LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE UTRECHT

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

This report was finalised on 25 March 2019

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE UTRECHT

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessments (September 2016) and the Assessment Framework for the Distinctive feature of small-scale and intensive education (4 November 2011) as a starting point.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Name of the programme:	Liberal Arts and Sciences
CROHO number:	50393
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	Major in Humanities (BA degree)
	Major in Social Sciences (BA degree)
	Major in Science (BSc degree)
	Interdepartmental Major (BA or BSc degree)
Location(s):	Utrecht
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Joint programme:	Double Degree LAS Law
	Double Degree LAS Physics
partner institutions involved:	Utrecht University
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline:	01/05/2019

The visit of the assessment panel Liberal Arts and Sciences to University College Utrecht of Utrecht University took place on 26 September 2018.

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

Cluster Liberal Arts and Sciences
The assessment of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Utrecht is part of the assessment of Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Sciences degree. The assessment of Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Sciences degree is part of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences.

From May to December 2018, a panel of expertise members assessed bachelor's programmes Liberal Arts and Sciences at eight universities. A panel of six to nine members was appointed for each site visit, based on the expertise and availability of each panel member and taking into account possible conflicts of interest.

The full panel Liberal Arts and Sciences consisted of eighteen members:

- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of the Radboud University [chair]
- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice chair]
- Prof. S. (Samuel) Abraham, co-founder and managing director of ECOLAS and founder, professor and rector of Bratislava International School of Liberal Education (BISLA, Slovakia)
- Dr. S.I. (Sylvia) Bergh, associate professor in Development Management and Governance at the International Institute of Social Studies in The Hague
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom)
- Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen
- Prof. W.M. (Wayne) Cranton, assistant dean (research) at the Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering and Sciences of Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom)
- C. (Carl) Gombrich, MSc programme director of the BASc Art and Sciences at the University College London (United Kingdom)
- Dr. K. (Katherine) Goodman, assistant professor and associate director of Inworks at the University of Colorado Denver (United States)
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany)
- Dr. A. (Alyssa) Schneebaum, lecturer and researcher at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and Universität Wien (Austria)
- Em. prof. A.H.A. (Fred) Soons, emeritus professor in International Public Law at Utrecht University
- Dr. M. (Mark) Sommerville, associate dean of Faculty Affairs and Development and associate professor in Electrical Engineering and Physics at Olin College of Engineering (United States)
- Dr. J.(Jos) Willems, former member of the board of Zuyd University of Applied Sciences and educational advisor for Higher Education
- Drs. S.C. (Sylvia) Witteveen, academic director of the Psychobiology programme at the Faculty of Science of the University of Amsterdam
- I. (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, University College Groningen
- Y. (Yara) van Ingen, bachelor's student Maastricht Science Programme, Maastricht University
- M. (Maya) Ouwehand, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, Utrecht University

For the assessment of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, two panel members (Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T.A Brus) were trained by the NVAO and appointed to head the assessment of the Distinctive Feature. Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen was involved in all site visits. Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. Brus was involved in the site visits at Leiden University College, University College Utrecht, University College Roosevelt, Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and Maastricht Science Programme.

The panel was supported by dr. Els Schröder as project coordinator of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences. She also acted as secretary during the visit to Leiden University College, University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme. She was supported by dr. Joke Corporaal at University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme, who also wrote the reports of the first five colleges. Dr. Marianne van der Weiden acted as secretary during the site visits to Groningen University College, University College Tilburg and University College Twente.

Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University
The bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Utrecht has been assessed as part of a combined site visit to Utrecht University's three Liberal Arts and Science programmes, which form separate 'tracks' within Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Science degree programme. In this report, these tracks will be referred to as 'programmes'.

The Utrecht University Liberal Arts and Sciences programmes are: Liberal Arts and Sciences at the Faculty of Humanities (hereafter: LAS), Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Utrecht (hereafter: UCU) and Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Roosevelt (hereafter: UCR). The programmes prepared individual self-evaluation reports. The panel visited the programmes at their individual premises in a combined site visit, which took place between 24-27 September in Middelburg and Utrecht. The panel's findings will be presented in three programme-specific reports.

