

ONDERZOEKERIJ

Research Master Social and Health
Psychology

Utrecht University

Report of the limited programme assessment

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl



Contents

Contents.....	3
Executive summary.....	4
1. Introduction	5
1.1 Administrative data	5
1.2 Introduction	5
1.3 Panel composition	5
1.4 Working method.....	6
2. Review	8
2.1 Intended learning outcomes	8
2.2 Teaching-learning environment	9
2.3 Student assessment.....	12
2.4 Achieved learning outcomes	14
3. Strengths and recommendations.....	16
3.1 Strengths of the programme	16
3.2 Recommendations.....	16
4. Conclusion.....	17
Appendix A – Panel composition and programmes of the cluster.....	18
Appendix B – Schedule of the visit	20
Appendix C – Documents studied	21
Appendix D – Abbreviations	22



Executive summary

The outcome of the external assessment of the research master Social and Health Psychology of the Utrecht University by an NVAO approved panel is positive.

The research master's programme convincingly profiles itself as a research-oriented programme in behavioural regulation applied to social and health issues. The education is closely related to the excellent research environment of the Department of Psychology and aims to educate students to conduct advanced research in the field of social and health psychology, either in or outside academia.

The intended learning outcomes (SHP uses the term academic objectives) are well described in terms of level and orientation. The panel suggests evaluating and eventually rephrasing its academic objectives to better reflect research outside academia.

The teaching-learning environment facilitates students to achieve the academic objectives. The two-year programme strongly focuses on training academic research skills and on actively guiding students to identify their own research interests and ambitions. The teaching staff allocated to the programme is properly qualified in terms of contents and academic skills.

The panel considers that there is room for improvement in offering students further opportunities for making their own choices within the programme, for example by offering more electives, encouraging students to study abroad and offering (more) internships outside academia. Furthermore, the panel advises the programme to pay more attention to the perceived study load of students, especially in the first semester. It recommends spreading out the study load more evenly over the year.

The programme has all components in place for a robust student assessment system. The members of the Board of Examiners have a strong track record in assuring the quality of assessment. The programme makes use of a variety of formative and summative assessments, which are all types of assignments, for example essays, presentations, papers and reviews. Although there is alignment between the courses and assessment forms, the panel encourages the programme to check the alignment of learning objectives with assessments on programme level.

All academic objectives are assessed in an integrated way in the graduation project. The panel is impressed by the thoughtful and extensive procedure to safeguard the quality of the master thesis, including attention for recent initiatives to promote research integrity and open science. The panel concludes that the master theses are of a good quality, and convincingly show that the academic objectives of the programme are achieved by the students. Alumni feel well-prepared for a job as a researcher, but mentioned that the preparation for a career outside academia could be improved.

The chair and the secretary 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: 20 May 2021

Rob Ruiter

(chair)

Annemarie Venemans

(secretary)



1. Introduction

1.1 Administrative data

Name of the programme:	Social and Health Psychology (research)
CROHO number:	60380
Level of the programme:	Master of Science
Orientation of the programme:	Academic
Study load:	120 EC
Location:	Utrecht
Variant:	Full-time
Expiration of accreditation:	1 November 2021

1.2 Introduction

This report focuses on the assessment of the research master's programme Social and Health Psychology (SHP) of Utrecht University (UU). This assessment forms part of a cluster assessment of thirteen research master's programmes at seven universities. In total, fifteen panel members participated in this cluster assessment. Appendix A provides an overview of the thirteen participating research masters and the composition of the total panel.

The assessment is based on the standards and criteria described in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands 2018 (limited framework). Research master's programmes must meet a number of additional criteria as described by the NVAO (specification of additional criteria for research master's programmes, 2016).

1.3 Panel composition

For every online visit, a (sub)panel was composed, based on the expertise and availability of panel members. Each (sub)panel consisted of five members, including the chair and the student member. The panel that assessed the research master's programme SHP consisted of the following members:

- Prof. dr. Rob Ruiters (chair), Professor of Health and Social Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience at Maastricht University;
- Prof. dr. Arne Roets, Professor of Social Psychology, Faculty of psychology and educational sciences, dept. of Developmental, Personality, and Social Psychology, Ghent University;
- Prof. dr. Guus Smeets, Professor of Education in Psychology, Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences at Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Yvonne Schittenhelm, BSc (student member), Master Individual Differences and Assessment, Tilburg University;
- Prof. dr. Karine Verschueren, Professor School and Developmental Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven.



