

**MASTER'S PROGRAMME**  
**DEVELOPMENT STUDIES**  
FACULTY OF GEOSCIENCES  
**UTRECHT UNIVERSITY**

QANU  
Catharijnesingel 56  
PO Box 8035  
3503 RA Utrecht  
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100  
E-mail: [support@qanu.nl](mailto:support@qanu.nl)  
Internet: [www.qanu.nl](http://www.qanu.nl)

Project number: Q0726  
© 2019 QANU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.



# CONTENTS

<b>REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT STUDIES OF UTRECHT UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE .....	23
APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	25
APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM .....	26
APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT .....	27
APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL .....	29

This report was finalised on 7 October 2019





# REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT STUDIES OF UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands for limited programme assessments as a starting point (September 2018).

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

### Master's programme Development Studies

Name of the programme:	Development Studies
International name of the programme:	
CROHO number:	60731
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	-
Location(s):	Utrecht
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/11/2019

The visit of the assessment panel Human Geography and Urban Planning to the Faculty of Geosciences of Utrecht University took place on 21, 22 and 23 May 2019.

The programme's management proposes to change the CROHO programme name, see Standard 1.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Utrecht University
Status of the institution:	publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	positive

## COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 11 February 2019. The panel that assessed the master's programme Development Studies consisted of:

- Em. prof. dr. L.J. (Leo) de Haan, emeritus professor of Development Studies at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) of Erasmus University Rotterdam [chair];
- Em. prof. dr. C. (Christian) Kesteloot, emeritus professor at the Division of Geography and Tourism of KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. F.J.A. (Frank) Witlox, professor of Economic Geography at the Department of Geography at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Dr. C.J. (Kees-Jan) van Klaveren, senior auditor and data protection officer at Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences;
- Drs. J. (Judith) Borsboom-van Beurden, senior researcher Smart Sustainable Cities at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU, Norway);
- Dr. L.B.J. (Lianne) van Duinen, project manager at the Council for the Environment and Infrastructure (Rli);
- J. (Jim) Klooster BSc, master's student Economic Geography at University of Groningen [student member].



The panel was supported by dr. M. (Meg) van Bogaert and dr. M.J. (Marijn) Hollestelle, who acted as secretaries.

Due to personal reasons, prof. dr. Frank Witlox was not able to attend the site visit itself. In consultation with the programme and the NVAO, he stayed on as a panel member and read and commented upon the self-evaluation report, a number of theses and the draft reports.

## WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The master's programme Development Studies at the Faculty of Geosciences of Utrecht University was part of the cluster assessment Human Geography and Urban Planning. In April and May 2019, the panel assessed nineteen programmes at four universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: University of Amsterdam, University of Groningen, Utrecht University, and Radboud University.

### *Panel members*

The panel consisted of the following members:

- Em. prof. dr. L.J. (Leo) de Haan, emeritus professor of Development Studies, at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) of Erasmus University Rotterdam [chair];
- Em. prof. dr. C. (Christian) Kesteloot, emeritus professor at the Division of Geography and Tourism of KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. E.M. (Ellen) van Bueren, professor of Urban Development Management at the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment of Delft University of Technology;
- Drs. J. (Judith) Borsboom-van Beurden, senior researcher Smart Sustainable Cities at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU, Norway);
- Dr. L.B.J. (Lianne) van Duinen, project manager at the Council for the Environment and Infrastructure (Rli);
- Dr. C.J. (Kees-Jan) van Klaveren, senior auditor and data protection officer at Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences;
- Prof. dr. M.A. (Maria) Koelen, professor of Health and Society at Wageningen University & Research;
- Prof. dr. F.J.A. (Frank) Witlox, professor of Economic Geography at the Department of Geography at Ghent University (Belgium);
- J. (Jim) Klooster BSc, master's student Economic Geography at the University of Groningen [student member];
- L. (Lars) Stevenson BSc, bachelor's student Political Science and master's student Comparative Politics, Administration & Society at Radboud University [student member];
- N.J.F. (Niek) Zijlstra, bachelor's student Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Amsterdam [student member];
- Prof. dr. ing. C.M. (Carola) Hein, professor of History of Architecture and Urban Planning at the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment of Delft University of Technology [referee assessment University of Groningen].

For each site visit, assessment panel members were selected based on their expertise, availability and independence.

The QANU project manager for the cluster assessment was dr. Irene Conradie. She acted as secretary in the site visit of the University of Amsterdam. In order to assure the consistency of assessment within the cluster, the project manager was present at the panel discussion leading to the preliminary findings at all site visits. All draft reports were checked by QANU. Dr. Meg van Bogaert and drs. Mariette Huisjes, freelance secretaries for QANU, acted as secretaries in the site visit of the University of Groningen. Dr. Meg van Bogaert also acted as secretary in the site visits of Utrecht University and Radboud University. Dr. Marijn Hollestelle, employee of QANU, was present at the site visit of Utrecht University, specifically for the ECA assessment report of quality in internationalisation of the master's

programme International Development Studies. The project manager and the secretaries regularly discussed the assessment process and outcomes.

#### *Preparation*

On 18 February 2019, the panel chair was briefed by the project manager on the tasks and working method of the assessment panel and more specifically his role, as well as use of the assessment framework. A preparatory panel meeting was also organised on 18 February 2019. During this meeting, the panel members received instruction on the tasks and working method and the use of the assessment framework. The panel also discussed the domain specific framework.

A schedule for the site visit was composed. Prior to the site visit, representative partners for the various interviews were selected. See Appendix 4 for the final schedule. Before the site visit, the programmes wrote self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the project manager. She checked these on quality and completeness and sent them to the panel members. The panel members studied the self-evaluation reports and formulated initial questions and remarks, as well as positive aspects of the programmes.

The panel also studied a selection of theses and their assessment forms for the programmes. The selection consisted of fifteen theses, based on a provided list of graduates between 2017-2018. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

#### *Site visit*

The site visit to Utrecht University took place on 21, 22 and 23 May 2019. Prior to the site visit, the panel discussed its initial findings on the self-evaluation reports and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit. During the site visit, the panel studied additional materials about the programmes and exams, as well as minutes of the Programme Committee and the Board of Examiners. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 5. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners and the Programme Committee. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received. The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the panel's preliminary findings and general observations.

#### *Report*

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to QANU for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project manager sent the draft reports to the faculty in order to have these checked for factual irregularities. The project manager discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty of Geosciences and University Board.

#### *Definition of judgements standards*

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited programme assessments, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the standards:

#### **Generic quality**

The quality that, from an international perspective, may reasonably be expected from a higher education Associate Degree, Bachelor's or Master's programme.

#### **Meets the standard**

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

**Partially meets the standard**

The programme meets the generic quality standard to a significant extent, but improvements are required in order to fully meet the standard.

