specifically in the first year compulsory courses on methodology. This is not just to broaden the student's methodological tool box, but also to raise their awareness of different conceptions of 'science' (for example, the current first year course 'Introduction to methodology' starts from the premise that research should always start from formulating testable research questions). While the boundaries between social science and humanities methodologies are in no way clear-cut, according to the panel the current underrepresentation of humanities methodologies in the basic methodological courses is likely to send students the wrong message on the added value of the humanities perspectives in the field of urban studies.

During the site visit, the panel discussed this issue both with the programme management and with the teaching staff. In this context, the programme management indicated that some basic research methodologies from the humanities would already be trained in the introductory course 'Academic writing and presenting'. However, the teaching staff suggested that this particular course would focus on more general research and writing

competences that students need to develop before they would have a more vigorous training in methodology. In the discussion, the lecturer of the introductory methodological course indicated that he plans to include humanities methodologies in his course. For the panel it was not clear how this could be integrated in the course's most recent learning outcomes, which strongly focus on social science methodology.

In the discussion, the lecturers elaborated on the link between the methodological courses and the other courses. They indicated that this link is to be found in the particular cases which students research as well as in the specific combination of (methodological) electives which are connected to the specialisation. The teaching staff acknowledged that an intensive dialogue between the lecturers of methodological core and elective courses and the lecturers of the courses in the four specialisations about the foundations of urban studies will be of extreme importance, in order to avoid that the two learning trajectories will not connect or connect too late in the third year.

(2) Space

Both with the programme management and with the teaching staff the panel has discussed to what degree the curriculum trains the students to integrate the spatial dimension of cities into their research projects, according to the panel one of the fundamental values of urban studies as a scholarly field. The panel missed an introductory course in urban geography or even urban sociology in the first year, the more so because the geographical dimension is not very prominent in most of the introductory courses. Even the introductory course 'Material City' appears to focus on only one (though very interesting and important) aspect of the spatial dimension of the city: its environmental infrastructure. The architectural and built infrastructure are hardly mentioned at all as important constituents of urban space. Furthermore, in the description of the four specialisations (application document p. 19) the dimension of space is not very prominent either, while in the methodological courses only the training in GIS clearly refers to the city's spatial dimension.

In the discussion with the programme management and teaching staff, the relative lack of specific courses on the spatial dimension of cities was generally acknowledged. Nevertheless, various lecturers indicated that the analyses of urban space will play an important role in their introductory courses. Both the programme management and the staff emphasised that their attention for the spatial dimension of cities will be expanded through their collective use of a handbook on urban social geography and through co-teaching with experts. However, this handbook is not yet included in the course documentation or the students' readers.

(3) Problem solving

For the panel, the stress on learning to formulate coherent solutions for urban problems in the intended learning outcomes, raises the question whether the students might be steered too much towards a social engineering perspective, departing from the (perhaps problematic) assumption that urban society is 'manufacturable' and leaving less space for social science and, especially, humanities approaches that find their added value primarily in a better understanding of complex urban problems (and the way they are represented and articulated), rather than in the capability to actually solve urban problems. Although the terminology in the available course descriptions does not suggest the idea of the 'manufacturable' city, the link between the particular learning outcome to formulate coherent solutions on the one hand and the curriculum and course design on the other hand, is still not very clear. In the discussions with the programme management and the teaching staff this potential field of tension was generally acknowledged.

(4) Interdisciplinarity

Regarding the interdisciplinary ambition of the programme, the panel supports the programme's outline to offer students in the first year a collection of more or less disciplinary introductions on various aspects of the city in the long term and in a comparative perspective. However, for the panel it was not obvious how the second-year courses in the four specialisations (both main courses and electives) would train students in approaching urban processes and problems in a genuine interdisciplinary way. Furthermore, the panel wondered to which extent the research for the thesis in the third year would have a, compulsory, interdisciplinary character.

