

Assessment report  
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

**Master Sociology**

Erasmus University Rotterdam

*Contents of the report*

1. Executive summary .....	2
2. Assessment process .....	5
3. Programme administrative information.....	8
4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard .....	9
4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes .....	9
4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment .....	12
4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment.....	14
4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes .....	16
5. Overview of assessments.....	17
6. Recommendations and shortcomings .....	18

## 1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Master Sociology programme of Erasmus University Rotterdam, which has been assessed according to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, as published on 20 December 2016.

The panel regards the programme objectives to be sound and relevant. The programme is clearly focused on the study of societal change, and the practical and policy implications thereof. The panel appreciates students being taught, among others, advanced theoretical and methodological knowledge, skills and knowledge to do independent research, and critical reflection upon social problems. The panel welcomes the four specialisations the programme offers. The panel approves of the students being educated to enter the labour market and to find positions in the programme domain. The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be comprehensive and to meet the master level. As they have not been updated to include the policy implications' subjects, the panel recommends to make the necessary adjustments.

The panel appreciates the Domain-specific Framework for Sociology, which has been drafted by the joint programmes in the Netherlands in this field of study. The panel considers this framework to be a sound and up-to-date description of the Sociology domain and of the attainment levels of Bachelor and Master Sociology programmes. The programme objectives are clearly aligned with the reference framework.

The panel considers the admission requirements and admission procedures of the programme to be up to standard. The panel is positive about the organisation and the contents of the pre-master programme.

Although the intended learning outcomes need to be updated, the curriculum is aligned to the programme objectives and meets the intended learning outcomes contents. The panel regards the courses to be up to standard, addressing sociological theory, methodology and policy implications in-depth. The panel welcomes students being trained in research skills and academic skills. The panel acknowledges these skills to be beneficial for the labour market preparation of students. As individual choices by students may hamper curriculum coherence, the panel suggests to ensure curriculum coherence in these situations.

The lecturers are good teachers, are very motivated and exhibit strong team-spirit. The expertise and research track records of the lecturers are beyond doubt. The postdoctoral researchers, PhD candidates, and tutors are prepared well for their teaching tasks. The workload of staff members seems high, especially during the Summer period and during peak moments. The panel suggests to monitor the average and the peak workload of the lecturers, and to take action, if this workload is too demanding.

The panel regards the educational concept and the study methods of the programme to allow for student-activating education and to be well-aligned to the student population and the first-generation university students among them. The number of hours of face-to-face education is adequate. The students-to-staff ratio is generous, allowing for small-scale education. The panel notes the strict protocols and scheduling of courses to benefit study progress. Strict scheduling may have a downside in terms of study delay, if schedules are not met by students. The panel, therefore, suggests to try and introduce more flexibility in courses' schedules. The student success rates are favourable.

The programme examination and assessment rules and regulations are aligned with the School guidelines and policies. The panel notes, however, these rules and regulations not to have been all appropriately implemented. To remedy this shortcoming, the panel specifies to implement the rules and regulations for examinations and assessments for the programme. The panel specifies also to align the Examination Board's, programme management's and examiners' perceptions of the rules and regulations that apply.

Although the position and the responsibilities of the Examination Board are adequate in a formal sense, the panel observes that the Board is not satisfactorily in control of the examination and assessment processes in the programme. To remedy this shortcoming, the panel specifies the Examination Board to ensure examination rules and regulations to be adhered to by the examiners, to oversee the examination and assessment processes of the programme, and to inspect or have inspected regularly the examinations as well as the Master Thesis projects of the programme.

The examination methods for the courses are adequate, as these meet the course goals and contents. The panel advises to state the course goals in more strict and directive terms to facilitate the alignment of course goals and examinations.

The supervision processes of the Master Thesis projects are appropriate. The assessment procedures for the Master Thesis projects are regarded by the panel not to be up to standard. The procedures regarding the assessment of the projects are not clear. To remedy these shortcomings, the panel specifies to draft clear and unambiguous rules for the Master Thesis project assessment and to ensure these rules being implemented.