**Does not meet the standard**

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

The panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the programme as a whole:

**Positive**

The programme meets all the standards.

**Conditionally positive**

The programme meets standard 1 and partially meets a maximum of two standards, with the imposition of conditions being recommended by the panel.

**Negative**

In the following situations:

- The programme fails to meet one or more standards;
- The programme partially meets standard 1;
- The programme partially meets one or two standards, without the imposition of conditions being recommended by the panel;
- The programme partially meets three or more standards.



## SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

### *Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes*

The master's programme Development Studies (henceforth: International Development Studies (IDS)) has a clear identity, synthesising the disciplines of human geography and the multi/interdisciplinary field of development studies, with an emphasis on the most influential processes that facilitate or hinder sustainable and inclusive development at various geographical scales. The balance between academic and professional training is valued by both the students and the panel. The intended learning outcomes (ILOs) reflect the identity and profile of the programme and are in line with the international requirements regarding the level and orientation of an academic master's programme. The panel is impressed by the proactive attitude and involvement of the Advisory Board. It concludes that the proposed name International Development Studies is fitting with the aims and content of the programme. It therefore judges positively on the proposed name change.

### *Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment*

According to the panel, the structure and coherence of the curriculum are good. Specifically, the compulsory, international research internship is an important feature, and the students are well prepared for it in courses during the first and second periods. The curriculum includes theory, empirical knowledge, research and transferable skills. The panel recommends that the programme continues working on more room for electives for the students. The attention paid to intercultural competences by creating a learning line is applauded, but the panel thinks that more emphasis could be given to the students' understanding and awareness of this learning line. The quality of the courses is good, and the relationship between the course objectives, ILOs and the Dublin descriptors shows that the curriculum enables students to achieve the ILOs. The programme offers a variety of teaching methods that stimulates active learning and leads to cohort formation and a close-knit community. The graduation rates have increased over the past years and are impressive. The diversity of the student body is valued by the panel as well as considered a point of attention. Specifically, attracting sufficient non-EU students remains a continuous challenge. The programme does have a broad and interesting approach to this challenge that includes support for non-EU students in applying for scholarships as well as organising summer schools in India and pairing students with local students during the research internship, with the purpose of having IDS students collaborate with global South students. All teaching staff combine research and teaching and are qualified in both. The faculty pays appropriate attention to the professionalisation of its teaching staff. The perceived work pressure is high, but the panel finds that the faculty is paying sufficient attention to this aspect. The lecturers are also actively looking for solutions to reduce the workload. In conclusion, the panel finds that the programme offers students a teaching-learning environment that enables them to achieve the ILOs.

### *Standard 3: Student assessment*

The increased attention paid by the programme and faculty to a systematic method of assessment and associated quality assurance has led to a good system of assessment. The students are informed about and are actively involved in the assessment. The programme uses a wide variety of assessment methods, and the final assessment of a course is always based on multiple assessment moments. The thesis assessment is appropriate, with an adequate independent assessment by the second examiner. However, the assessment form should more clearly show the independent assessment of both examiners. The panel pointed out that the limited amount of written feedback found on a number of assessment forms could be improved. Moreover, a separate item for explicitly assessing international and intercultural learning could be included. The plan to regularly discuss the expectations of a thesis held by staff members is supported. The Board of Examiners and the quality assurance system are functioning properly, and the panel notes that the Board of Examiners has taken important steps in the past period. It concludes that the assessment is sufficiently reliable, valid and transparent. The assessment of the thesis is adequately organised.



*Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes*

The panel reviewed a random selection of theses that were produced by students of the IDS programme. It agreed with the grades given by the supervisor and second examiner. The employability of the graduates is increasing, and although not all students feel fully prepared for the labour market, the programme pays sufficient attention to this aspect. The panel was impressed by the Shared Value Foundation (SVF) and Young Expert Programmes (YEP) initiatives of the programme. Based on the selection of master's theses, the alumni survey and interviews with alumni during the site visit, the panel concludes that students realise the ILOs as formulated by the programme.

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

*Master's programme Development Studies*

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	meets the standard
Standard 3: Student assessment	meets the standard
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	meets the standard
General conclusion	positive

The chair, prof. dr. Leo de Haan, and the secretary, dr. Meg van Bogaert, of the panel hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 7 October 2019

# DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS

## Context

The Faculty of Geosciences has four departments and is one of the seven faculties of Utrecht University (UU). Within the Faculty of Geosciences, the Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning is responsible for the teaching of various programmes, including the master's programme International Development Studies. The department focuses on research, teaching and outreach related to the Urban Futures research programme, investigating urban issues in the context of an ongoing worldwide trend of increasing urbanisation. The responsibility of coordinating and managing the master's programme International Development Studies is assigned to the department's Director of Education. The daily management of all master's programmes is carried out by the Education Coordination Team (ECT), composed of the bachelor coordinator, the master coordinator, the education coordinator, and is chaired by the Director of Education. The ECT is advised on issues pertaining to the programme by the Master Education Committee.

### **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

### *Profile*

In the past decades the world has become increasingly interconnected by flows of people, commodities, money, ideas, policies and collective actions. The possibility for inclusive and sustainable development depends very much on the direction and scale of these flows, as they have direct consequences for people's livelihood opportunities. The emergence of new flows leads to rapid transformations of global landscapes, which call for new conceptualisations in the international development studies disciplines. The aim of the International Development Studies (IDS) master's programme is to educate students in such a way that they will be able to make a substantial contribution to the building of a sustainable society. In pursuit of this aim, the programme facilitates their acquisition of theoretical and empirical knowledge, research and transferable skills, professional attitude and ethical awareness at the master's level. The IDS master's programme emphasises the most influential processes that facilitate or hinder sustainable and inclusive development at various geographical scales. These include climate change, rapid urbanisation, migration, large-scale investment in land, food security, and the role of different actors and institutions in the developmental process. IDS is rooted in the departmental Urban Futures research institute, which investigates urban issues in the context of an ongoing global trend of increasing urbanisation. In the self-evaluation report the programme positions itself well within the Domain-Specific Reference Framework, by pointing to the significance of the embeddedness of socio-spatial phenomena and different mobility flows, producing spatial inequality. In doing so, it also clarifies why the programme is part of the Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning. In addition, the programme has elaborated its profile by integrating the definition of development studies of the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI), subscribing to multi/interdisciplinarity.

The panel thinks that the programme has a clear identity in the field of development studies. It saw a profile of an attractive, international education with a specific focus on sustainability. In its opinion, the focus on spatial issues and issues of place as well as the connection with geosciences is convincing, and therefore this programme fits within the cluster of Human Geography and Spatial Planning. Students told the panel that the programme teaches them to think critically and provides them with an international perspective on societal challenges. Also, they appreciate the balance between academic and professional training in the programme.



