

Besluit

Besluit strekkende tot het verlenen van accreditatie (na herstel) aan de opleiding wo-master Criminal Law and Criminology van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

	Gegevens	
datum	Naam instelling	: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
31 maart 2016	Naam opleiding	: wo-master Criminal Law and Criminology (60 EC)
onderwerp	Variant opleiding	: voltijd
Besluit	Locatie opleiding	: Groningen
accreditatie wo-master	Datum goedkeuren Panel 1	: 9 september 2013
Criminal Law and Criminology	Datum eerste locatiebezoek	: 2 oktober 2013
van de Rijksuniversiteit	Datum eerste visitatierapport	: 12 december 2013
Groningen	Datum herstelplan	: 13 maart 2014
(004266)	Datum herstelbesluit NVAO	: 29 augustus 2014
uw kenmerk	Datum tweede locatiebezoek	: 16 juni 2015
15/12109	Datum tweede visitatierapport	: 7 augustus 2015
ons kenmerk	Datum aanvraag 2 (na herstel)	: 23 september 2015
NVAO/20160720/AH		
bijlagen	Instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg	: ja, positief besluit van 29 juli 2014
2		

Voorgeschiedenis

Op 19 december 2013 ontving de NVAO van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen een accreditatieaanvraag voor de opleiding wo-master Criminal Law and Criminology vergezeld van een paneladvies waarin de standaarden 2 (onderwijsleeromgeving) en standaard 3 (toetsing en gerealiseerde eindkwalificaties) en daarmee het eindoordeel als onvoldoende werden beoordeeld. Bij brief van 13 maart 2014 heeft de instelling het herstelplan en het positieve oordeel van het deskundigenpanel daarover toegezonden aan de NVAO. Op basis daarvan nam de NVAO op 29 augustus 2014 een besluit tot het verlengen van de accreditatietermijn (zogenoemd herstelbesluit) van de opleiding met een periode van twee jaar, derhalve tot en met 28 augustus 2016.

Op 23 september 2015 ontving de NVAO een nieuwe accreditatieaanvraag vergezeld van een rapport van het panel, waarin de betreffende standaarden nu positief zijn beoordeeld. De opleiding heeft naar het oordeel van het panel binnen de herstelperiode van 2 jaar de nodige verbeteringen doorgevoerd voor de standaarden 2 en 3. Het panel is van mening dat de opleiding na het doorvoeren van de verbeteringen voor deze standaarden thans het vereiste niveau heeft bereikt.

Beoordelingskader

Pagina 2 van 8 – Artikel 5a. 12a. van de Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek (Stb. 2010, 293);

- Accreditatiebesluit WHW (Stb. 2011, 536);
- Beoordelingskader voor de beperkte opleidingsbeoordeling van de NVAO (Stcrt. 2014, nr 36791).

Bevindingen

De NVAO stelt vast dat in het visitatierapport (na herstel) deugdelijk en kenbaar is gemotiveerd op welke gronden het panel de kwaliteit van de opleiding voldoende heeft bevonden.

Advies van het visitatiepanel (eerste beoordeling)

Samenvatting bevindingen en overwegingen van het panel.

This report reflects the assessment panel's findings and considerations on the Criminal Law and Criminology programme at the University of Groningen. The evaluations are based on interviews conducted with staff, students and graduates of the programme and on information provided in the critical reflections, selected theses, course files and additional material supplied during the site visit.

In its assessment, the panel observed positive aspects as well as ones which could be improved. The panel is positive about the integration of criminal law in the programme and the assessment; the didactical principle of the international classroom; facilities; quality of staff and the Examination Boards. It is, however, critical about other aspects of the programme. The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes, the programme and the assessment are insufficiently linked in terms of the criminology part of the programme; the ambitious intended learning outcomes for criminology are not covered in the programme, are not assessed and students do therefore not achieve all intended learning outcomes in this respect. The low intake rates and the thesis assessment form are also points of concern.