The panel was supported by dr. Annemarie Venemans-Jellema, who acted as secretary.

All panel members and the secretary have signed a declaration of independence and confidentiality. In this declaration they affirm not to have had any business or personal ties with the programme in question, for at least five years prior to the review.

The NVAO approved the composition of the panel on 26 November 2020.

1.4 Working method

Preparation

On 14 January, the panel of the entire cluster held a general online kick off meeting. In this meeting, the panel received an introduction to the assessment framework and discussed the working methods in preparation to and during the online visits.

The programme drew up a self-evaluation describing the programme's strengths and weaknesses. This self-evaluation included a chapter in which the students reflected on the programme. The panel members prepared the assessment by analysing the self-evaluation report and the appendices provided by the institution. The panel also studied a selection of fifteen master theses and the accompanying assessment forms from the programme. The theses selection was made by the panel's secretary based on a provided list of at least fifty theses of the most recent years. In the selection, consideration was given to a variation in assessments (grades) and topics.

The panel members individually formulated their preliminary findings and a number of questions they want to raise during the online visit. The secretary made an overview of these preliminary findings and questions and sent it to the panel members as a starting point for the preparation of the panel during the online visit.

To further ensure that the different panels used the same working method and approach for all thirteen programmes in the cluster, the two chairs and the two secretaries had two additional meetings: one prior to the first visit and one halfway through all the visits.

Online visit

The online visit took place on 4 March, 2021 (see Appendix B). During the preparatory meeting, the panel discussed the preliminary findings and decided which questions to raise in their meetings with the programme representatives. During the visit, the panel spoke with representatives of the management, students, lecturers, alumni, and the Board of Examiners. Everybody involved in the programme had the opportunity to inform the panel in confidence about matters they consider important to the assessment. No one made use of this opportunity. The panel used the last part of the online visit to evaluate the interviews and had a second meeting with the programme's management to receive answers to any remaining questions. At the end of the visit, the chair presented the panel's preliminary findings and first impressions of the programme.



Report

The secretary drew up a draft report based on the panel's findings. This draft report was presented to the members of the panel and adjusted based on their feedback. After adoption, the draft report was sent to the institution for verification of factual inaccuracies. The secretary discussed the programme's comments with the chair, after which the secretary drew up the final report and circulated it to the panel for a final round of comments.

The report follows the four standards such as set of in the NVAO's Assessment Framework 2018 (limited framework): 1) the intended learning outcomes, 2) the teaching-learning environment, 3) assessment, and 4) achieved learning outcomes. Regarding each of the standards, the assessment panel gave a substantiated judgement on a three-point scale: meets, does not meet, or partially meets the standard. The panel subsequently gave a substantiated final conclusion regarding the quality of the programme, also on a three-point scale: positive, conditionally positive, or negative.

Development dialogue

Although 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 in light of the outcomes of the assessment report.



2. Review

2.1 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, analysis and considerations

In the SHP programme, students focus on issues of behavioural regulation with respect to social and health issues. For this purpose, students complete a programme on major concepts, theories and models of the way people predict, control, and change their own behaviour as well as the behaviours of others for the benefits of social interaction and health.

The panel appreciates the focus on behavioural regulation applied to social and health issues. It is of the opinion that this focus makes the programme unique. The panel discussed if the title of the programme fits with this specific focus. It came to the conclusion that although the focus of the programme is on behavioural regulation, the programme still covers the major domains of social and health psychology and therefore the title suits the programme. Students confirmed they were aware of the focus of the programme prior to enrolment.

The SHP programme distinguishes theoretical-analytical skills, research skills, and communication skills. These skills correspond to formulated intended learning outcomes (SHP uses the term academic objectives) in line with the Dublin descriptors. The academic objectives set the stage for specific course aims and types of assessment. The panel established that the formulated objectives within each of the skills are indeed formulated at the adequate level (master) and according to the relevant orientation (academic). The panel welcomes the attention to academic integrity in the programme and applauds the explicit mention of “being aware of the professional ethics of psychologists in a societal, academic and empirical context” in the academic objectives.