### *Intended learning outcomes*

The aim of the IDS programme is translated into six main learning goals:

1. To make sense of societal challenges and transformation from an interdisciplinary perspective;
2. To analyse social issues with a holistic, system approach;
3. To be able to conduct fieldwork research, collecting data on the ground;
4. To be sensitive to the importance of context (place, space, time);
5. To focus on the well-being of the people and communities;
6. To be solution oriented.

These learning goals were then translated into 16 intended learning outcomes (ILOs), which were structured to match closely with the five Dublin descriptors (see Appendix 2). An additional, sixth category was added, underlining the programme's goal to prepare students for further study or work. In addition to a match with the Dublin descriptors, the ILOs are related to the Domain-Specific Reference Framework and the definition of development studies as formulated by the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI). They were updated in the evaluation period and now reflect the current state of development studies. The revision also led to a better connection to the department's Urban Future research programme, in particular the Transnational Mobilities research theme. According to the panel, the revised set of ILOs fits the profile and identity of the programme well. It is positive about the programme's intention to regularly evaluate the ILOs and determine whether they still fit the rapidly changing discipline of development studies.

### *Connection to the professional field*

The IDS programme is academically and professionally oriented, with ILOs emphasising both academic and transferrable skills. An emphasis is put on fieldwork research through a compulsory internship in a global South context. The programme prepares students for both PhD research and work in a professional setting. Revision of the ILOs was done together with members of the Advisory Board, which comprises members in the professional field who are familiar with important developments in the graduates' work field. The panel was impressed by the proactive attitude and involvement of the Advisory Board. The Board has a clear view on the IDS programme and of the graduates' competencies required by the professional field. The panel considers the Advisory Board to be an asset to the programme.

### *Proposed name change*

At the time of the site visit, the programme had only one, English, name registered in CROHO, Development Studies. The programme indicated that this name does not sufficiently reflect its international profile and is not the name the programme uses in its communication; it expressed the wish to change its name to the one it commonly uses, International Development Studies. The panel noted the programme's clear international focus, both in its aims as well as in its curriculum. To include 'International' in its programme name and international name is therefore a logical choice, in the panel's view.

### **Considerations**

The master's programme International Development Studies has a clear identity, synthesising the disciplines of human geography and the multi/interdisciplinary field of development studies, with an emphasis on the most influential processes that facilitate or hinder sustainable and inclusive development at various geographical scales. The balance between academic and professional training is valued by both the students and the panel. The ILOs reflect the identity and profile of the programme and are in line with the international requirements regarding the level and orientation of an academic master's programme. The panel is impressed by the proactive attitude and involvement of the Advisory Board. It concludes that the proposed name International Development Studies is fitting with the aims and content of the programme. It therefore judges positively on the proposed name change.

## Conclusion

*Master's programme Development Studies*: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

### **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

### *Curriculum*

The one-year (60 EC) programme is taught in English. Appendix 3 provides an overview of the curriculum, which shows that the first semester is predominantly used for theoretical courses. The cumulative and complementary courses form a logical and coherent sequence. The *Development Themes* course (7.5 EC) provides students with conceptual and empirical knowledge of current development and poverty trends in Asia, Latin America and Africa. In the same period students follow the *Development Theories* course (7.5 EC), in which the major approaches and theories that have dominated thinking about development are critically examined. In the second period course, *Advanced Methods and Techniques for Development Studies* (10 EC), the students obtain the knowledge and skills required to analyse, interpret, design and carry out research with a particular focus on geographical research in developmental contexts. They told the panel that the M&T course covers the broad field of qualitative and quantitative research methods. They understand the decision to do so, but some would have appreciated becoming acquainted with fewer methods, but in more depth. The teaching staff told the panel that the present set-up and choice of topics are deliberate decisions as the graduates need to be able to work with both qualitative and quantitative research methods. In the second period, the students are given a choice of six electives (5 EC). In the second semester (periods 3 and 4), they do their three-month internship abroad and write their master's thesis (jointly worth 30 EC).

Students the panel interviewed appreciate the structure and content of the programme. In the first semester they start with theory after which they go abroad for international experience. They feel well prepared for the final part of the curriculum. They have minor recommendations to improve the curriculum further, for example including more practical aspects in the theory and adding problem-solving to problem understanding. They would also appreciate more electives, although they understand that this will remain restricted in a one-year programme. Although they are formally allowed to choose electives that are offered outside the programme, it is difficult to find a course from other departments that fits their interests as well as the schedule of the curriculum. The panel noticed that the programme is working on improving the choice of electives and stimulates it to continue these efforts.

The panel is of the opinion that the programme has drawn up a diverse and balanced curriculum, in which theory as well as empirical knowledge, research and transferable skills are taught both on campus and in the field. The coherence of the curriculum was strengthened, as recommended by the previous assessment panel. In order to form a picture of the course content, the panel had access to the educational material of a number of courses during the site visit (see Appendix 5). The content and level of the courses the panel looked at in more detail are good. For example, the *Development Theories* course critically examines the major approaches and theories that dominate and has dominated thinking about 'development' at present. The course is quite right in making more room for newer and topical themes such as sustainability, social justice and post-colonialism, as compared to classical development theories. The panel also appreciates that a new subject was added to the course, i.e. working with theory, to strengthen the link between this course and other parts of the curriculum. Another course the panel in-depth reviewed was the *Advanced Methods and Techniques for International Development Studies*, which pays substantial attention to research designs, quantitative data collection and analysis, qualitative methods and analysis, and research ethics and communication. The panel values that also post-fieldwork workshops are organised to help students



to analyse their own data. The elective course *Migration, Mobilities and Sustainable Futures*, which is followed by many IDS students, takes an innovative perspective on human migration. Instead of focusing on a particular human mobility flow narrowly, it examines how these movements share complex and dynamic relations. The panel values that students not only learn about and reflect on dominant conceptualisations of migration and development, the mobilities paradigm and politics of mobility perspective, but also focus on methodological issues.

The panel also noted that the completion of the full research cycle in methods and techniques clearly leads to the level of an academic master's programme. All courses are subject to a standard course evaluation and subsequent reflection by the course coordinator on the outcomes. This often leads to adjustments of the course. An appendix to the self-evaluation report provides the connection between the course objectives, the ILOs and the Dublin descriptors. Based on this extensive document, the panel concludes that the courses are aligned with the ILOs.