During the site visit, the teaching staff acknowledged the multidisciplinary rather than interdisciplinary character of the programme and the value added of approaching questions regarding the city from several disciplinary perspectives. It became clear, moreover, that lecturers from two or three disciplines cooperate in developing all specialisations and the corresponding electives. The healthy city will for example be developed by lecturers from pedagogy, psychology and the faculty of humanities.

Regarding the interdisciplinary nature of the thesis, the lecturers replied that the thesis should reflect the (interdisciplinary) specialisation themes. An interdisciplinary or even multidisciplinary perspective would not be obligatory, yet students should reflect in their introduction on various disciplinary perspectives and should be capable to explain their choice for a disciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary approach to answer their main research question. The lecturers also considered the possibility of two supervisors per thesis with different disciplinary backgrounds. The lecturers generally agreed that clear and consistent communication with students about differences between multi- and interdisciplinary approaches will be essential throughout the entire BA programme.

Intake and mentoring

In order to create an international classroom, the programme aims for 35% international students. International students can be enrolled if they have a diploma that is comparable to the Dutch VWO diploma and if they are sufficiently proficient in English¹¹. Dutch students are admitted if they possess a VWO diploma.

The first-year students are assigned to a mentor and divided in groups of 18-20 students with a mentor. These groups will meet two to three times. Alongside these group meetings the student will have at least two individual meetings with the mentor. In order to pass the first year, students have to complete a minimum of 45 EC (BSA). From the second year onwards the study advisor takes over the assistance of students, for example with help for drawing up their study plan.

The panel wondered whether these generous arrangements for mentoring and supervising students are feasible. It also wondered why the intensive mentoring by lecturers is concentrated in the first year, while specific mentoring from an urban studies perspective might be more necessary from the second year onwards. In response to these questions, the interlocutors referred to experiences with similar arrangements in the programmes of

¹¹ At least 6.5 IELTS, 570/630 TOEFL or grade C in the Cambridge Certificate of Advanced English.

International Studies and History as well as to lecturers' practice of also mentoring the students after the first year.

Staff

The application documentation reports an estimated staff-student ration of 1:23. It also mentions that none of the staff members is solely appointed to teach in the programme of Urban Studies. All envisioned lecturers except one have a PhD and are engaged in research. 89% of the staff of the coordinating faculty of Humanities has acquired a university teaching qualification (BKO). It did not become clear to which extent this also applies for staff from other faculties.

The panel met a very enthusiastic team with substantial teaching experience. However, it noticed limited experience regarding urban questions. Also, the intentions on the research-education nexus do not fully materialize in the courses and reading lists. Some lecturers hardly have any experience in research on urban issues at all. The programme chair explained that the policy was to first attract staff from within the university and to invite guest lecturers when necessary, for example from the Delft University of Technology. The intention is to also recruit new staff once the programme has started. She also explained that the documentation only includes the staff contributing to the first year and that the programme management can call upon more expertise in the institutes. The faculty board added that, for the courses in the second and third year, they expect the expertise on the urban field to increase among staff due to the current reorientation of the institutes. Furthermore, they explained that selected senior staff developed the programme and that expertise regarding urban themes will be taken into account when recruiting junior teaching staff.

Some of the lecturers already have multidisciplinary teaching experience, others do not. The programme management and the lecturers mentioned that they enjoyed the cooperative development of the programme. For many participants, this resulted in new perspectives on their own and other disciplines. The exchange of several disciplinary backgrounds and outlines of courses turned out to be very important for learning from each other and for developing a common language.

Considerations

The panel found a well-structured programme with (potentially) good courses, which are taught by a highly qualified, committed and professional staff. Specifically, the panel appreciates the general structure of the programme. It supports the idea to start with broader disciplinary oriented courses addressing themes like governance and physical aspects of cities before offering more specialised multi- and even interdisciplinary courses. The staff clearly enjoyed to cooperatively develop the programme, and to define common principles and knowledge of urban studies, while contributing their own disciplinary expertise to the programme.

The most urgent issues to address are, according to the panel, (1) the need to develop a coherent and guiding definition of the foundations of Urban Studies, (2) further reflection on the value-added of a Humanities approach and how to translate this in the methodological courses in particular, (3) the further integration of a spatial dimension in the introductory courses, the methodological courses and the four thematic course, and (4) the danger of over-emphasizing a social engineering perspective.