According to the self-evaluation report, the main goal of the SHP programme concerns student training in conducting advanced research in the field of social and health psychology, either in (PhD candidate) or outside academia (e.g., junior researcher, data analyst). Although it is acknowledged that the broad research focus is covered in the academic objectives, the panel feels that the programme is predominantly academically oriented. The panel is of the opinion that the programme’s aim fits with the needs of the work field. However, it suggests evaluating and eventually rephrasing its academic objectives to better accommodate the training of young researchers for positions outside academia.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that SHP is a unique programme with a good set of academic objectives that gives clear shape to its two-year research master's programme. The programme therefore meets standard 1.



2.2 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, analysis and considerations

SHP is one of seven research master programmes offered at the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences (FSBS) of the UU. The programmes are organised by the Graduate School of Social and Behavioural Sciences (GSSBS). The Graduate School is chaired by the vice-dean, who is advised by the Board of Studies (BoS), comprised of the programme coordinators of the seven research masters.

Admission

SHP aims at enrolling between fifteen to twenty new students per academic year. The average number of students actually starting the programme is seventeen over the past 6 years. The programme has an inflow from different bachelor's programmes. Almost one-third of the SHP students come from abroad.

Strict admission criteria are in place, such as an academic bachelor's degree in Social or Behavioural Sciences, academic achievements, methodological and statistical skills (e.g., courses for about 20 EC), and English language proficiency, next to more 'soft' criteria such as study motivation and future ambition. Requirements that are lacking can be remedied in a Summer School in Methods and Statistics offered by the FSBS. The panel considers the admission requirements of the programme to be selective and, therefore, to be appropriate for this research master programme. The admission procedures are elaborate and strict, allowing only motivated and very talented students in.

Curriculum

SHP is a two-year programme of 120 EC that consists of two semesters per year. Within a semester there is a period of fifteen weeks of intensive teaching, learning and assessment. The curriculum is organised into a Theory cluster, a Methodology cluster and Research cluster. The Theory cluster (30 EC) consists of four courses that make students familiar with current theories and models and give them an in-depth knowledge of SHP's core concepts and state of the art knowledge pertaining to issues of social and health-related behaviour.

The Methodology cluster (22.5 EC) consists of three comprehensive courses about psychological research methods. Students are given a full overview of advanced issues in multivariate statistics, advances in mediator versus moderator analyses, and advanced research methods.

The Research cluster amounts to half of the programme and is intended to integrate the knowledge and skills from both the theory and methodology clusters. This cluster consists of three parts. During a short research training in the second semester of the first year, students actively participate in ongoing research in social and/or health psychology, by working on research assignments and assisting in (PhD) research projects. The management explained during the interview that this training gives students the possibility to explore their research interest. The second part is a research training dedicated to the preparation, performance, and writing of the research project of the master thesis in year 2. The emphasis of this training is put on instructing, supporting and supervising students in writing their research proposal, and on writing the theoretical part of their thesis and the design and



preparation of their empirical study. The final component of the cluster involves the writing of the master thesis.

In the second year, students also take an elective course of 7.5 EC. Students can select a course from another research master within or outside the UU. The students whom the panel spoke with expressed their desire of choosing more than one elective. This would allow them to expand their knowledge on subjects for which there is currently limited time in the programme or to undertake a more extensive first research training. The panel endorses this suggestion.

The panel studied the curriculum and is convinced that it is coherent, well-structured and covers many topics and competences without becoming superficial. The curriculum allows changes to be made and is open to recent developments in the field. The panel spoke highly of the set-up of the Research cluster. It especially appreciates the involvement of not only the supervisor, but also teachers and students. Students act as each other's reviewer throughout the whole training. In that way they learn how to give critical yet constructive comments to other students, and deal with other students' criticism.

The panel was impressed by the attention paid to research integrity and ethics in the programme. For example, students are obliged to submit their research protocol for approval to the Ethics Review Board of the FSBS and the research proposal to the BoS for reading by two members and approval, next to the thesis supervisor. In addition, the programme devotes attention to open science, such as the principles of FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable) data and pre-registration of the theses.

One of the appendices of the self-evaluation report showed the relationship between the academic objectives and the courses. The panel was able to ascertain that the objectives of all courses are well described in the course catalogue and established that they jointly comprise the complete set of academic objectives.