The Master theses match the intended learning outcomes. The theses are of adequate quality. The panel generally agrees to the grades given by the programme examiners, but regards some theses to be graded somewhat too high. No theses were found to be unsatisfactory by the panel. Theses could improve in terms of language, style and referencing. The panel suggests to ensure ethical and judicial (legal privacy rules) screening of the Master theses, in case of primary data collection. The panel considers students completing the programme to have reached the intended learning outcomes and regards the programme to offer adequate preparation for the labour market. Programme graduates obtained suitable positions, most of them shortly after graduation. The panel proposes to install a professional field advisory board and to reinforce alumni relations to keep the programme aligned to trends in the professional field.

The panel which conducted the assessment of the Master Sociology programme of Erasmus University Rotterdam assesses this programme to be satisfactory in the terms of the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands. Standard 3 is assessed by the panel to be unsatisfactory. The panel considers the improvement of the shortcomings identified under this standard to be realistic and feasible within the period of two years. Therefore, the panel recommends NVAO to grant the programme an improvement period of two years and to extend the current accreditation term of the programme for that period.

Rotterdam, 12 April 2019

Prof. dr. A. Need  
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren  
(panel secretary)

## 2. Assessment process

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

Management of the programmes in the assessment cluster Sociology convened to discuss the composition of the assessment panel and to draft the list of candidates.

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

- Prof. dr. A. Need, professor Sociology and Public Policy, School of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences, University of Twente (panel chair);
- Prof. dr. S. Waslander, professor Sociology, TIAS School for Business and Society, Tilburg University (panel member);
- Prof. dr. I. Glorieux, professor, Department Sociology, Research Group TOR, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (panel member);
- A.G. Duursma, student Bachelor Sociology, VU Amsterdam (student member).

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prior to the date of the site visit, all panel members sent in their preliminary findings, based on the self-assessment report and the final projects studied, and a number of questions to be put to the programme representatives on the day of the site visit. The panel secretary summarised this information, compiling a list of questions, which served as a starting point for the discussions with the programme representatives during the site visit.

Shortly before the site visit date, the complete panel met to go over the preliminary findings concerning the quality of the programme. During this preliminary meeting, the preliminary findings of the panel members, including those about the final projects were discussed. The procedures to be adopted during the site visit, including the questions to be put to the programme representatives on the basis of the list compiled, were discussed as well.

On 18 January 2019, the panel conducted a site visit on the Erasmus University Rotterdam campus. The site visit schedule was in accordance with the schedule as planned. In a number of separate sessions, panel members were given the opportunity to meet with Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences Board representatives, programme management, Examination Board representatives, lecturers and final projects examiners, and students and alumni.

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

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

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

### 3. Programme administrative information

Name programme in CROHO: M Sociology  
Orientation, level programme: Academic Master  
Grade: MSc  
Number of credits: 60 EC  
Specialisations: Arbeid, Organisatie en Management (Dutch-taught)  
Grootstedelijke Vraagstukken en Beleid (Dutch-taught)  
Governance of Management and Diversity (English-taught)  
Politics & Society (English-taught)  
Location: Rotterdam  
Mode of study: Full-time and Part-time (instruction language Dutch/English)  
Registration in CROHO: 66601  
Name of institution: Erasmus University Rotterdam  
Status of institution: Government-funded University  
Institution's quality assurance: Approved



## 4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard

### 4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

#### *Findings*

The Master Sociology programme is one of the programmes of Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The School offers bachelor and master programmes in the social sciences and organises research programmes in the social sciences. The Dean of the School is responsible for the quality of all these programmes. The Department of Public Administration and Sociology is responsible for this and the other programmes in this domain within the School. The Director of Education of the Department has the responsibility for the organisation and delivery of the programmes. The coordinators of each of the four specialisations offered in the programme manage these specialisations on a day-to-day basis. The Programme Committee, being composed of equal numbers of lecturers and students, advises programme management on the quality of the programme. The School Examination Board has the authority to ensure the quality of examinations and assessments of this and the other programmes of the School. In 2015, the Departments of Public Administration and of Sociology within the School merged. This merger allowed to broaden the scope of the programme and to include policy implications.