The panel that visited Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University consisted of six members:
- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of Radboud University [chair];
- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice-chair];
- Prof. mr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen;
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany).;
- I. (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's student of Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Groningen [student member];

The following panel members were consulted as referees:
- Prof. C. (Carl) Gombrich, programme director of the BASc Art and Sciences at University College London (United Kingdom) [referee Sciences];
- Drs. S.C. (Sylvia) Witteveen, academic director of the Psychobiology programme at the Faculty of Sciences of the University of Amsterdam [referee Life Sciences];
- Dr. A. (Alyssa) Schneebaum, lecturer and researcher at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and Universität Wien (Austria) [referee Economics].

The panel was supported by dr. J. (Joke) Corporaal, who wrote the report, and dr. E. Schröder, who supervised the site visit and reporting process as project manager and secretary.

For the assessments of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education at UCR and UCU, two panel members (Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T.A Brus) were trained by the NVAO and appointed to head the assessments of the Distinctive Feature. The practice-based assessments at these two programmes took place on 24-26 September 2018 combined with the regular assessments of the bachelor's programmes.

The NVAO approved the composition of the panel on 16 April 2018.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

Preparation
The panel chair, secretary and representatives of the three programmes jointly composed a schedule for the site visits. Prior to the site visits, the programmes selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 4 for the definitive schedule.

Before the assessment panel's visit to Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University, the project coordinator received the programmes' self-evaluation reports. She sent these to the panel and secretary, after checking them for completeness of information. Upon reading the self-evaluation reports, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings, which they send to the secretary and project coordinator.

Final projects
For UCU, the panel studied a selection of fifteen theses and the accompanying assessment forms, based on a provided list with theses of the last two years. This selection was made by the panel's chair, in cooperation with the secretary, based on input from the other panel members. The chair and secretary took care that a variety of topics and disciplines was covered, and made sure that the distribution of grades in the theses selection matched the distribution of grades over all theses.

Site visit
The panel visited the programmes between 24-27 September 2018. It visited UCR on 24-25 September, UCU on 26 September and LAS on 27 September. During these visits, UCR and UCU were also assessed by the panel on the Distinctive Feature of Small-Scale and Intensive Educations.

At the start of the site visit on 24 September, the panel held a preparatory meeting during which it was instructed regarding all assessment frameworks and procedures. After this, the panel discussed its working method and its preliminary findings for the site visit with respect to the regular assessments of all three programmes and the assessments of the Distinctive Feature (if applicable). It also paid attention to the content and use of the programmes' domain-specific framework of reference, which is included in Appendix 1.

After its initial meetings, the panel focused on its individual assessments of the programmes. At each location, the panel started with a dedicated panel meeting, in which the panel discussed its preliminary findings for each programme followed by a programme-specific development conversation. In it, the panel and representatives of the visited programme discussed various developments routes for the programme. The result of these conversations are summarised in three separate reports, which will be published through the programmes' communication channels. The information received during the development conversations are not part of the conducted assessments.

The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes and visited the available facilities. It also examined materials provided by each programme. An overview of these materials for UCU is given in Appendix 5, and for the other programmes in their own programme-specific report.

At all three locations, the panel used the final part of the visit to discuss its programme-specific findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards the panel chair gave an oral presentation, in which he expressed the panel's preliminary impressions and general observations.

Reports
After the site visit, the secretary wrote three draft reports: each programme received its own report. The draft report for LAS focuses on the regular NVAO programme assessment. The draft reports for UCR and UCU include two separate chapters: the first part of these reports focuses on the regular NVAO programme assessment of the bachelor's programme, and the second part of the report specifically addresses the standards related to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education.

Subsequently, the secretary sent the reports to the assessment panel and project coordinator for feedback. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project coordinator sent the draft reports to the university in order to have these checked for factual irregularities. The secretary

discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and adapted the reports accordingly before its finalisation.

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 both the standards and the programme as a whole.

Generic quality

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

Unsatisfactory

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard and shows shortcomings with respect to multiple aspects of the standard.

Satisfactory

The programme meets the generic quality standard across its entire spectrum.

Good

The programme systematically surpasses the generic quality standard.

Excellent

The programme systematically well surpasses the generic quality standard and is regarded as an international example.