Although the structure of the programme and objectives per course are clearly defined, a point of attention is the accumulation of skills in the curriculum. The panel noted that there is already an advanced level in the first semester of the programme. For example, students mentioned a first-semester assignment in which they had to review each other's paper without being trained in reviewing. According to the panel the first semester should be more tailored to the competences of the students at the start of the curriculum to better create a gradual build-up and scaffolding of students' knowledge and skill development.

The panel noticed that research is an explicit part in the course contents and the didactic approach of SHP. All courses focus on how to become a successful independent researcher. Although the panel established that the programme provides a solid research basis for students, it is of the opinion that the research focus is mainly academic (in line with the academic objectives). Students see the applied focus partly coming back in the assignments, but the panel believes that an applied focus can become more apparent in the programme, for example by collaborating more with research organisations outside academia for internships, by inviting more guest lecturers and by stronger presence of alumni in the programme.

The didactical concepts of the programme are 'learning in practice' and 'learning through active participation' in an international classroom context. The panel established that these concepts are well implemented in the programme. The programme's small scale ensures a highly interactive learning and tutoring environment with a great deal of attention for the student's individual needs, performance and development. The panel agrees that the diverse student population provides an international classroom (internationalisation at home), but does not consider this to be a full



equivalent to an international experience. According to the students, there are not many opportunities to broaden their horizon internationally. International projects are allowed, but, according to the students, not explicitly stimulated. The panel recommends the programme to encourage (especially the Dutch) students to spend part of their studies at a university abroad.

The language of instruction is English. The programme management substantiates its choice by arguing that the current lingua franca of scientific research and renowned research is carried out in an international context. Moreover, an English-taught programme is accessible for international students. The panel supports this choice.

Staff

The panel gathered from the self-evaluation report and the interviews that the programme is carried out by a sufficient number of teaching staff. Teachers and supervisors of SHP are tenured faculty members at the assistant, associate and full professor level. Research master students also work with post-docs and PhD candidates with respect to training in research methods and hands-on experiences in research projects and labs. Because of the small scale and intensity of the programme, students and teachers meet regularly.

The content of the programme is closely connected to the research that is executed by the Psychology Department, which is visible in the content of the curriculum and the topics of theses. In 2017, the department was assessed in the research review Psychology, according to the guidelines of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2015-2021 (SEP). The department received a very good score on quality and relevance and an excellent score on viability. This reputation of the institute is endorsed by the panel. The panel recognised the staff's scientific quality and international academic reputation.

The panel observed that the staff team is highly qualified for the realisation of the curriculum in terms of content and educational expertise. They are very motivated to work with this selected group of students. This programme also functions as a kind of safe haven within an otherwise heavy teaching load expressed by staff members and confirmed by the programme's management. The students have ample personal contacts with the teaching staff, who are easily accessible also during the COVID-19 crisis.

Study load and study guidance

SHP students are required to acquire essential academic skills, current psychological knowledge, and the principal tenets and practices of scientific work. As a consequence, the programme is demanding. During the online visit, students explained that they experience heavy workload. According to the students the panel spoke with, especially the first semester of the programme is overwhelming. From the start of the study, students are thrown in at the deep end, which according to the programme's management fits with the teaching concept of learning-by-doing. Students hold the semester system accountable for this high study load, since four courses must be taken simultaneously.

The panel is of the opinion that the high perceived study load in the first semester can be attributed to the high concentration of teaching, learning and assessment in a relatively short period of time. It therefore recommends the programme to spread out the study load more evenly over the year. In addition, extending the first semester with, for example, an introduction week that precedes the first semester teaching period and explains the working methods and didactical concepts might be especially helpful for students not coming from an UU bachelor programme.



The panel is impressed by the intensity and flexibility of the student support system in place. It established that the easy access to contact with teachers and supervisors really works. In addition, the panel is of the opinion that SHP has a good system for study guidance in place. First, the programme appointed a staff member for tutoring and information provision to students. The tutor – who is not responsible for any teaching module in the programme to preserve a safe environment for the student - has formal and informal meetings with students, maintains an open-door policy, and has confidential access to student records. The students that the panel spoke with, are pleased with the tutor. Second, students themselves organised a mentoring programme (“buddy system”). Second-year students pair with one to two first-year students for informal contact, companionship and help.