The objectives of the programme are to educate students to understand, explain and critically reflect upon societal change, the consequences of societal change and the policy implications thereof. Students are taught theoretical and methodological insights in this domain, are trained to formulate and evaluate research proposals and to conduct independently sociological or policy-related research, and are educated to critically reflect upon social problems and policies and to translate research into policy advice.

The programme offers four distinct specialisations, being the Dutch-taught specialisations Arbeid, Organisatie en Management and Grootstedelijke Vraagstukken en Beleid and the English-taught specialisations Governance of Management and Diversity and Politics & Society. The international specialisations are offered since 2016. The specialisations are related to the research interests of the programme staff. The Arbeid, Organisatie en Management specialisation studies the relations between individualisation and globalisation and the organisation of work and governance of organisations. The Grootstedelijke Vraagstukken en Beleid specialisation is directed towards social and spatial contradictions in modern urban agglomerations. The Governance of Management and Diversity specialisation is focused upon issues and policy approaches of international migration and integration. This specialisation is offered jointly with Leiden University and Delft University of Technology. The Politics & Society specialisation studies the causes and consequences of the changes in the relations between society and politics. The programme is in the process of adding two specialisations.

The programme objectives are aligned to the requirements of the Domain-specific Framework for Sociology which was completed in 2018. This domain-specific framework has been drafted by the joint Sociology programmes in the Netherlands. In this framework, the general objectives and final attainment levels for Bachelor and Master Sociology programmes have been outlined.

Students are prepared to enter the labour market. They are educated for positions as PhD candidates in academia or for positions in the professional field as consultants, managers, researchers or teachers in public sector organisations or private companies.

In the focus on critical sociology, the programme distinguishes itself among the Sociology programmes in the Netherlands, especially bridging the Utrecht University and University of Amsterdam programmes' perspectives.

The objectives of the programme have been translated into the programme intended learning outcomes. These intended learning outcomes specify, as the main points, advanced knowledge and understanding in one or more of the subareas of sociology, profound knowledge and understanding of methods and techniques of social science research, knowledge and skills to do research independently, critical reflection upon research findings and standpoints in this field, oral and written communication skills, skills to collect and assess information, and collaboration skills.

The intended learning outcomes have not yet been updated to include the policy implications' subjects in the curriculum, being one of the main contributions by the Public Administration Department to the programme. The curriculum adaptations have preceded the update of the intended learning outcomes.

Programme management compared the intended learning outcomes quite extensively to the Dublin descriptors for master programmes, to demonstrate these to meet master level requirements.

### *Considerations*

The panel regards the programme objectives to be sound and relevant. The programme is clearly focused on the study of societal change, and the practical and policy implications thereof. The panel appreciates students being taught, among others, advanced theoretical and methodological knowledge, skills and knowledge to do independent research, and critical reflection upon social problems.

The panel welcomes the four specialisations the programme offers. These allow students opportunities to specialise in one of these fields.

The panel appreciates the Domain-specific Framework for Sociology, which has been drafted by the joint programmes in the Netherlands in this field of study. The panel considers this framework to be a sound and up-to-date description of the Sociology domain and of the attainment levels of Bachelor and Master Sociology programmes. The panel regards the objectives of this programme to be clearly aligned with the reference framework.

The panel approves of the students being educated to enter the labour market and to find positions in the programme domain.

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be comprehensive. As they have not been updated to include the policy implications' subjects, the panel recommends to make the necessary adjustments. The panel regards the intended learning outcomes to meet the master level.