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for the distinctive feature of small-scale and intensive education, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the standards:

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality 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

All the criteria are scored as "meets the standard".

Negative

One or more of the criteria are scored as "does not meet the standard".

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Summary Judgement Framework for Limited Programme Assessments

Standard 1
UCU has formulated three main goals: (1) to free students from pre-set aims and perspectives so as to flourish as individuals and citizens; (2) to prepare students for a meaningful, continued education and career; (3) to enable students to become part of a vibrant, intercultural community. These aims need not be realized in the curriculum alone, but also in extra-curricular activities organised and within UCU's tight-knit, international community of students and staff. The panel concludes that UCU's aims are truly student-centred: students are encouraged and supported to develop their own programme within and across disciplines. By doing so, students are kept motivated to further develop their intellectual abilities while broadening their interests. The panel also appreciates that UCU seems to have clear development plans.

The programme's 16 end terms are clearly articulated and convincingly linked to the Dublin descriptors. The panel is impressed with the attention for international, intercultural and reflective skills in the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and it considers the efforts of the programme to improve the existing ILOs further proof of the good way in which UCU continuously strives to develop its programme. The ILOs surpass what may be expected of an academic bachelor degree programme in Liberal Arts and Sciences. UCU is multidisciplinary in its approach rather than interdisciplinary. The panel appreciates the development plans to explore the balance between disciplinary grounding and integration, which may result in a change of the ILOs. The panel recommends as part of this process to rephrase the ILOs describing 'disciplinary depth', 'broad knowledge' and 'communication skills', specifying for instance the level achieved or the disciplinary skills acquired.

Standard 2
The panel was impressed with UCU's honest and reflective attitude, indicating the confidence of a genuinely development-oriented programme. It concludes that UCU's educational philosophy links well with its educational practice, and that the College follows a really innovative approach to student-led learning, including (honours) student-led courses and a course co-designed by staff and students. UCU offers a varied and stimulating curriculum. Courses have clear outlines, and an 'end term matrix' links learning outcomes at course and track to those at degree level, ensuring that there is a clear link between the courses and the programme's overall aims. The requirement that students must follow at least one course in every discipline, as well as the other degree requirements and the language requirement, ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across and within disciplines. The communication of course objectives and end terms, however, can be improved, because many students are currently insufficiently aware of these. Also, the panel advises UCU to start a dialogue with students and staff to look into the various possibilities of reducing the workload and creating more 'room to fail'.

According to the panel, UCU has an impressive feedback cycle in place. UCU appears to be a community where students take responsibility for their learning experience, where their input is taken seriously and where they have plenty of opportunity to pursue personal talents and develop new interests. The panel observed that students are really involved in the UCU community. Outreach projects, extracurricular activities and residential housing allow students to develop valuable lifelong skills, for instance leadership, intercultural or managerial skills, that feed back into the programme. UCU has a peer support system. The panel sees this as a positive sign of the community spirit and the sense of solidarity amongst students.

The programme has dedicated and professional staff members, who employ innovative teaching strategies. The panel considers co-creation as cutting-edge practice that could become an effective signature of the programme. It encourages UCU to share this good practice beyond the College. The panel also really appreciates the teacher-scholarship plans and supports UCU to advance these plans into the development of a model that might be useful to the other University Colleges. The tutorial

system – central to the way UCU operates – seems to function well. In general, students really appreciate their tutors. Sometimes there are problems caused by different expectations. The panel recommends to, in general, communicating more clearly what the different support systems (tutors, Student Life Officers, Writing and Skills Center, Futures Centre) set out to do, and what the extent and limits of support are. The panel strongly supports the students' request for a dedicated UCU psychologist. The programme has adequate facilities. However, to improve wheelchair accessibility and to improve the interior of the buildings, making them better places to study and work, renovations are needed. The panel supports the programme's wish to bring the renovations scheduled for 2022 forward.

Standard 3
UCU has spent considerable attention to assessment in the past year. The panel is pleased to see that the programme now has a good Assessment Policy Plan in place, which aims to ensure, amongst other things, that assessment and grading practices are more transparent. It commends the programme on these changes and on its plans to keep prioritising the coordination of assessment in the near future, including further development of its assessment forms. The panel concludes that the Exam Board has significantly contributed to an improvement of the assessment system. It supports increasing the Exam Board's capacity in such a manner that the Board can continue contributing to further development and innovation of the assessment practices. The panel concluded that the quality of assessment is monitored and safeguarded by the Exam Board at a good level.