(1) According to the panel the lack of an explicit and clear definition of urban studies (both of its foundations and its development as a field of knowledge) and the lack of a shared and explicit vision on urban studies from a humanities perspective, makes it harder than necessary to further develop the focus and consistency of the programme. As a consequence, the panel experienced a lack of consistency in how the courses are embedded in the field of urban studies. Some courses, for example the one on cultural diversity, fit better with the field of urban studies than others. The introductory course 'Individuals, groups and urban institutions' in particular should be looked at carefully.

(2) Neither the documentation nor the discussions during the site visit provided the panel with a clear view on what the programme management sees as the specificity of the humanities perspective and how this adds to urban studies in a broader sense. Especially the methodological trajectory is in need of further elaboration and clarification in this respect. As far as the panel understood, the humanities approach will not only be realised in the four specialisations, but also in the methodological approaches offered in the programme. Yet how exactly this will be realised is still unclear. Methodologies specific for the Humanities seem underrepresented in the introductory courses, and the connection between the specialisations and the methodology trajectory is very open-ended.

(3) The panel questions the limited and mostly implicit attention for the spatial dimension in the programme. It experienced difficulties to see where exactly the basic theories and approaches of urban geography will be introduced and missed the architectural and built infrastructure as important constituents of urban space. Although various lecturers indicated that the analyses of urban space will be addressed in their introductory courses through co-teaching with experts and the collective use of a handbook on urban social geography, the panel noticed that this handbook is not yet included in the course documentation or the students' readings lists.

(4) As far as problem solving is concerned, the panel is concerned that students might be steered too much towards a social engineering perspective leaving less space for social science and, in particular, humanities approaches that find their added value primarily in a better understanding of complex urban problems and how these are articulated, represented and expressed. The link between the particular learning outcome to formulate coherent solutions on the one hand and the curriculum and course design on the other hand, is not sufficiently clear.

In order to tackle these issues, the panel recommends to first explicate in a memorandum the programme's definition of (the foundations of) urban studies and its humanities perspective. This will facilitate the translation of this definition of urban studies into the respective courses of the programme, and make it easier to further concretize in the programme interdisciplinarity (in relation to the humanities perspective) and the urban spatial dimension.

The panel's concerns regarding the training of students in approaching urban processes and problems in a genuine interdisciplinary way in the second year were counterbalanced as the teaching staff acknowledged the multidisciplinary character of the programme and explained how the thesis will reflect the (interdisciplinary) specialisation themes. With regard to intake and mentoring, the panel's concerns were also convincingly addressed during the site visit. While intended to admit 35% international students, the programme provides a generous mentoring programme, especially for the first year. The panel is reassured about

the feasibility as there is already experience with similar arrangements in the International Studies programme.

One final concern relates to the programme's staff. The panel applauds the intentions related to the gradual reorientation of research institutes and staff, but recommends to really guard this over the longer term as this will be key for the well-functioning of the programme in the future.

Conclusion

The programme partially meets standard 2.

4.3 Standard 3: Assessment

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

Outline of findings

The application document and other information on the programme have informed the panel that assessments will be used to: register students' progress, give students insight in their progress, observe issues and give students insights in these issues. In order to serve these functions, the assessment system is based on the following principles: variety in forms of assessment, mandatory midterm assessments, mandatory feedback to students, construction and grading validated by a second assessor and the Board of Examiners overseeing the quality of assessments. Forms of assessment are for example: written exams, weekly assignments, presentations and incidentally also the involvement of the student in the course is part of the assessment. In practice, this implies that each course has, in line with the faculty's policy, at least two assessments; a midterm and a final one. This is to encourage continuous studying, to spread the course load and to increase the feedback moments for students. From the Overview of the first-year courses (appendix 4) and the Assessment policy plan for the first year (appendix 9) the panel learns that almost all first year courses comply with this principle and in addition to that also show a variation in forms of assessment for each course.