#### *Master's thesis and internship*

The second semester is devoted to individual research-related activities, including an independent research project and writing of the master's thesis. The previous assessment panel recommended streamlining this part of the curriculum, a suggestion which was actively taken up by the programme. Many of the positive aspects identified by the present panel are the result of improvements made in the past evaluation period. The *Research Internship/master's thesis* (30 EC) is designed to give students the opportunity to conduct substantial fieldwork-based individual research on a topic related to international development. All students conduct a three-month research internship in the global South. The master's thesis is based on the research conducted during the research internship. The students are given a wide choice of research positions with broad research themes but can also organise their own research projects. The research plan that was drafted for the *Advanced Methods & Techniques* course is carried out under the supervision of the IDS programme's supervisor and often in close collaboration with the host organisations in the field. The thesis supervisor always has a PhD and is specialised in the research topic. Drawing on their fieldwork, the students write their master's thesis upon their return from the field. They told the panel that the support and supervision provided by teaching staff are excellent and strongly appreciated. They feel well prepared to start their *Research internship and Master's thesis*.

The overseas fieldwork research component is considered crucial by the programme, since a majority of the ILOs are achieved in it. Like the staff and students, the panel considers this research internship a major strength of the programme. In addition to the significant contribution to the achievement of the ILOs, it was impressed by the way the staff deals with supervision of the students when abroad. The students are actively discouraged from going to high-risk places and are proactively teamed up to go to the same place while working on different topics. The teaching staff is also actively looking for reliable partners and pays a lot of attention to preparing students with respect to safety and security.

To prepare students for the internship, a learning line on intercultural competences was developed. This trajectory includes sessions in which these competences are explicitly discussed with the students by using cases. They are prepared for the unfamiliar cultural context they will encounter during their internship. In their research proposal they have to reflect on their identity in relation to this aspect, and another reflection is required in the interim report (after eight weeks of fieldwork). The learning line culminates in the master's thesis. The panel applauds the clear view the programme has developed on intercultural competences, the way it has made that explicit in teaching the students and organized that in a learning line. Although the students recognised the different parts, for example the attention paid in the *Advanced Methods and Techniques* course and the interim report, they were not really aware of the learning line. The panel recommends paying specific attention to helping the students understand the whole learning line, and especially to positionality.

### *Didactic approach, teaching methods and teaching-learning environment*

The IDS programme is structured according to the Utrecht Education Model. This model has four pillars, the first of which is a clear distinction between bachelor's programmes with a broad education and master's programmes with a specialisation. Flexibility and freedom of choice form the second pillar; students largely determine their own study path. The third pillar is the programme's aim for small-scale education with activating working methods. Finally, the fourth pillar focuses on the professional development of the instructors. In the curriculum the IDS programme aims furthermore at providing students with a diverse (multidisciplinary, international and intercultural), inspiring and engaging environment for personal and professional growth. The first semester is more lecturer-driven, while the second semester requires a high level of student self-management.

All of the courses use various complementary teaching approaches and methods, and stimulate the students' active participation in the acquisition and application of knowledge and skills. During tutorials, the students usually work in supervised groups, or focus on specific skills, such as statistical, qualitative analysis, GIS (geographical information system) and research skills. In addition, field visits are organised. In the first semester, when the students prepare their research proposal, they are required to regularly present their plans to their peers and lecturers. In the second semester, active and independent learning is of even greater importance: they have to demonstrate their capability to formulate and conduct research with a high level of autonomy. They confirmed to the panel that a variety of activating teaching methods is used in the courses. The panel got the impression of a close community and successful cohort formation despite the fact that the students are abroad for three months.

### *Enrolment, admission, supervision and study ability*

The admission requirements for IDS have been described, and admission is granted on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the criteria with respect to previous training, proficiency in the English language, average grade, motivation, and extracurricular and work experience. Applicants might be offered an individualised pre-master's programme before they start the IDS programme. Intake numbers range from 30 to 50 students per year, and the majority of applicants hold a bachelor's degree external to Utrecht University with diverse disciplinary backgrounds. The graduation rates are good, in 2017/18 a total of 69% of students graduated immediately after the 12-month programme. The panel is impressed by the efforts and results of the programme. The previous panel recommended improving the graduation rates. Attention to graduating on time is clearly part of student guidance; the students are informed and stimulated to graduate on time. Milestones and deadlines are announced early on, return days help teaching staff to connect to and stimulate students, and the programme uses strict deadlines with respect to the master's thesis.

The diversity of the student body, both with regard to disciplinary background and nationality, is considered by both the programme and the panel to be an asset as it enriches discussions and learning experiences by providing different perspectives. At the same time, diversity poses challenges in course planning and execution. The programme has been making extra efforts to accommodate this challenge, specifically in the *Advanced Methods & Techniques* course. Two of the three compulsory courses are shared with students of the International Development (ID) track of the Sustainable Development (SD) specialisation of the Environmental Sciences Master's programme (SD-ID track). This further strengthens the diversity in the classroom.

### *Internationalisation*

The self-evaluation report stated that the programme is internationalised. For example, all courses are taught in English, and all student assignments must be written in English. In addition, the number of international students attending the programme is large, with an average of 29% non-Dutch students over the period of evaluation. The teaching staff is also increasingly non-Dutch and/or has studied, taught and done research in international contexts. Another internationalisation aspect of the programme is the compulsory three-month internship conducted in a global South setting, which is considered a crucial part of the programme. To further strengthen and improve the internationalisation aspect of the programme, a number of initiatives have been developed, for



example the learning trajectory on intercultural competences. Finally, the application for the Cequint special feature on internationalisation, which was assessed parallel to this re-accreditation assessment, is expected to further the internationalisation aspects of the programme.

During the site visit, the panel learned that it is difficult for the programme to attract sufficient students from the global South to enrol in the programme. Although many prospective students are interested and eligible, tuition fees are often an insurmountable barrier. There are some scholarships that students can apply for, but these are limited in number. Nevertheless, the programme is supporting prospective students to apply for scholarships, to increase their chances of actually enrolling in the programme. The programme management told the panel that it also wants to increase the number of non-European international students from e.g. the US or Japan. The panel thinks that the programme has a broad and interesting approach to this challenge which is ambitious and realistic at the same time. In this regard, it appreciates the setting up of summer schools in India, thus allowing students from the programme to collaborate with global South students of Indian universities. Another good example is the initiative to pair students from the programme with local, i.e. global South, students while doing research during the research internships. The panel fully agrees with the programme that a diverse student population, including students from the global South, would fit the programme's contemporary representation of development studies.

#### *Teaching staff*

A number of staff changes have taken place in the last evaluation period. As a result of retirement and other departing staff members, younger staff members with a more international and interdisciplinary background have been recruited. The balance between junior and senior staff members is considered to be good, and all staff members are involved in both teaching and research. Regarding the latter, staff members have received prestigious grants. All tenured teaching staff hold a Basic Teaching Qualification (BKO), about half also have their Senior Teaching Qualification (SKO). PhD students and postdocs are involved in the teaching and thesis supervision, but always under the responsibility of a senior staff member. The department has paid sufficient attention to the professionalisation of its teaching staff, and the panel is impressed by the high percentage of staff members with a SKO. The research of staff members is closely connected to the master's programme, and the reputation of the teaching staff regarding the quality of research is good, according to the panel.