The assessment of the thesis trajectory has much improved in the period under consideration and ensures a well-functioning assessment system. The panel considers the reflexive thesis meetings as offered by one teacher as an excellent practice that could beneficially be rolled out to all UCU students. The new thesis guideline is clear. UCU uses a good variety of assessment methods, including innovative ways of assessment such as peer assessment and oral exams. Though continuous assessment seems to be working well, the panel thinks that the number of assignments in some courses ought to be reduced. It also suggests, with the current revision of assessment forms, including a more sophisticated set of universally applied assessment criteria in the feedback form, with clear statements for successful performance in each area, differentiated by grade band and level of study. The panel strongly supports the changes that the Exam Board wants to make in this respect. It trusts UCU to act upon the Exam Board's recommendations based on the many positive changes implemented to further enhance transparency and reliability at UCU over the period under consideration. The panel is also enthusiastic about the system of peer consultation within the tracks, and about the Exam Board checking the quality of course and track assessment in no less than three tracks each semester.

Standard 4
The panel concludes that UCU graduates achieve the learning outcomes, including the more ambitious ones regarding intercultural and reflective skills. In the majority of the theses that the panel read, the student work easily reached or surpassed what may be expected of a monodisciplinary programme at bachelor's level. In most cases, students tackled daring topics by convincingly bringing together relevant material and presenting persuasive ideas. Most UCU graduates continue their studies in a master's programme, often at Utrecht University or abroad and frequently in highly ranked programmes. The fact that graduates perform well in these monodisciplinary programmes, and the fact that 25% continues in a PhD trajectory, is seen as further evidence of the high quality of graduates of this programme (standard 4).

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

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes   good

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment good
Standard 3: Student assessment good
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes good

General conclusion good

The chair, prof. dr. Theo Engelen, and the secretary of the panel, dr. Els Schröder, 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: 25 March 2019

Summary judgment Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education

Standard A
UCU's intended learning outcomes reflect the College's interpretation of liberal learning. UCU appears to be an admirably honest and self-reflective organisation. Its ILOs are clearly described and pay sufficient attention to disciplinary depth, a broad knowledge base, skills associated with thinking, communication, learning and research, intercultural and reflective skills. Some ILOs could be phrased more precisely and the panel advises the programme to address interdisciplinarity more explicitly in the ILOs. Currently, UCU is in the process of further fine-tuning its profile and ILOs. The panel has every faith in this process and in the changes that will follow from it. As a result, it is confident that UCU meets the standard.

Standard B
The programme's content is inseparably connected to relevant extra-curricular activities and co-curricular activities. The panel concludes that there is a clear link between course objectives, track outlines, extra-curricular activities and intended learning outcomes. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. Outreach projects and extracurricular activities feed back into the programme and help students to develop academic and personal skills and a sense of civic responsibility. The panel is pleased to hear that UCU has clear development plans for embedding civic engagement and for making skills development in the curriculum more explicit.

Standard C
The panel verified that the set-up of the programme, including its residential setting, is aimed at creating a social, academically challenging community. Classes are small-scale, and students have 16 hours of face-to-face teaching during semester. Another 40 hours are reserved for self-study. This results in an intensive workload during term time. Students are well represented at all levels of the programme and the student voice is generally well heard. Students are closely involved in curriculum development and sometimes also in course development. The panel encourages staff and students to look for fresh connections and new initiatives to foster and renew the community spirit that UCU has successfully developed over the years.

Standard D
The panel is satisfied with the quantity and quality of UCU's intake. UCU has an elaborate admission procedure in place, resulting in a good match between students entering the programme and the programme's main goals and intended learning outcomes.

Standard E
The panel notes that the teachers are deeply committed to the liberal arts and sciences values, and that their courses show various innovative, student-centred ways of learning. The available expertise is well tuned to the various academic demands of UCU's courses and tracks. The programme has shown impressive progress regarding career opportunities for staff.