All courses, except one, use a combination of assessment forms. In four out of eleven courses this includes closed question exams, either as the midterm or as the final exam; sometimes combined with additional open questions. In seven courses papers and/or essays are used as assessment method.

The panel interviewed the Board of Examiners on its role in safeguarding the quality of the assessment plan and the assessments. The Board is satisfied with the plans at this moment. At the actual start of the programme the Board plans to monitor assessment practices intensively the first year(s). They did not share the panel's concern about multiple choice exams being appropriate assessments methods. There are good experiences with such exams, for example in the psychology programme. The Board recognised that developing good multiple-choice exams requires specific knowledge on constructing questions, but this is available and lecturers will get assistance to develop the exams.

Students are well informed about the assessments. Each study year the students have at least two opportunities to do the final assessment. Not in all cases a resit for the midterm assessments is provided. Lecturers as well as the Board of Examiners indicate that this is to encourage continuous studying although they admit that it might sometimes cause delay.

The thesis will focus on a subject in one of the specialisations and will be assessed by two assessors, the supervisor and a second assessor appointed by the Board of Examiners. The grade will be awarded after joint consultation between both assessors using the faculty's generic assessment form.

The panel wondered whether the faculty's assessment form for the thesis is experienced as adequate for assessing theses on urban studies. This concern was already raised by the lecturers and put on the agenda of the Curriculum Committee¹² and the Board of Examiners. The form will be modified to meet the requirement of Urban Studies.

As far as quality assurance of assessments is concerned, several procedures are in place. Examples are the peer to peer consultation in the construction of exams and the grading of the results, in addition, the use of rubrics or answer models. As a rule, the lecturer of a course is also the examiner, unless he or she is a junior staff member. The panel wondered whether it is feasible for all papers announced in the course assessments to follow these principles. The Board of Examiners explained that assessors of papers are expected to at least calibrate. The documentation announces that the programme manager is moreover expected to have a crucial role in overseeing the quality of course descriptions, rubrics, assessment forms and course evaluations of all courses. During the site visit, it became clear that the Curriculum Committee will also have a responsibility in this respect.

The Board of Examiners will be positioned in the Faculty of Humanities. The panel interviewed two envisioned members and the secretary of the initial Board of Examiners. They informed the panel that several lecturers involved in developing the programme have experience as a member of Boards of Examiners in other programmes. They also explained that the Board of Examiners to be installed will consist of 6 or 7 members with a varying disciplinary background and an external member, most probably an expert on testing and assessment from outside the university. The secretary of the Board of examiners also serves other Boards of Examiners in the Faculty of Humanities.

The study advisor is presented in the documentation as a linking pin between the students and the Board of Examiners. When the panel asked the Board of Examiners to elaborate on the position of the study advisor, it became clear that a study advisor will only inform the Board and does not participate in any decision making of the Board. It also became clear that students can approach the Board directly.

The main concerns of the Board of Examiners are the need for a shared assessment framework facilitating valid assessments for this broad programme and the importance of maintaining authority in the faculty as well as in the programme. They intend to invest in good relations with the administration and the management as well as with lecturers and the field in order to cope with these concerns.

¹² The curriculum committee consists of the programme manager and four lecturers from different faculties. It advises on learning trajectories, further development of courses and the curriculum, the connection between teaching and research, the assessment and the information provided by the study guide.

Considerations

According to the panel, the assessment-plan is sufficiently well designed regarding: appropriate forms of assessments, variety in assessment forms, the enhancement of constant studying and the spread of study load. The panel is confident that closed question exams will be well constructed. In addition, sufficient assessment of writing and research skills is available in the programme.

The panel has also confidence in the composition, position and support of the Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners fulfils its legal responsibilities in a professional and authoritative manner.

The concern regarding the feasibility of having two assessors for each paper and thesis has been counterbalanced. In practice, papers will not always be assessed by two assessors, but the assessors will use rubrics or answer models and are also expected to calibrate their grading. In case of doubt and for the purpose of calibration peer-to-peer consultation will be used.