The staff-student ratio decreased over the assessment period from 1:40 in 2012/13 to 1:36 in 2017/18, predominantly as a result of the recruitment of young assistant professors. The share of teaching of tenured staff varies between 50-80%, and the workload perceived by the staff is high, which was a point of attention during the previous assessment. Causes of the high perceived workload are the fact that lecturers teach in several courses, that they are committed to teaching and often spend more time than the hours assigned (which are rather tight), and that they have to find a balance in combining research and teaching. The panel is pleased to notice that the perceived work pressure is recognised by the management of both the programme and the faculty. However, it is an issue that should continue to receive attention.

#### **Considerations**

According to the panel, the structure and coherence of the curriculum are good. Specifically, the compulsory, international research internship is an important feature, and the students are well prepared for it in courses during the first and second semesters. The curriculum includes theory, empirical knowledge, research and transferable skills. The panel recommends that the programme continues working on more room for electives for the students. The attention paid to intercultural competences by creating a learning line is applauded, but the panel thinks that more emphasis could be given to the students' understanding and awareness of this learning line. The quality of the courses is good, and the relationship between the course objectives, ILOs and the Dublin descriptors shows that the curriculum enables students to achieve the ILOs. The programme offers a variety of teaching methods that stimulates active learning and leads to cohort formation and a close-knit community. The graduation rates have increased over the past years and are impressive. The diversity of the



student body is valued by the panel as well as considered a point of attention. Specifically, attracting sufficient non-EU students remains a continuous challenge. The programme does have a broad and interesting approach to this challenge that includes support for non-EU students in applying for scholarships as well as organising summer schools in India and pairing students with local students during the research internship, with the purpose of having IDS students collaborate with global South students. All teaching staff combine research and teaching and are qualified in both. The faculty pays appropriate attention to the professionalisation of its teaching staff. The perceived work pressure is high, but the panel finds that the faculty is paying sufficient attention to this aspect. The lecturers are also actively looking for solutions to reduce the workload. In conclusion, the panel finds that the programme offers students a teaching-learning environment that enables them to achieve the ILOs.

## Conclusion

*Master's programme Development Studies*: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

### **Standard 3: Student assessment**

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

## Findings

All master's programmes in the department follow the UU PDCA cycle. In the past period the department has systematised and improved the assessment and grading system, which includes the development of an elaborate Assessment Plan. This plan covers the complete implementation of the assessment policy at the curriculum and course levels, and shows the relationship between the learning objectives of the courses and the ILOs of the programme. In addition, each course has an assessment matrix that shows how the course-level learning objectives are assessed. The course coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the course is assessed in accordance with the requirements of validity, reliability and transparency. The panel finds that the Assessment Plan, which consists of the course matrices, provides insight into the assessment of the final attainment levels of the programme. It also appears that all the ILOs in the curriculum are covered and adequately assessed. Before the start of each course, the students are informed about the assessment method, the rules for participation, and the conditions for resits. In line with the Utrecht Education Model, the programme applies a system of continuous assessment. The final grade for a course does not depend on one final exam but on at least two assessment moments and includes the grades for several types of assessment, such as take-home assignments, presentations, group seminars and intermediate tests. According to the self-evaluation report, the weighting of the various tests forming part of the courses is evaluated as satisfactory by the students. They also think that the material examined reflects the expectations based on the course catalogue and the information provided through the course manual. Increasingly, assessment elements in the programme are graded with a standardised grade sheet to contribute to transparency in grading.

Students informed the panel that they are in general positive about the quality of assessment. The student chapter provides a similar positive perspective. One minor point of attention that was mentioned relates to feedback. Although the lecturers are willing to provide feedback and the quality of the feedback is good, the students have to proactively approach the lecturers for feedback (oral or written).

### *Quality assurance of assessment*

The faculty-wide Board of Examiners plays the role of internal supervisor of the quality of examinations. It guarantees the quality of assessment in various ways, such as random checking of the quality of an assessment. As a result of the previous assessment report, a number of points were addressed, such as the implementation of the faculty's assessment policy and the safeguarding of the quality of the theses. At the request of the Board of Examiners, a Committee of Assessment carries out test analyses (or has them carried out) and submits its conclusions. The selection of courses for which examinations are assessed is partly random and partly based on lecturer and/or student evaluations. The Director of Education has the overall responsibility to implement and



monitor all measures that assure the quality of the programmes, courses and assessments. The panel thinks that the establishment of a Committee of Assessment is a good development and was pleased to notice that this committee is giving advice to the Board of Examiners, which is and considers itself ultimately responsible for assuring the quality of assessment. The Board of Examiners verifies the quality of the theses every other year by checking the quality and assessment form of a random selection of theses.

#### *Assessment of the master's thesis*

The master's thesis is considered the ultimate test of whether a student merits a master's degree. The thesis is assessed by the supervisor and a second reader (staff member). A standardised grading sheet (based on a rubric) is used for the assessment. The panel was surprised to find that the rubric lacks a separate item for explicitly assessing international and intercultural learning outcomes. It feels that the programme would do well to include this on the thesis assessment form. It reviewed the thesis assessment procedure and is of the opinion that the rubric is used consistently. The self-evaluation report mentioned that although minor differences are observed occasionally between the two readers of the thesis, the rubric provides sufficient guidance. The students confirmed this observation of differences in the assessment of a thesis, and told the panel that these differences sometimes depend on the second assessor. With new staff members who may have been used to a different tradition in grading, the programme considers it useful to regularly have an open discussion on the expectations relating to the thesis and the underlying research, preferably at set times. The panel thinks that this is a good plan.

The assessment of the thesis is based on the composite grade of thesis, interim report and presentation. The second examiner independently assesses the thesis report, although the first and second assessors jointly fill out the assessment form. The students told the panel that it is clear to them that the thesis was assessed by two examiners, and the panel is positive about the procedure and is sufficiently convinced that the second examiner provides an independent assessment. Nevertheless, it is of the opinion that the independent assessment procedure should be clearly documented, i.e. the assessment form should show the assessment of both examiners. A number of theses the panel reviewed contained ample feedback with a good substantiation of the assessment. Other theses contained more limited feedback, which is a point of attention according to the panel. Students and alumni informed the panel that the procedure of assessment is clear to them, regular meetings with the supervisor are informative, and the feedback (both written and oral) is appreciated. The panel appreciates the use of a rubric, as it assures a reliable and valid assessment of the theses. At the same time, use of a rubric entails the risk that aspects relating to content, such as relevance, coherence and creativity, will be overlooked in the assessment. The panel recommends not neglecting these aspects in the thesis assessment. It reviewed a sample of the theses and found that, in general, the master's theses are validly and reliably assessed. The final grade by the panel was in all cases similar to that on the assessment form (less than one grade point difference).