*Assessment of this standard*

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

## 4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

### *Findings*

The student influx the last few years remained rather stable at about 100 incoming students per year. The influx in the Dutch-taught specialisations declined but was offset by the increase of the influx of students in the English-taught specialisations. The admission criteria for the programme are to have completed academic bachelor programmes in Sociology or in one of the other social sciences, depending upon the specialisation to be taken. Foreign students should have equivalent prior education and, in addition, are to submit a letter of motivation and are to be proficient in English. Students having completed bachelor programmes in other disciplines or having completed higher professional education bachelor programmes (hbo) are required to take the 60 EC pre-master programme before being allowed to enrol.

The programme takes one year to complete for the full-time variant and two years for the part-time variant and carries the study load of 60 EC. For the programme, the intended learning outcomes have been mapped to the curriculum components to show the curriculum meeting the programme intended learning outcomes. Although the contents of the curriculum are different and are aligned to the specialisations' foci, the curriculum structure is quite similar. Three courses (22.5 EC) in each of the specialisations are mandatory and address the core subjects of the specialisation. In the Governance of Management and Diversity specialisation, the number of courses is larger, the study load being equal however. In addition, the Social-scientific research in practice course (7.5 EC) and one elective (7.5 EC) are scheduled. In the former course, both qualitative and quantitative research methods are addressed. At the end of the curriculum, students draft the Master Thesis research proposal (7.5 EC) and complete the Master Thesis project (15 EC).

A total number of 24 staff members are involved in the programme. They are experts in the fields they lecture in, are actively engaged in research in their fields. All lecturers have PhD degrees. About 25 % of the staff is BKO-certified, whereas 10 % of the lecturers is in the process of obtaining this certificate. About 50 % of the staff members are exempted from the BKO-obligation. In addition to these staff members, postdoctoral researchers, PhD candidates, coordinators and tutors participate in education. They are trained to guide students in problem-based learning classes, working groups or practical classes. Coordinators guide tutors and arrange practical classes. Practical classes on research skills, statistics or qualitative data analysis are lectured by staff members. Staff members and tutors working together within courses meet regularly to discuss the education. Lecturers in the programme meet frequently to discuss the programme and curriculum coherence. The lecturers' workload is quite demanding.

The educational concept of the programme is directed towards interactive and small-scale teaching. The students-to-staff ratio for the programme is 12/1. The number of hours of face-to-face education varies between 7.5 hours per week to 9.0 hours per week, depending upon the specialisation. These hours do not include the Master Thesis projects supervision hours. The study methods adopted in the courses are lectures, tutorials and written assignments. The tutorials include oral presentations and feedback, debates

or analysing journal articles. In the international specialisations, the international classroom is promoted by, among others, organising small groups of students with different backgrounds in the tutorials. At the beginning of the programme as well as in the course of the programme, students are informed about the curriculum. They are also informed about their study progress. Students may contact study advisors, when they experience study problems. The programme drop-out rates are very limited. The average student success rates of the programme are 65 % after one year and 85 % after two years for the Dutch-taught specialisations and 84 % after one year and 96 % after two years for the English-taught specialisations (figures for last three to four cohorts).

### *Considerations*

The panel considers the admission requirements and admission procedures of the programme to be up to standard. The panel is positive about the organisation and the contents of the pre-master programme.

Although the intended learning outcomes need to be updated, the curriculum is aligned to the programme objectives and meets the intended learning outcomes contents. The panel regards the courses to be up to standard, addressing sociological theory, methodology and policy implications in-depth. The panel welcomes students being trained throughout the curriculum in research skills and academic skills. The panel acknowledges these skills to be beneficial for the labour market preparation of students. As individual choices by students may hamper curriculum coherence, the panel suggests to ensure curriculum coherence in these situations.