Taking all its findings into consideration, the panel decides that the programme does not fulfill the requirements set by the NVAO for re-accreditation. Following the NVAO framework for assessment and argumentation, the panel recommends the implementation of an improvement period on Standard 2 and 3. The panel considers an improvement period on these Standards important, but would also like to stress that it has seen many positive aspects in programme, encouraging confidence of the panel in the programme, its graduates and the management. The criminal law part of the programme is adequate and the panel is confident that graduates obtain all the requirements for a career in academia (PhD) or a profession in the field in criminal law. Therefore, the panel recommends a 'light' improvement period, including that the programme management redefine the exact relation between criminal law and criminology in the intended learning outcomes and amend the programme and the assessment to match the newly developed intended learning outcomes.

Furthermore, the programme management should take action of the low intake rates and the thesis assessment form. The panel advises that, after a period of reparations, the programme is reassessed.

The master's degree programme Criminal Law and Criminology focuses on international, cross-border and comparative aspects of criminal law and procedure. It aims at combining the disciplines of criminal law and criminology. It is taught in English and targets both Dutch and foreign students who intend to work in criminal law or criminology or who are already established practitioners in one of these fields.

The panel studied the stated mission and profile of the programme. It finds that the international, comparative and multidisciplinary approach to law is of great value to students as it stimulates them to look beyond their own paradigms. The profile and mission of the programme are adequate for criminal law; the panel concludes, however, that the position of criminology described in the critical reflection is too ambitious for a one-year master's programme. During the site visit, the management and teachers explained that the emphasis of the programme is first and foremost on criminal law. The main target of the programme was described as making students aware of criminology aspects within criminal law topics and of the differences between the two disciplines. The panel strongly recommends that the programme management redefine the exact relation between criminal law and criminology and their roles within the programme more clearly in the future. This should include a discussion of the position of the programme with respect to other master's programmes in the field of criminal law (benchmarking).

The panel studied the intended learning outcomes of the programme and ascertained that they reflect the level of an academic master's programme. The learning outcomes are clearly formulated and specific. They adequately cover the domain-specific framework of reference for law and are applicable to the working field of criminal law. Like the profile and mission, the intended learning outcomes are, however, far too ambitious for a one-year programme targeting bachelor graduates in law. At the moment, they reflect the position of criminology as being equal to criminal law. Although they have adequately been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation, the panel strongly advises the programme management to adjust the position of criminology in the learning outcomes.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment unsatisfactory

The master's programme Criminal Law and Criminology has a workload of 60 EC and consists of compulsory courses (5 courses of 6 EC), optional courses (2 courses of 6 EC) and a thesis (18 EC). The panel observed that the programme is organised in a clear and coherent manner. The courses show an obvious development in terms of level and difficulty. The programme has implemented the didactic principle of the 'international classroom'. The panel established that this principle fits well with the international student population of the programme. It concludes that the principle is well implemented and of great added value to dealing with comparative criminal law.

The panel studied the facilities, staff, intake, feasibility and tutoring system of the programme. It concludes that the programme is feasible and the study load is evenly distributed. The facilities and tutoring system are well organized, and the teaching staff consists of accessible, enthusiastic and professional experts offering students a safe and challenging learning environment. The teacher-student ratio is acceptable, and adequate attention is paid to course and programme evaluations. The low intake of the programme is, however, a point of serious concern. The panel evaluated the realisation of the intended learning outcomes in the programme. It concludes that adequate attention is paid to criminal law issues, academic skills and professional orientation. It is more concerned, however, with the position of criminology in the programme. It recommends that the programme management adjusts the learning outcomes for criminology (see Standard 1); amend the programme and assessment to match these newly developed learning outcomes; if

Pagina 4 van 8 possible, increase the attention paid to criminology in individual courses; and introduce an extra course in basic criminology. A basic criminology course is of great value to a programme focusing upon any form of integration between criminal law and criminology. The panel prefers the introduction of a separate course in basic criminology over the option of implementing criminology in every criminal law course. The reason for this is that students, firstly, already have a background in law and need to further enhance this expertise, and secondly, that students need more basic knowledge in criminology to be able to write a thesis with a criminology accent.

Ensuring the input of a criminology expert with a solid academic background should be part of the adjustment process of the programme and assessment to match newly developed learning outcomes, which are consistent with ideas of the programme management about the orientation of the programme in terms of criminology. Recent events have resulted in a shortage of expertise in criminology. The panel strongly advises the programme management to recruit a criminology expert as soon as possible. It believes the programme needs a professor with a solid academic profile to back up the criminology part of the programme. Furthermore, the programme management must develop an action plan addressing the low intake rates. The panel believes that these changes can result in a futureproof and focused programme, educating open-minded, academic professionals in the field of criminal law. Therefore, it recommends the implementation of an improvement period for Standard 2.