#### **Considerations**

The increased attention paid by the programme and faculty to a systematic method of assessment and associated quality assurance has led to a good system of assessment. The students are informed about and are actively involved in the assessment. The programme uses a wide variety of assessment methods, and the final assessment of a course is always based on multiple assessment moments. The thesis assessment is appropriate, with an adequate independent assessment by the second examiner. However, the assessment form should more clearly show the independent assessment of both examiners. The panel pointed out that the limited amount of written feedback found on a number of assessment forms could be improved. Moreover, a separate item for explicitly assessing international and intercultural learning could be included. The plan to regularly discuss the expectations of a thesis held by staff members is supported. The Board of Examiners and the quality assurance system are functioning properly, and the panel notes that the Board of Examiners has taken important steps in the past period. It concludes that the assessment is sufficiently reliable, valid and transparent. The assessment of the thesis is adequately organised.

## Conclusion

*Master's programme Development Studies*: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

### **Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes**

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

## Findings

### *Achieved learning outcomes*

Prior to its site visit, the panel studied a sample of 15 recent master's theses. Without exception, they sufficiently demonstrated, in its view, that the graduates realised the ILOs. The self-evaluation report mentioned that the achievement of the ILOs is also illustrated by the fact that some students publish articles based on their thesis research. Overall, the panel was impressed by the quality of the theses it read, especially by those with high grades. It was pleased to notice a significant number of theses using mixed methods (combining qualitative and quantitative methodology), which is considered key to multi/interdisciplinary research. A point of attention according to the panel is the explanation of the relevance of the topic to development studies, which is absent in many theses. With respect to all theses, it identified positive aspects as well as critical points. However, both positive and critical points were different in all theses.

### *Preparation for the labour market*

In the self-evaluation report, the achievement of the ILOs is furthermore evidenced by the opportunities graduates have on the labour market. The Labour Market Monitor in 2017 indicated that those opportunities have improved. Among the alumni, 84% had a job in 2017 compared to 56% in 2015. Furthermore, 74% of graduates indicated that the research skills prepared them well for the labour market, and 63% indicated that the theoretical knowledge prepared them as well. As indicated under standard 1, the panel is very positive about the Advisory Board and its involvement in the programme. Not only does the Advisory Board regularly meet with the programme management to consider the ILOs and their achievement, it is also involved in teaching activities. Its members are actively involved in the introduction week, Return Days, and the presentation of research proposals. According to the panel, this helps the Advisory Board to gain a good understanding of the programme and at the same time allows students to obtain input from the professional field.

The panel identified a number of nice initiatives by the programme to support students in their transition to the labour market. The programme established the Shared Value Foundation (SVF) to support graduates in building their careers. Through SVF, graduates from the programme together with local fieldworkers conduct impact assessments in the Global South to help businesses, governments and other organisations gain insight into the impact of their activities and to help them have a more positive impact on society. In addition, in 2017, the programme initiated a collaboration with Young Expert Programmes (YEP) of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to facilitate students from the programme conducting research for their master's theses at organisations in the Global South that participate in YEP. The aim is to bridge the gap between academic research and hands-on experience with organisations in the field, while simultaneously providing an opportunity for organisations to benefit from field research and potentially new Young Experts. In 2018, one IDSM student did research within the context of this partnership. The programme aims to increase this number.

The previous assessment panel recommended preparing students better for the labour market. According to the evaluations, the students still feel insufficiently prepared, though the ones the panel talked to were more satisfied with their preparation for the labour market. Students the panel interviewed indicated that the programme organises a number of activities, such as company visits, but often early on in the curriculum when they are not yet focussing on the labour market. However, the panel is of the opinion that the programme has increased its activities and is doing well in



preparing the students for the labour market. The students did indicate that they appreciated the company visits, which provide them with a lot of information and insights. Organising research internships with private sector organisations may also add to this. The panel is of the opinion that the programme is actively working on this aspect, but it might require more explicit attention for the students to recognise it.

### **Considerations**

The panel reviewed a random selection of theses that were produced by students of the IDS programme. It agreed with the grades given by the supervisor and second examiner. The employability of the graduates is increasing, and although not all students feel fully prepared for the labour market, the programme pays sufficient attention to this aspect. The panel was impressed by the Shared Value Foundation (SVF) and Young Expert Programmes (YEP) initiatives of the programme. Based on the selection of master's theses, the alumni survey and interviews with alumni during the site visit, the panel concludes that students realise the ILOs as formulated by the programme.

### **Conclusion**

*Master's programme Development Studies*: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel's judgement on standards 1, 2, 3 and 4 for the master's programme International Development Studies at Utrecht University is 'meets the standard'. Therefore, according to the rules of the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders, the general and final judgement is positive.

### **Conclusion**

The panel assesses the *master's programme Development Studies* as 'positive'.

# APPENDICES



# APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

## **The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain in the Netherlands**

The current domain-specific reference framework confines itself to a substantive description of the two core disciplines, in combination with the general expectations regarding the competencies of graduates. Therefore, it is a more concise document than the previous (2012) one. The exit qualifications for bachelor and master programmes are no longer included, partly because the Dublin descriptors already provide an adequate general description of the desired scientific level, but also to give the programmes taking part in the reaccreditation ample opportunity to demonstrate their own specific profile in their self-studies.

The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain is very broad and diverse, and the different academic programmes within the Netherlands highlight different elements. They vary, for example, in the balance between scientific and professional training, degree of research intensity, degree of integration between the two core disciplines, opportunities to specialize, and types of specialization offered. This domain-specific reference framework emphasizes the common features applying to all programmes.

The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain revolves around the complex relationship between people (society) and their environment (space). There are five qualities that determine the mind set of geographers and planners. First of all, the ability to think from a time-space perspective, these being the two dimensions within which human action unfolds. Secondly, the ability to study the relation between people and environment in the context of intertwined spatial scale levels (local, regional, national, global). Insight into socio-spatial transformations is gained by studying the interaction between these scale levels (the multi-scalar perspective), without making prior assumptions about the dominance of any one level (e.g. the global level) over another (e.g. the local level). Thirdly, the mind set of geographers and planners is based on the idea that space and society closely interact and shape each other. Human actions, and the behavioural patterns that develop in the course of time (institutions), crystallize in space, while conversely, spatial structures and place-related features trigger and shape human actions. A fourth quality relates to the strong multidisciplinary orientation in the work of geographers and planners; relationships between humans and their environment are studied from a range of mutually supplementary disciplinary perspectives. The precise combinations chosen depend on the nature of the socio-spatial problems being studied and will vary per programme within the domain. Finally, the fifth quality is closely linked with all the above: the integrative character of the geographical and planning approach. This crux is an ambition to understand the mutual cohesion between economic, social, cultural and political phenomena and processes within their specific spatial contexts.