The panel supports the initiative to adjust the generic Thesis assessment form of the Faculty of Humanities to the needs of assessing theses of Urban Studies. Nevertheless, the multi- or interdisciplinary character of the thesis and the question how to integrate and assess different perspectives require attention according to the panel in the further development of the third year.

Conclusion

The programme meets standard 3.

4.4 Qualification and field of study (CROHO)

The panel advises to award the degree 'Bachelor of Arts' to the wo-bachelor Urban Studies. The panel supports the program's preference for the CROHO field of study: Cross-sectoral.

4.5 Conclusion

The panel concludes that the bachelor programme on Urban Studies offered by Leiden University meets two out of three standards fully. The second standard is met partially, but the panel is convinced that the programme will be able to fulfil conditions to meet this standard fully within a reasonable period of time. Therefore, the quality of the programme is assessed as conditionally positive.

The conditions are:

- make the programme's definition about the foundations of urban studies and the humanities perspective more explicit in a memorandum;
- build on these definitions in the design of the courses of the programme and the curriculum as a whole;
- spell out more clearly and specifically what the value added of the Humanities perspective is and integrate this better in the programme, especially in the methodological trajectory;
- bring to the fore the urban dimension in introductory courses better, especially, but not exclusively, in the course 'Individuals, groups and urban institutions';
- integrate the spatial dimension more in the program, in the introductory as well as the methodological and thematic courses.

5 Overview of the assessments

Standard	Assessment
<p>Intended Learning outcomes <i>Standard 1: 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</i></p>	<p>Meets the standard</p>
<p>Teaching-learning environment <i>Standard 2: The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.</i></p>	<p>Partially meets the standard</p>
<p>Student assessment <i>Standard 3: The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.</i></p>	<p>Meets the standard</p>
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>Conditionally positive</p>

Annex 1: Composition of the panel

- Prof. dr. Bert De Munck (chair) is Professor at the History Department of the University of Antwerp, Belgium, teaching 'History of the early modern period', 'Theory of historical knowledge', and 'Public history'. He is member of the Centre for Urban History at the same university and director of the Scientific Research Community (WOG) 'Urban agency. The historical fabrication of the city as an object of study' and of the interdisciplinary 'Urban Studies Institute'. While he has worked on apprenticeship, craft guilds, labour and social capital, his current research interests include the circulation of technical knowledge, guilds and civil society, the assessment of skills and material culture, and conceptual and theoretical approaches to urban history and urban studies. Bert de Munck also has experience in the governing board of the History Department and as a member of the exam committee, the fraud committee and the interdisciplinary committee of the history programme.

- Dr. Petra Brouwer is assistant Professor of Architectural History at the Department of Art History at the University of Amsterdam and coordinator of the Master's Program Art History. She is chair of the Advisory Committee of the Amsterdam Centre for Architecture [ARCAM];

She studied Art History and Physical Planning at the University of Amsterdam, from where she graduated cum laude. From 1996-2008 she worked as a researcher and lecturer in Architectural History at the Free University of Amsterdam, where she received her PhD in 2009. Her dissertation *De wetten van de bouwkunst. Nederlandse architectuurboeken in de negentiende eeuw* [The Laws of Architecture. Dutch Architectural Textbooks in the Nineteenth Century] was published in 2011 by NAI Publishers Rotterdam and was shortlisted for the Karel van Mander-Prize 2016.

Brouwer works as an architectural critic and is a frequent guest lecturer and participant in debates at architectural, cultural and educational institutions. She is member of the Amsterdam Center for Cultural Heritage and Identity and the Amsterdam School for History (both at the University of Amsterdam). Since 2017 Brouwer is editor-in-chief of the international, peer-reviewed open access journal *Architectural Histories*, journal of the European Architectural History Network (EAHN).