The panel considers the lecturers to be good teachers, to be very motivated and to exhibit strong team-spirit. The expertise and research track records of the lecturers are beyond doubt. The postdoctoral researchers, PhD candidates, and tutors are prepared well for their teaching tasks by both the staff members and the coordinators in the programme. The workload of staff members seems high, especially during the Summer period and during peak moments. The panel, therefore, suggests to monitor the average and the peak workload of the lecturers, and to take action, if this workload is too demanding.

The panel regards the educational concept and the study methods of the programme to allow for student-activating education and to be well-aligned to the student population and the first-generation university students among them. The number of hours of face-to-face education is adequate. The students-to-staff ratio is generous, allowing for small-scale education. The panel notes the strict protocols and scheduling of courses to benefit study progress. Strict scheduling may have a downside in terms of study delay, if schedules are not met by students. The panel, therefore, suggests to try and introduce more flexibility in courses' schedules. The student success rates are favourable.

### *Assessment of this standard*

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

### 4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

#### *Findings*

The programme examination and assessment regulations are in line with the University Students' Charter and the Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences Education and Examination Regulations and the Rules and Regulations of the School Examination Board. As has been indicated, the School-wide Examination Board has the authority to monitor the quality of examinations and assessments of all the School's programmes, including this programme. Within the Board, one member is the academic member for the Sociology programmes. In addition, on the Board sit a test expert and an external member. On behalf of the Examination Board, the School-wide Test Committee has the tasks to review examinations and theses.

Programme management and the Examination Board have taken some measures to promote the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments. Examiners are appointed by the Examination Board. Test matrices, specifying the relations between the course goals and the examinations, have been introduced, but have not yet been adopted in all courses. The Test Committee has not yet reviewed these projects nor has the Committee reviewed examinations in the programme. Written assignments and theses are screened for fraud and plagiarism by examiners. The Examination Board monitors these processes and handles cases. The panel notes the Examination Board, programme management and examiners to have different perceptions about the applicable rules and regulations.

In some but not all of the courses, multiple examination methods are adopted. Examination methods include written examinations, written assignments, or papers. Attendance may be taken into account.

The Master Thesis project rules and regulations are extensively described in the Thesis manual. In the projects, students have to demonstrate having reached the programme intended learning outcomes. The Master Thesis projects are individual research projects, covering the empirical cycle. The topics of the projects may either be chosen from topics suggested by the programme staff, or proposed by students themselves or be aligned with internships at external organisations. All students are entitled to supervision by their supervisor. Throughout the thesis drafting and writing process, students meet in small groups of students. These groups are guided by the thesis supervisor. The Master thesis proposals are assessed by the supervisor and the second reader. Research proposals are to be presented on a symposium. The Master thesis projects are assessed by the supervisor and the second reader. They conduct their assessment on the basis of assessment scoring forms, which include as assessment criteria problem definition, theoretical framework, research design, data and methodology, analysis, scholarly character, and argumentation and style. A rubrics form has been added to the assessment scoring form. The process by which both examiners arrive at their assessments, whether they meet to discuss their assessments and whether they use one or separate assessment forms to fill out, is not clear to the panel. In the discussions with examiners and the Examination Board, different procedures were mentioned. The procedures about the grading of the Master Thesis projects remained unclear to the panel as well. In particular, it was not clear

whether and if so, under which conditions unsatisfactory scores for assessment criteria might be compensated for to arrive at satisfactory scores for the project as a whole.

#### *Considerations*

The programme examination and assessment rules and regulations are aligned with the School guidelines and policies. The panel notes, however, these rules and regulations not to have been all appropriately implemented. To remedy this shortcoming, the panel specifies to implement the rules and regulations for examinations and assessments for the programme. In addition, the panel specifies to align the Examination Board's, programme management's and examiners' perceptions of the rules and regulations that apply.