Key terms in the domain are space, place, location, scale, networks, linkages, spatial behaviour, place attachment, spatial quality, spatial design and spatial interventions. Within the domain socio-spatial problems are taken as starting points of scientific inquiry. These issues include spatial inequality, globalization, migration, segregation, diversity and identity, environmental burden, sustainable area development, mobility and governance. The aim is not only to make critical analyses of the issues concerned, but also to design plans and interventions that may solve or reduce socio-spatial dilemmas.

The international and comparative character of studying the relation between people and environment is inherent to the Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning disciplines. Socio-spatial problems, and planned actions to deal with them, are marked by the specific national, regional and local context in which they arise. The significance of the embeddedness of socio-spatial phenomena is the key to Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning. However, awareness of the importance of context does not imply that the disciplines are merely the sum of an endless series of case-studies. The ambition is to identify the international similarities and differences of socio-spatial processes and developments, in order to unravel both their unique and generic aspects. Both facets are typical of the quest of Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning to



formulate theories (explanation in context). To emphasize this international, comparative character, teaching does not focus solely on the Netherlands. And when studying Dutch cases, the international importance and international suitability of the theoretical perspectives and research angles developed will always be considered. Continuing on from this, the composition of staff and students in all the Dutch programmes in the domain is becoming increasingly diverse (in many ways). The 'international classroom' being introduced in more and more programmes, facilitates and reinforces the international-comparative orientation of both disciplines.

The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain has evolved in close cohesion with the other social sciences. While it shares important qualities with the latter - such as attention for formulating theory and the need for rigid methodology - it is also distinct by emphasizing particular qualities. The strong empirical orientation, apparent in the importance attached to primary data collection and fieldwork, is a typical feature of our domain. Furthermore, 'learning by doing' has become an important part of all programmes, partly because it enhances sensitivity to the time and place (context)-bound character of social, cultural, political and economic phenomena and developments. Geographers and planners are constantly challenged to step outside the comfort zone of their own field. Finally, research within the domain has increasingly opened up for a wide spectrum of methods and techniques. This methodological pluralism corresponds with the choice to study socio-spatial problems at various scale levels, which precludes a standard method of analysis.

Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning graduates are able to identify, analyse and explain socio-spatial problems, based on and contributing to the 'body of knowledge' adhering to the discipline. They are also fully conversant with general social-scientific methods and techniques, as well as more domain-specific research methods, such as GIS and spatial impact analysis. The Bachelor's programmes do this, in line with the basic level of the Dublin descriptors, by laying a broad scientific foundation in the two core disciplines, while the Master's programmes train students, again following the Dublin framework, at a theoretically and methodologically more advanced and specialist level.

The programmes under consideration prepare students for a variety of professions and sectors. Typical jobs include researcher, teacher/lecturer, consultant, policy official and project manager. A common characteristic of staff qualified in Human Geography and/or Urban and Regional Planning is their inclination for a comprehensive approach to problems, and their ability to create awareness on the spatial diversity of societal problems. Students with a specialist Master's degree often find themselves in professions directly connected with their specialism, such as spatial planning, area development, urban policy, construction and housing, regional policy, traffic and transport management or environmental policy. The self-studies of the individual degree programmes will inform more specifically on the professions and sectors in which graduates work.

*The domain-specific framework of reference (DSFR) has been formulated by the national disciplinary meeting (Disciplineoverleg Geografie en Planologie). The former DSFR has been adjusted, i.e. updated and shortened by omitting the concrete exit qualifications for bachelor and master. The participating programmes have been able to comment on the draft. It has been laid down during the meeting on 6 September 2018.*



## APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

### Master's programme International Development Studies

Overview of the intended learning outcomes in relation to the Dublin descriptors and the EADI definition of development studies.

Qualifications after completion according to the Dublin descriptors	EADI definition (Development Studies)	Intended learning outcomes of IDS M programme
<p><b>A. Knowledge and understanding</b> Have demonstrated knowledge and understanding that is founded upon and extends and/or enhances that typically associated with Bachelor's level, and that provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and/or applying ideas, often within a research context</p>	<p>To deal with the complexities of development processes and issues, graduates in Development Studies should be able to carry out analyses and academic research in a broad perspective, using conceptual frameworks sensitive to relevant socio-economic and politico-ethical aspects. They must recognize the need to bring in features, concepts and methods from relevant disciplines with scientific rigor.</p>	<p>A1. Graduates have advanced theoretical and empirical knowledge and understanding of key themes in development studies (in particular: global investment and trade, migration and mobilities, local livelihoods change, climate change and natural resource management, land governance and urbanisation, health and gender, with a focus on the situation in Asia, Africa and Latin America). A2. Graduates are able to analyse development-related issues in a manner that is interdisciplinary, relational (e.g. translocal perspective, with 'development chains' and 'development corridor' concepts), holistic and systemic (e.g. Theory of Change). A3. Graduates take a people-centred perspective in approaching development issues. A4. Graduates are solution-oriented.</p>
<p><b>B. Applying knowledge</b> Can apply their knowledge and understanding, and problem-solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to their field of study</p>	<p>Graduates must be able to select and apply relevant methods for collecting, interpreting and assessing (qualitative and quantitative) information on development processes and their impacts, including knowledge and know-how from a variety of relevant sources. They must be able to operate intelligently in situations of incomplete, scarce or inaccurate data and information.</p>	<p>B1. Graduates are able to design and conduct original research (involving data collection on the ground, fieldwork abroad) in an independent, responsible, reflective and innovative way. B2. Graduates are able to adapt general methodologies to the requirements of specific contexts. B3. Graduates have the ability to apply knowledge and appropriate qualitative and quantitative research techniques in data collection, processing, analysis and interpretation. B4. Graduates have problem-solving competences in contexts that are unfamiliar, international, cross-cultural, multidisciplinary and resource-poorer (with incomplete, scarce or inaccurate data and information). B5. Graduates are able to work well both independently and in international and cross-cultural teams.</p>
<p><b>C. Making judgements</b> Have the ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity, and formulate judgments with incomplete or limited information, but that include reflecting on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgments</p>	<p>To deal with the complexities of development processes and issues, graduates in Development Studies should be able to carry out analyses and academic research in a broad perspective, using conceptual frameworks sensitive to relevant socio-economic and politico-ethical aspects. They must recognize the need to bring in features, concepts and methods from relevant disciplines with scientific rigor.</p>	<p>C1. Graduates can integrate knowledge, handle complexity, and critically reflect on development theories, practices and ways in which development is measured and evaluated. C2. Graduates are able to apply knowledge and understanding in such a way that they demonstrate professionalism and high ethical standards in their work.</p>
<p><b>D. Communication</b> Can communicate their conclusions, and the knowledge and rationale underpinning these, to specialist and non-specialist audiences clearly and unambiguously</p>	<p>They must be able to communicate the results of their research (and their ways of arriving at these results) to a variety of audiences ranging from academia and policy makers to a wide set of stakeholders, including local communities and civil society organisations, and consider ways to engage these stakeholders in the follow-up of the research.</p>	<p>D1. Graduates are able to communicate their conclusions, as well as the knowledge, reasons and considerations underpinning these conclusions, in different formats (oral, written, ICT, multimedia, in material and virtual media) to a wide range of audiences (specialists and non-specialists), including academics, policymakers, local communities and civil society organisations. D2. Graduates are able to engage relevant stakeholders in the follow-up to the research and/or actions by, for example, participating in public debates or formulating policy recommendations.</p>
<p><b>E. Learning skills</b> Have the learning skills to allow them to continue to study in a manner that may be largely self-directed or autonomous</p>		<p>E1. Graduates are able to sustain learning processes in an independent manner. E2. Graduates keep up with developments in the field and engage with new issues of social relevance.</p>
<p><b>F. Ready for the future</b></p>		<p>F1. Graduates are qualified for PhD studies and jobs as junior professionals in the field of international development.</p>



## APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

period 1 (Sept-Nov)	period 2 (Nov-Jan)	period 3 (Feb-Apr)	period 4 (May-Aug)
<b>Development Themes</b> 7.5 EC	<b>Advanced Methods and Techniques for Development Studies</b> 10 EC	<b>Research Internship/ MSc Thesis</b> 30 EC	
<b>Development Theories</b> 7.5 EC	<b>Elective course</b> 5 EC		

In Period 2, students can opt for one of the following 5 EC elective courses:

- Real Estate
- Healthy cities
- Urban heritage
- Migration, mobilities and sustainable futures
- Techniques of futuring: imagining the city of the future
- Urban infrastructures

## APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

<b>DAY 0</b>		<b>Monday - 20 May 2019</b>
16:30	18:00	Arrival of panel at the hotel, internal meeting (NVAO assessment framework, preliminary findings, preparation)
18:30	21:00	Dinner (panel meeting)
<b>DAY 1</b>		<b>Tuesday - 21 May 2019</b>
08:30	09:00	Arrival of panel / Welcome (optional: with a short presentation at 8:45)
09:00	11:00	Internal meeting (ECA assessment framework, preliminary findings, preparation) and documentation review
11:00	12:30	Meeting with management (all programmes; 15 min. per programme and 15 min. ECA Frameworks, initial findings, preparation)
12:30	14:00	Lunch / internal meeting / consultation hour (13:15-13:45)
14:00	14:45	Meeting with students MSc Development Studies (including PC staff member) - last 15 min. ECA
14:45	15:30	Meeting with teaching staff MSc Development Studies (including PC staff member) - last 15 min. ECA
15:30	16:00	Internal meeting / break
16:00	16:45	Meeting with staff responsible for international(isation) activities
16:45	17:15	Virtual tour through the building (including internationalisation facilities and digital learning environment)
17:15	18:00	Meeting with MSc Development Studies alumni and external stakeholders
18:00	18:30	Collecting preliminary findings
18:30	19:00	Travelling to the restaurant
19:00	21:00	Dinner (panel meeting)
<b>DAY 2</b>		<b>Wednesday - 22 May 2019</b>
08:30	09:00	Arrival and preparation
09:00	09:45	Meeting with BSc Sociale Geografie en Planologie students and alumni (including PC student)
09:45	10:30	Meeting with BSc Sociale Geografie en Planologie teaching staff (including PC staff member)
10:30	11:00	Internal meeting
11:00	11:30	Meeting with MSc Human Geography students (including PC student)
11:30	12:00	Meeting with MSc Human Geography teaching staff (including PC staff member)
12:00	12:45	Lunch / internal meeting
12:45	13:15	Meeting with MSc Spatial Planning students (including PC student)
13:15	13:45	Meeting with MSc Spatial Planning teaching staff (including PC staff member)
13:45	15:00	Collecting preliminary findings and preparing the next sessions

15:00	15:30	Meeting with MSc GIMA students (including PC student)
15:30	16:00	Meeting with MSc GIMA teaching staff (including PC staff member)
16:00	16:30	Collecting preliminary findings and internal meeting
16:30	17:30	Meeting with alumni MSc Human Geography, MSc Spatial Planning, MSc GIMA
17:30	18:00	Travelling to the restaurant
18:00	21:00	Dinner (panel meeting)
<b>DAY 3 Thursday - 23 May 2019</b>		
08:45	9:00	Arrival and preparation
09:00	9:30	Internal meeting
9:30	10:30	Meeting with Board of Examiners and Student Advisers all programmes
10:30	11:00	Internal meeting
11:00	12:00	Final interview with management
12:00	13:45	Lunch and deliberations panel, formulating preliminary findings and conclusions NVAO framework
13:45	14:15	Deliberations panel, formulating preliminary findings and conclusions ECA framework
14:15	14:45	Feedback of preliminary findings and conclusions
14:45	15:00	Break
15:00	16:00	Development dialogue
16:00	16:30	Departure

## APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied fifteen theses of the master's programme International Development Studies. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

During the site visit, the panel studied, among other things, the following documents (partly as hard copies, partly via the institute's electronic learning environment):

1. Orientation to the professional field and alumni
  - Alumni newsletters
  - Arbeidsmarktmonitor
  - Orientation to the professional field by students
2. Bachelor board
  - Meeting documents 2018/17/16
3. Assessment forms bachelor and master
4. Course archive Ba/Ma 2017-2018 & 2018-2019
5. Diverse
  - Handboek Academische Vaardigheden NL-ENG
  - Docentenhandleiding SGPSL 2018-2019 NL-ENG
  - Overzicht bijeenkomsten Broodje Onderwijs 2018-2019
6. Board of Examiners
  - Centrale examencommissie Geowetenschappen
  - Kamer examencommissie SGPL
  - Toetscommissie
  - Reglement examencommissie UGB & GB
7. Kwaliteitszorg
  - Cursusmatrijzen
  - Instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg UU
  - Rapportage toetscommissie
8. Toetsplannen
  - MT Academic School – mastercoördinatoren overleg
  - Vergaderstukken 2018
  - Vergaderstukken 2017
  - Vergaderstukken 2016
9. Nationale Studenten Enquête
  - NSE 2018/17
10. OER 2018-2019 Ba/Ma
11. Onderwijsdag
  - Programma en overige informatie 2019/18/17
12. Opleidingscommissies
13. Stage (internship) Ba/Ma
  - Studiewijzer en formulieren stage bachelor 2018-2019
  - Course manual Internship IDS 2018-2019
  - Course manual Internship Human Geography 2018-2019
  - Course manual Internship Spatial Planning 2018-2019
  - Overzicht stage via Geobaan 2017, 2018