COVID-19

Due to COVID-19, almost all education of the programme switched to online teaching and assessment in the past year. The panel asked students and teachers about their experience with online teaching. Whilst COVID-19 evidently had an impact on the interaction between student and teachers, both are positively surprised about the online possibilities. Students mentioned that there was still a lot of social interaction and discussion possible, facilitated high responsiveness of staff members when students reach out to them. The panel concluded that although the COVID-19 situation is not an optimal teaching and learning situation, the programme still allows students to achieve the academic objectives. The panel noted that the programme has not thought about possible adaptations to the programme after COVID-19. It suggests the programme to evaluate of what measures might be kept after the pandemic.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the structure of the curriculum is challenging and enables students to achieve the final qualifications. The highly skilled teaching staff enables students to achieve the proposed academic objectives. Therefore, the programme meets standard 2.

2.3 Student assessment

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

Findings, analysis and considerations

Assessment policy and methods

UU requires all programmes to provide detailed assessment plans in a concerted effort to ensure a university-wide quality assurance and to improve the alignment of student assessments to the academic objectives. The panel studied the assessment plan and established that there is an alignment between the academic objectives and the course objectives on the one hand and an alignment between courses and assessment types on the other.

The programme uses a variety of assessment forms, for example presentations, (opinion) papers, discussion assignments, and reviews. Most courses have individual and group assignments. The panel noted that the programme solely uses assignments as an assessment form. The lecturers explained that within the format of assignments they make use of a diverse pallet. However, the panel wonders



if all academic objectives can be assessed merely the use of assignments. Although there is an alignment between the courses and assessment forms, the panel encourages the programme to check the alignment of learning objectives with assessments on programme level, especially if teaching contents concerns basic knowledge that relies heavily on knowledge and understanding (typically shared under Dublin descriptor 1).

Besides summative assessments, the programme makes use of formative assessments in the form of feedback from teachers and peers. The panel is of the opinion that this form of assessment really fits with the didactical concept of the programme. To further develop this form of assessment, the panel suggests the programme to implement a portfolio system in which students can save all their formative feedback and keep track of their development of skills.

Board of Examiners

There is one Board of Examiners (BoE) for all seven research master programmes of FSBS. Each research master programme has one person in the BoE that is responsible for that individual programme.

The panel reviewed the activities of the BoE in monitoring the quality of examinations. Once a year, the vice-dean, each research master coordinator, the chair of the BoE and the SHP member of the BoE, have a meeting in which they discuss the assessment plan and theses. Yearly, the BoE checks the level of theses by reading the best and worst theses. In addition, the BoE yearly prepares the Education and Examination Regulations (EER) and communicates this in a meeting with the programme coordinators. The BoE reports to the vice-dean who may use this information in the annual quality assurance meetings with the programme coordinators. The panel concludes that the BoE has adequate procedures that safeguard the quality of testing.

One point of attention is the procedure with respect to fraud and plagiarism. The panel understood that the programme has a check on fraud and plagiarism, but the BoE has no strict procedure in place, in case of fraud and plagiarism. During the visit, the BoE told the panel that it rarely encounters fraud or plagiarism, partly because it is not systematically checked. The likelihood of plagiarism is deemed to be fairly low, as assignments are highly specific to the course and the lecturer. The few cases the BoE encountered were mainly because of ignorance by the students. The panel recommends the programme to better formalise this procedure in the EER, inform students, and make plagiarism checks a standard procedure in written assignment and thesis evaluations.

Assessment of the master thesis

The panel established an extensive process for grading the thesis project. First, two members of the BoS and the thesis proposal supervisor evaluate the thesis proposals. In addition, the proposal must be approved by the Ethical Review Committee of the FSBS.

Second, the master thesis is graded by the supervisor and an independent second grader who is another SHP teacher who was not involved in the supervision. In the case of a large discrepancy between the grade of the supervisor and the second grader, the SHP coordinator acts as a moderator to achieve more agreement. The thesis is graded on scientific contribution, theoretical embeddedness, appropriateness of methodology, appropriate reporting of the results, depth of discussion and written presentation. In addition, the supervisor (but not the second grader) grades the student's work independency. Thus, the supervisors assess the product and the process separately.