Standard 3: Assessment and achieved learning outcomes unsatisfactory

The panel studied the assessment policy and procedures of the programme. It concludes that an adequate assessment policy has been put into place by the Faculty of Law. On a programme level, the forms of examination are varied, and the assessment is consistent with the educational goals of the courses. The panel is more critical about the thesis assessment form. It strongly recommends that the Board of Examiners implement a standardized form with clear criteria for assessment.

There are two Boards of Examiners responsible for the Criminal Law and Criminology programme, a central board and a board for the five international master's programmes of the Faculty of Law. The latter Board of Examiners deals with requests for dispensation, special exam regulations and fraud. The central Board focuses on general assessment procedures within the Faculty of Law and is responsible for guaranteeing the realisation of the final attainment levels. The panel spoke to members of both boards and concludes that they are aware of their responsibilities. The central Board analyses outcomes and samples of exams, and studies theses with high and low marks from every department. The panel recommends that the central Board of Examiners enhance its professionalism even further by implementing an evaluation cycle for exams and theses.

To evaluate the achieved academic level of the master's students, the panel studied a selection of theses. It established that all theses, except for one, represent an academic master's level in criminal law. All incoming students have the ambition to continue with a career in the field of criminal law. From the perspective of criminal law, academic outlook and professional skills, the panel concludes that the theses fulfil all of the criteria. It is more than confident that graduates of this programme obtain all the requirements for a career in academia or a profession in the field in criminal law.

The panel also concludes that students do not have the right background to write a thesis that extensively integrates criminology, and until this moment nobody has done so. Strictly speaking, the theses do therefore not test the students' knowledge and skills in criminology and the intended learning outcomes are not tested or achieved. Consequently, the panel

Pagina 5 van 8 assesses Standard 3 as unsatisfactory. Yet, the panel is confident that the problems can be solved adequately if the assessment is aligned with newly developed intended learning outcomes. The panel strongly advises the implementation of an improvement period for Standard 3.

The panel assesses the standards from the Assessment framework for limited programme assessments in the following way:

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	unsatisfactory
Standard 3: Assessment and achieved learning outcomes	unsatisfactory
General conclusion	unsatisfactory

Advies van het visitatiepanel (beoordeling herstel)

On October 2nd, 2013, the master's programme Criminal Law and Criminology was evaluated by an assessment panel. The panel assessed Standard 1 (Intended learning outcomes) as 'satisfactory'. Standard 2 (Teaching-learning environment) and Standard 3 (Assessment and achieved learning outcomes), however, were assessed as 'unsatisfactory'. Consequently, in line with the framework's decision rules, the programme as a whole was assessed as 'unsatisfactory'.

On June 16th, 2015, the assessment panel again visited the master's programme Criminal Law and Criminology in order to find out whether the suggested improvement measures had been implemented successfully. Since Standard 1 had already been assessed as 'satisfactory', the panel focussed on Standards 2 and 3.

The panel found that the intended learning outcomes were adequately redefined. In addition, a new compulsory course had been introduced, Introduction to Criminology, and a renowned criminology expert appointed. To target the low intake rates of the programme, an Associate Dean and marketing advisor were appointed to help implement the strategy.

The Boards of Examiners now analyse the intended learning outcomes for each course, verify whether all intended learning outcomes are embedded in the course material, and randomly check exams. The panel confirmed an improvement in the assessment cycle. The new thesis assessment form has an explicit request asking the examiner(s) to elaborate on the marking criteria and to assess and grade them individually. The panel read nine theses that had been produced since the previous assessment. Although the panel argues that the overall grading is somewhat on the high side, the level of the theses is of a satisfactory academic quality. The panel confirms that the theses and assessments have improved and that the intended learning outcomes are realised upon graduation.