Standard F
UCU has sufficient staff to fulfil the demands posed upon a small-scale, intensive programme. Staff is professional and dedicated and the programme benefits from a low staff to student ratio.

Standard G
The panel concludes that UCU's facilities help create a good teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities.

Standard H
The level of the selected theses, studied by the panel, is considered good. In their theses, students often tackle daring subjects and they succeed well in doing so. Graduation rates have been very high from the start, at approximately 90%. The majority of students (75%) graduates without any study

delay. Graduates enrol in highly ranked master's programmes in the Netherlands or abroad. No less than a quarter subsequently starts a PhD trajectory. The fact that they have no major problems in being admitted into master's programmes, and the fact that graduates perform well in these programmes, compared with their peers, is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard.

Practice-based assessment
With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that UCU meets all standards. In its assessment under Standards A, B, C, E, and G, the panel also paid specific attention to the formulation of intended learning outcomes, status and implementation of inter- and multidisciplinarity in the curriculum, engagement of UU-staff in extracurricular activities, career development opportunities for UCU staff, and laboratory facilities for students, as these were identified as 'areas of improvement' in the 2012 assessment. The panel concludes that UCU has shown good improvement on all points; the College has either tackled the issues or is in the process of doing so. The improvement shown, the development plans, and the fact that all criteria meet the standard, result in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature by the panel.

The panel assesses the standards from the *Assessment framework for the Distinctive Feature of Small-scale and Intensive Education* in the following way:

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Standard A: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard B: Relationship between the goals and content	meets the standard
Standard C: Structure and didactic concept	meets the standard
Standard D: Intake	meets the standard
Standard E: Quality of staff	meets the standard
Standard F: Number of staff	meets the standard
Standard G: Available facilities	meets the standard
Standard H: Level realised	meets the standard
General conclusion	positive

The chair, prof. dr. Theo Engelen, and the secretary of the panel, dr. Els Schröder, 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: 25 March 2019

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

Organisational context

University College Utrecht started in 1998 as the first Liberal Arts and Sciences College in the Netherlands. Today, it is a track of the Liberal Arts and Sciences programme at Utrecht University, which consists of three tracks (hereafter called programmes); two English-taught honours colleges (University College Utrecht and University College Roosevelt) and a non-selective, university-wide Liberal Arts and Sciences programme (LAS), taught in Dutch. All three programmes aim to educate students in the Liberal Arts and Sciences and prepare them for a meaningful career and life. Each programme is run independently under separate management.

UCU is governed by the College Board (comprising the dean, the managing director, the director of education, the student assessor, heads of department, head tutor and the 'head of education and student office') and the Board of Studies (director of education, student assessor, heads of department and tutor representative). These two governing bodies are advised by the UCU Council (staff and student representatives) and the Academic Student Council. An independent Exam Board is responsible for the quality, transparency and validity of assessment in the programme.

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
The self-evaluation report describes the three goals of 'liberal learning' at UCU as follows: (1) to free students from pre-set aims and perspectives so as to flourish as individuals and citizens; (2) to prepare students for a meaningful, continued education and career; (3) to enable students to become part of a vibrant, intercultural community. The programme has a strong international outlook and takes a student-centred and student-managed approach: guided by their tutor, students compose their curriculum within and across the three disciplinary based departments: Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities. By letting students explore and develop their own interests and intellectual abilities, they are kept motivated and compelled to look beyond their initial interests. The programme aims to cultivate 'connections among scholarly knowledge, a commitment to community engagement, and extra-curricular activity'.

The panel concludes that UCU's goals, international outlook and student-centred approach fits the Domain Specific Framework of Reference well. They reflect the LAS principles of studying across disciplines, while placing emphasis on the students' development and his or her responsibility towards their own learning process and towards society. It also learnt from the SER and site visit that the management has clear development plans, which also involve further fine-tuning and updating UCU's profile and ILOs. The panel was impressed with the detailed list of changes made 2012-2017 and sees this as proof of a development-oriented mindset.