The thesis is publicly defended in a meeting of a Thesis Examination Committee. Students shortly present their thesis and respond to questions raised by two examiners, one from the SHP programme, the other examiner is a teacher from another research master programme of the GSSBS. The final decision on the grade is made after the defence by the Thesis Examination Committee, comprised of the supervisor and second grader, the two examiners and the programme coordinator.

The panel is very impressed by this thoughtful and extensive procedure. In its opinion, the procedure guarantees the quality of research, objectivity of assessment, and uniformity of quality standards across all research master programmes. According to the panel, the GSSBS set an example for other research master programmes. However, the panel has one point of improvement with respect to transparency of the process. It suggests the programme to make more transparent for students how the different assessors involved come to the final decision about the grade.

Conclusion

In sum, according to the panel, the assessment system is fair, reliable and valid and the BoE takes its responsibilities seriously. The programme therefore meets standard 3.

2.4 Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings, analysis and considerations

The master thesis serves as the final evaluation of research competence to demonstrate that the academic objectives of the programme have been realised, regarding the academic skills. Students complete the entire empirical cycle during their thesis project. All students collect their own data for their thesis. The master theses testify to the students' acquired academic skills in terms of academic writing, formulating research hypotheses grounded in theory and literature, conducting appropriate analyses and interpreting them correctly.

The panel studied theses of fifteen graduates from recent cohorts. It was impressed by the overall level of the theses. In general, the theses were well-constructed and demonstrated a high level of in-depth knowledge of the respective topics. The theses demonstrated that SHP graduates are capable of performing scientific research on a high level. The panel considers the theses' quality to be in line with the grades actually given. The panel is convinced that graduates achieve the ambitious academic objectives of the programme. According to the panel, several theses are suitable for publication.

The quality of the programme is clearly expressed by the achievements of the students, who are doing well according to the self-evaluation report. Of the 69 SHP alumni who graduated between 2015-2018, 68 are employed. Most graduates (69%) work in research positions, such as PhD student, junior researcher or data scientist. Most of the remaining SHP graduates found a job not directly involving the execution of research, such as psychologist, university teacher or consultant.

During the online visit, alumni reported that they were very satisfied with their education and felt well-prepared for a job as a researcher. According to the interview with the alumni, the preparation for a career outside academia could be improved. The panel advises to pay more attention to career paths outside academia.



Conclusion

The panel is convinced that students having completed the programme reached the academic objectives and is very positive about the labour market prospects of the programme graduates. The programme therefore meets standard 4.



3. Strengths and recommendations

3.1 Strengths of the programme

The panel is impressed by the following features:

- Research community – Student cohorts are small, ensuring a highly interactive learning and tutoring environment with a great deal of attention for the student's individual needs, performance and development, and being attended by a highly motivated staff;
- Master thesis procedure and outcome – The programme has a thoughtful and extensive procedure to safeguard the quality of the master thesis both in terms of contents and assessment and theses are of high quality;
- Open science – A lot of attention is paid to ethics in the programme, for example by pre-registration and the FAIR principle;
- High quality of end products – The overall academic quality of the studied theses is very high.

3.2 Recommendations

For further improvement of the programme, the panel makes the following recommendations:

- Study load – Pay more attention to the perceived study load of students, especially in the first semester, by gradually building-up the curriculum and spreading out the study load more evenly over the year;
- Student-centred – Offer students more room for making their own choices within the programme, for example by offering more electives, encouraging students to study abroad and offering (more) internships outside academia;
- Assignments – Check the alignment of learning objectives with assessments on programme level to verify if all learning objectives can be achieved with only assignments;
- Applied research – Increase the focus on research outside academia in learning outcomes and curriculum.



4. Conclusion

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes have been adequately concretised with regard to content, level and orientation. The teaching-learning environment of the programme facilitates students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The programme has an adequate assessment system. The final projects of the research master's programme are of a good quality, and convincingly show that the intended learning outcomes of the programme are achieved by the students.