Although the position and the responsibilities of the Examination Board are adequate in a formal sense, the panel observes that the Board is not satisfactorily in control of the examination and assessment processes in the programme. To remedy this shortcoming, the panel specifies the Examination Board to ensure examination rules and regulations to be adhered to by the examiners, to oversee the examination and assessment processes of the programme, and to inspect or have inspected regularly the examinations as well as the Master Thesis projects of the programme.

The examination methods adopted for the courses are adequate, as these meet the course goals and course contents. The panel welcomes the diversity of examination methods in the courses. The panel advises to state the course goals in more strict and directive terms to facilitate the alignment of course goals and examinations.

The panel considers the supervision processes of the Master Thesis projects to be adequate. The panel welcomes students being well-guided in this process. The assessment procedures for the Master Thesis projects are regarded by the panel not to be up to standard. The procedures regarding the assessment of the projects, including the completing the assessment scoring forms, the interaction between examiners and the rules for compensation of unsatisfactory scores for assessment criteria are not clear. To remedy these shortcomings, the panel specifies to draft clear and unambiguous rules for the Master Thesis project assessment and to ensure these rules being implemented.

#### *Assessment of this standard*

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

#### 4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

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

##### *Findings*

Master Thesis projects are individual research projects, covering the empirical cycle and including either qualitative or quantitative data analyses.

The panel studied fifteen Master theses of programme graduates of recent years. All specialisations were represented. The average grades for the Master Thesis projects were 6.9 to 7.4 for programme graduates for the years 2015, 2016 or 2017.

The programme surveyed the graduates' careers. About 90 % of the programme graduates found positions shortly after their graduation. At the time of the survey, nearly all of them were employed. About ten to fifteen graduates continued their studies as PhD candidates. Others found employment in private companies (50 %), semi-public organisations (31 %) or public sector organisations (19 %). Positions of these graduates are consultants (19 %), managers (12 %), researchers (10 %), teachers (9 %) or project managers (5 %).

##### *Considerations*

The Master theses the panel studied, match the intended learning outcomes. The theses are of adequate quality. The panel generally agrees to the grades given by the programme examiners, but regards some theses to be graded somewhat too high. No theses were found to be unsatisfactory by the panel. Theses could improve in terms of language and style and in terms of referencing. The panel suggests to ensure ethical and judicial (legal privacy rules) screening of the Master Thesis projects, in case of primary data collection.

The panel considers students completing the programme to have reached the intended learning outcomes and regards the programme to offer adequate preparation for the labour market in the programme domain. Programme graduates obtained suitable positions, most of them shortly after graduation.

The panel proposes to install a professional field advisory board and to reinforce alumni relations to keep the programme aligned to trends in the professional field.

##### *Assessment of this standard*

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



## 5. Overview of assessments

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

## 6. Recommendations and shortcomings

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

- To update the intended learning outcomes to include the policy implications' subjects, presented in the curriculum.
- To ensure curriculum coherence in situations of some of the individual choices by students.
- To monitor the average and the peak workload of the lecturers, and to take action, if this workload is too demanding.
- To try and introduce more flexibility in courses' schedules.
- To state the course goals in more strict and directive terms to facilitate the alignment of course goals and examinations.
- To ensure ethical and judicial (legal privacy rules) screening of the Master Thesis projects, in case of primary data collection.
- To install a professional field advisory board and to reinforce alumni relations to keep the programme aligned to trends in the professional field.

As standard 3, Student Assessment, is assessed to be unsatisfactory, the panel summarises the shortcomings to be remedied. These are the following.

- To implement the rules and regulations for examinations and assessments for the programme.
- To align Examination Board's, programme management's and examiners' perceptions of the rules and regulations about examinations and assessments that apply.
- For the Examination Board to ensure examination rules and regulations to be adhered to by the examiners, to oversee the examination and assessment processes of the programme, and to inspect or have inspected regularly the examinations as well as the Master Thesis projects of the programme.
- To draft clear and unambiguous rules for the Master Thesis project assessment and to ensure these rules being implemented.