The panel assesses the standards from the Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessments in the following way:

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	satisfactory
Standard 3: Assessment and achieved learning outcomes	satisfactory
General conclusion	satisfactory

Pagina 6 van 8 **Besluit**

Ingevolge het bepaalde in artikel 5a.10, derde lid, van de WHW heeft de NVAO het college van bestuur van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen te Groningen in de gelegenheid gesteld zijn zienswijze op het voornemen tot besluit van 8 februari 2016 naar voren te brengen. Per e-mail van 21 maart 2016 heeft de instelling laten weten geen opmerkingen te hebben.

De NVAO besluit accreditatie te verlenen aan de wo-master Criminal Law and Criminology (60 EC; variant: voltijd; locatie: Groningen) van de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen te Groningen. De NVAO beoordeelt de kwaliteit van de opleiding als voldoende.

Dit besluit treedt in werking op 29 augustus 2014 en is van kracht tot en met 28 augustus 2020.

Den Haag, 31 maart 2016

De NVAO
Voor deze:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R.P. Zevenbergen', is written over a horizontal line. To the left of the signature, there is a small handwritten mark that looks like '6.0'.

R.P. Zevenbergen
(bestuurder)

Tegen dit besluit kan op grond van het bepaalde in de Algemene wet bestuursrecht door een belanghebbende bezwaar worden gemaakt bij de NVAO. De termijn voor het indienen van bezwaar bedraagt zes weken.

Uit besluit van 29 augustus 2014

Onderwerp	Standaard	Beoordeling door het panel
1. Beoogde eindkwalificaties	De beoogde eindkwalificaties van de opleiding zijn wat betreft inhoud, niveau en oriëntatie geconcretiseerd en voldoen aan internationale eisen	Voldoende
2. Onderwijsleeromgeving	Het programma, het personeel en de opleidingsspecifieke voorzieningen maken het voor de instromende studenten mogelijk de beoogde eindkwalificaties te realiseren	Onvoldoende
3. Toetsing en gerealiseerde eindkwalificaties	De opleiding beschikt over een adequaat systeem van toetsing en toont aan dat de beoogde eindkwalificaties worden gerealiseerd	Onvoldoende
Eindoordeel		Onvoldoende

Beoordeling na herstel

Standaard	Standaard	Beoordeling door het panel
1. Beoogde eindkwalificaties	De beoogde eindkwalificaties van de opleiding zijn wat betreft inhoud, niveau en oriëntatie geconcretiseerd en voldoen aan internationale eisen	Voldoende
2. Onderwijsleeromgeving	Het programma, het personeel en de opleidingsspecifieke voorzieningen maken het voor de instromende studenten mogelijk de beoogde eindkwalificaties te realiseren	Voldoende
3. Toetsing en gerealiseerde eindkwalificaties	De opleiding beschikt over een adequaat systeem van toetsing en toont aan dat de beoogde eindkwalificaties worden gerealiseerd	Voldoende
Eindoordeel		Voldoende

De standaarden krijgen het oordeel onvoldoende, voldoende, goed of excellent.
Het eindoordeel over de opleiding als geheel wordt op dezelfde schaal gegeven.

Panel eerste beoordeling en beoordeling herstelplan

- Prof. L.M. Moerings, LL.M (chairman), emeritus professor of Penology at the Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology of Leiden University;
- Prof. H.G. van der Wilt, LL.M, professor of International Criminal Law at the University of Amsterdam;
- Prof. A. de Nauw, LL.M, emeritus professor of Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure at the University of Brussels (Vrije Universiteit Brussel);
- L.M. Noordam, LL.B, master's student in law at the VU University Amsterdam (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam).

The panel was supported by A.J. Wieldraaijer-Huijzer MA, who acted as secretary and project manager (certified).

Panel beoordeling gerealiseerd herstel

- Prof. L.M. Moerings, LL.M (chairman), emeritus professor of Penology at the Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology of Leiden University;
- Prof. H.G. van der Wilt, LL.M, professor of International Criminal Law at the University of Amsterdam;
- Prof. A. de Nauw, LL.M, emeritus professor of Criminal Law and Criminal Procedure at the University of Brussels (Vrije Universiteit Brussel);
- L.M. Noordam, LL.B, master's student in law at the VU University Amsterdam (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam).

The panel was supported by J.J. Krooneman MSc, who acted as secretary and project manager.