Standard	Judgement
Standard 1	Meets the standard
Standard 2	Meets the standard
Standard 3	Meets the standard
Standard 4	Meets the standard
Final conclusion	Positive



Appendix A – Panel composition and programmes of the cluster

Panel composition of the cluster:

- Prof. dr. Janke Cohen-Schotanus (chair) Professor emeritus of Research of Education in the Medical Sciences;
- Prof. dr. Rob Ruiters (chair), Professor of Health and Social Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience at Maastricht University;
- Prof. dr. Lidia Arends, Professor of Statistics and Research Methodology, Department of Psychology, Education & Child Studies at Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Prof. dr. Caroline Braet, Professor of Developmental Psychopathology, Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology at Ghent University;
- Prof. dr. Rachel Gibson, Professor of Politics, Department of Politics, University of Manchester;
- Prof. dr. Harm Hospers, Professor emeritus of Applied Health Psychology;
- Prof. dr. Detlev Leutner, Professor of Instructional Psychology, Department of Instructional Psychology Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Duisburg-Essen;
- Prof. dr. Maike Luhmann, Professor of Psychological Methods, Department of psychology, Ruhr University Bochum;
- Hanne Oberman, MSc (student member). Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural, Biomedical, and Social Sciences, Utrecht University (graduated in 2020);
- Prof. dr. Arne Roets, Professor of Social Psychology, Faculty of psychology and educational sciences, Department of Developmental, Personality, and Social Psychology, Ghent University;
- Prof. dr. Guus Smeets, Professor of Education in Psychology, Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences at Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Yvonne Schittenhelm BSc, (student member), Master Individual Differences and Assessment, Tilburg University;
- Marie Stadel, MSc (student member), Behavioural and Social Sciences Research Master, University of Groningen (graduated in 2020);
- Prof. dr. Lieven Verschaffel, Professor of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven;
- Prof. dr. Karine Verschueren, Professor School and Developmental Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven.

The cluster is composed of thirteen programmes:

- M Individual Differences and Assessment (research), Tilburg University;
- M Behavioural Science (research), Radboud University;
- M Clinical and Developmental Psychopathology (research), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam;
- M Social Psychology: Regulation of Social Behaviour (research), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam;
- M Psychology (research), University of Amsterdam;
- M Communication Science (research), University of Amsterdam;
- M Educational Sciences: Learning in Interaction (research), Utrecht University;



- M Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural, Biomedical and Social Sciences (research), Utrecht University;
- M Development and Socialisation in Childhood and Adolescence (research), Utrecht University;
- M Social and Health Psychology (research), Utrecht University;
- M Behavioural and Social Sciences (research), University of Groningen;
- M Psychology (research), Leiden University;
- M Developmental Psychopathology in Education and Child Studies (research), Leiden University.



Appendix B – Schedule of the visit

March, 4 2021

Time	Session
08.30 – 10.00	Preparation panel
10.00 – 10.45	Management
10.45 – 11.00	Evaluation
11.00 – 11.45	Students
11.45 – 12.00	Evaluation
12.45 – 13.30	Lecturers
13.30 – 13.45	Evaluation
13.45 – 14.15	Alumni
14.15 – 14.30	Evaluation
14.30 – 15.00	Examination board
15.00 – 15.30	evaluation and preparing questions for management
15.30 -16.00	Second meeting management
16.00 – 17.30	Evaluation
17.30 – 17.45	Presentation of first findings



Appendix C – Documents studied

- Self-evaluation report with appendices;
 - Appendix 1, Recommendations external review 2015;
 - Appendix 2, Previous external review of the educational programme;
 - Appendix 3, Overview current curriculum and description of courses;
 - Appendix 4, Courses and final terms;;
 - Appendix 5, Education and Examination Regulations
 - Appendix 6, Inflow, dropout, graduation and labour market positions SHP, 2015–2020;
 - Appendix 7, Overview of staff (2018–2020);
 - Appendix 8, Impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on education;
- Fifteen theses with assessment forms.



Appendix D – Abbreviations

BKO	<i>Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs</i>
BoE	Board of Examiners
BoS	Board of Studies
EC	European Credit
EER	Education and Examination Regulations
FAIR	Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable
FSBS	Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
GSSBS	Graduate School of Social and Behavioural Sciences
NVAO	<i>Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie</i>
OER	<i>Onderwijs- en Examenreglement</i>
SEP	Standard Evaluation Protocol
SHP	Social and Health Psychology
UU	Utrecht University