Previously Brouwer lectured at the Amsterdam Academy of Architecture (1999-2003), was a member of the Architecture advisory committee of The Netherlands Architecture Fund [Stimuleringsfonds voor Architectuur] (2011-2013); the jury of the Amsterdam Architecture Prize (2013); the Amsterdam Town Planning Advisory Council [Amsterdamse Raad voor de Stadsontwikkeling] (2005-2010); architectural critic for *De Witte Raaf* (1998-2004) and a member of the editorial board of *Stadsgeschiedenis* (2010-2017). As a student, she was one of the founding editors of *Simulacrum*, journal for art and culture of the Department of Art History at the University of Amsterdam.

- Prof. dr. Jan Hein Furnée, is professor of European Cultural History at the History Department of the Radboud University. He studied history at the University of Groningen, defended his PhD dissertation at the same university and worked as lecturer at Theatre, Film and Television Sciences at the University of Utrecht. From 2005 until 2015 he was a lecturer in modern history at the University of Amsterdam. From 2011 until 2015 he was also part-time professor of History at the Open University.

Furnée studies the history of urban leisure culture, consumer culture, tourism, and

cultural participation and policy in The Netherlands and Western Europe since 1750. Next to his main monograph on leisure culture and social relations in late nineteenth-century The Hague (*Plaatsen van beschaafd vertier*, 903 p.) he has edited several volumes on European leisure and consumer culture. Between 2005 and 2016 he has been (chief)editor of the journal *Stadsgeschiedenis* (urban history). From 2010 till 2016 he acted as secretary of the European Association for Urban History. In 2013 he initiated the Amsterdam Centre for Urban History.

- Drs. Patrick Pilipiec is currently a master student in both the Master Health Education and Promotion and the Master Healthcare Policy, Innovation and Management at Maastricht University. Prior to these studies, he already obtained three other master diplomas from other Dutch universities. In previous years, he had a two-year seat in the central Student Council at the Open University of the Netherlands (Open Universiteit), of which he served as Chairman for one year. In the same period, he represented this council at Interstedelijk Studentenoverleg, where he was active in the quality assurance of higher education in the Netherlands. Patrick is almost three years involved with the NVAO.

Secretaries

Drs. Frank Wamelink (policy advisor NVAO, process coordinator)

Drs. Johanneke Braaksma (educational advisor OAKnet, external secretary)

Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit

The panel visited Leiden University on 20 September 2017 as part of the external assessment procedure regarding the wo-bachelor Urban Studies.

9.-00 – 9:30 Welcome, meeting and reading time for panel

Prof. dr. Bert De Munck (voorzitter)	Professor at the History Department of the University of Antwerp
Dr. Petra Brouwer	Assistant Professor of Architectural History at the Department of Art History at the University of Amsterdam
Prof. dr. Jan Hein Furnée	Professor of European Cultural History at the History Department of the Radboud University
Drs. Patrick Pilipiec	Student member
drs. Johanneke Braaksma	External secretary
drs. Frank Wamelink (process coordinator)	Policy advisor NVAO

9.30 – 10.15 Meeting with Programme Management

Prof. Dr. Manon van der Heijden	Professor of Comparative Urban History – Programme Chair
Drs. Marrij Zeeman	Programme Manager
Dr. Arjaan Wit	Director of Studies Institute of Psychology
Dr. René Kleijn	Director of Education Institute of Industrial Ecology
Dr. Kristiaan van der Heijden	Director of Studies Institute of Institute for Education and Child Studies
Dr. Jan Jansen	Director of Studies Institute of Institute for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology

10.30 – 11.00 Meeting with Faculty Board

Prof.dr. Mark Rutgers	Dean Faculty of Humanities
Dr. Egbert Fortuin	Vice-Dean Faculty of Humanities
Dr. J. Magliano Tromp	Vice-Dean Faculty of Government and Global Affairs
Prof. dr. Paul Nieuwenburg	Vice-Dean Faculty of Social Sciences

11.15 – 11.30 Short update outline the development of the programme by Manon van der Heijden

11.45 – 12.45 Meeting with teaching staff

Prof. Dr. Manon van der Heijden	Professor of Comparative Urban History – Programme Chair
Dr. Nadia Bouras	Lecturer 'Cultural Diversity in urban contexts'
Dr. Jurriaan Witteman	Lecturer 'Methodology: Data Collection'
Dr. S. Cucurachi	Lecturer 'The Material City'
Dr. Jeff Fynn Paul	Lecturer 'Urban Economics'
Dr.ir. Vlad Niculescu-Dinca	Lecturer 'Governance of cities and citizens'
Dr. Hannah de Mulder	Lecturer 'Cultural Diversity in urban contexts'
Dr. James McAllister	Lecturer 'Philosophy of Science and the City' and Academic Director, Institute of Philosophy

12.45 – 14.00 Lunch and tour of Wijnhaven building

13.30 – 14.00 Guided by Jaap Kamphuis, programme coördinator BA International Studies

14.00 – 14.45 Meeting with professional field and student

Anne-Marie Hitipeuw	Chief Resilience Officer City of the Hague
Björn Gallée	Student
Henriette Bersee	Head of Policy Studies at Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment
Désirée Meijer	Senior Advisor PBLQ

15.00 – 15.30 Meeting with proposed Examination Board

Dr. Vivian Kraaij	Associate professor Psychology
Prof. Dr Frans Willem Korsten	Senior University Lecturer Literary Studies
Drs. Sander Bos	Secretary to the Board of Examiners

15.30 – 16.45 Meeting time for panel**16.45 – 17.15 Oral presentation of preliminary findings by the panel and exchange of ideas**

Prof. Dr. Manon van der Heijden	Professor of Comparative Urban History – Programme Chair
Dr.ir. Vlad Niculescu-Dinca	Lecturer 'Governance of cities and citizens'
Dr. Jeff Fynn Paul	Lecturer 'Urban Economics'
Dr. Jan Jansen	Director of Studies Institute of Institute for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology
Drs. Marrij Zeeman	Programme Manager
Prof. dr. Egbert Fortuin	Vice-Dean Faculty of Humanities

Prof. dr. Paul Nieuwenburg	Vice-Dean Faculty of Social Sciences
Dr. J. Magliano Tromp	Vice-Dean Faculty of Government and Global Affairs

Annex 3: Documents reviewed

Programme documents presented by the institution

- Information dossier
- Appendices to the information dossier:
 - 1. Interviewees
 - 2. Overview of comparable 'bachelor programmes
 - 3. Learning outcomes and courses
 - 4. Overview of first year courses
 - 5. Overview of study paths and related master programmes
 - 6. Overview of the staff
 - 7. Staff student ratio
 - 8. Course and examination regulations
 - 9. Assessment plan for the first year
 - 10. thesis assessment
 - 11. Short course descriptions
 - 12. CDHO Ruling
- Documents made available during the site visit
 - Books to be used in the first year
 - Extended course descriptions of the first year
 - Programme overview and learning trajectories
 - Overview and explanation of the management structure
 - Manual for Boards of examiners, Faculty of Humanities (2016)
 - Manual for Programme Committees, Faculty of Humanities (2017)
 - Tips for tests, Faculty of Humanities (2016)
 - Kwaliteitsborging toetsing, Faculteit der geesteswetenschappen (2016)
 - Doelmatigheid Urban Studies, macrodoelmatigheidsdossier.
 - Gids Onderwijskwaliteitszorg Faculteit Sociale Wetenschappen.
 - kaderdocument-leids-register, vooruitleg 100-600 niveau.
 - Facultaire OER Geesteswetenschappen 2017-2018.
 - Regels en richtlijnen 2017-18 van de Examencommissies Geesteswetenschappen.

Annex 4: List of abbreviations

ba	bachelor
EC	European Credit
GIS	Geografisch informatiesysteem
ma	master
NVAO	Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie
wo	wetenschappelijk onderwijs

The panel report was ordered by NVAO for the initial accreditation of the programme wo-bachelor Urban Studies of Leiden University.

Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO)
Parkstraat 28
P.O Box 85498 | 2508 CD DEN HAAG
T 31 70 312 23 00
E info@nvaio.net
W www.nvaio.net

Aanvraagnummer 005545