Intended learning outcomes
UCU has formulated sixteen 'end terms'. These intended learning outcomes are divided over nine categories: (1) Disciplinary depth (ILO 1-2), (2) Broad knowledge (ILO 3), (3) Thinking skills (ILO 4-6), (4) Communication skills (ILO 7), (5) Learning skills (ILO 8-9), (6) Research skills (ILO 10), (7) International and intercultural orientation (ILO 11-13), (8) Societal orientation (ILO 14), and (9) Other skills (ILO 15-16).

The panel notes that the intended learning outcomes are clearly articulated and convincingly linked to the Dublin descriptors in the self-evaluation report. The ILOs include specific skills associated with liberal arts and sciences, such as international, intercultural and reflective skills. The panel is in particular enthusiastic about learning outcomes 12-14 ('Graduates understand and can reflect on cultural differences', 'Graduates reflect on their own value system in relation to that of others' and 'Graduates are able to apply knowledge and skills towards solutions for societal solutions'), which it considers evidence of the high level the programme is aiming for. The panel also has some minor points for improvement. It suggests including 'societal diversity' in learning outcome 12 and phrasing ILOs 1-3, 7 and 11 in a more specific way. For instance, ILO11 ('Graduates can speak foreign languages') could specify the level of proficiency that students are expected to reach.

The programme has consciously and deliberately chosen to be multidisciplinary in its approach rather than interdisciplinary. At the same time, as discussed with the panel during the site visit, it is in the process of carefully implementing features of interdisciplinarity so as to explore the right balance between disciplinary grounding and various forms of integration. The panel appreciates these development plans, which may, in future, result in a revision of the ILOs.

Considerations
The panel concludes that UCU's goals are truly student-centred: students are encouraged and supported to develop their own programme within and across disciplines. By doing so, students are kept motivated to further develop their intellectual abilities while broadening their interests. The purpose of UCU's LAS approach is summarized as: (1) to free students from pre-set aims and perspectives so as to flourish as individuals and citizens; (2) to prepare students for a meaningful, continued education and career; (3) to enable students to become part of a vibrant, intercultural community. These aims need not be realized in the curriculum alone, but also in extra-curricular activities organised and within UCU's tight-knit, international community of students and staff. The panel appreciates that UCU seems to have clear development plans.

The panel considers the programme's 16 end terms clearly articulated and convincingly linked to the Dublin descriptors. The panel is impressed with the attention for international, intercultural and reflective skills in the ILOs. The ILOs surpass what may be expected of an academic bachelor degree programme in Liberal Arts and Sciences. UCU is multidisciplinary in its approach rather than interdisciplinary. The panel appreciates the development plans to explore the balance between disciplinary grounding and integration, which may result in a change of the ILOs.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'good'.

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
At UCU, students complete approximately 24 courses, 4 courses per semester. With the exception of a short 2.5 EC internship, short lab courses (2.5 EC) and a longer 15 EC research thesis, most courses account for 7.5 EC. The courses are scheduled in a 15-week semester with a one-week midterm break halfway. Students have 16 contact hours per week (4 classes times 4 hours). In addition, they are expected to spend 40 hours on self-study. This results in a workload of 56 hours per week. In 2017-2018 students could choose from 170 courses and 14 various kinds of internships/research thesis projects. For a full description of the programme, see Appendix 3.

All courses are aimed at an introductory, intermediate or advanced level. These levels build on each other: before following a level 3 course in a certain discipline, students first need to complete a least a level 1 and a level 2 course. All courses are grouped in tracks within the different disciplines. Disciplines are mostly classic academic disciplines such as Biology or Sociology, but some represent thematic fields of study, such as 'Art History and Museum Studies', 'China Studies' and 'Media and Performance Studies'. The disciplines are housed in UCU's three departments Sciences, Social sciences and Humanities. After the first year, students choose in which of these three majors they want to specialise. For Humanities and Social Sciences this will lead to a BA degree, for the Sciences majors to a BSc degree. Students can also choose interdepartmental combinations, and a minority of students (10%) chooses this option.

All UCU students must complete two tracks (ten courses or 75 EC in total) within their chosen specialisation, with at least three courses (22.5 EC) at level 3. This enables them to reach a certain depth in their discipline. In line with LAS principles, students also have breadth requirements, including language acquisition. Finally, they have to take the (only) mandatory, first-year course 'Research in Context'. Skills training such as academic writing and presenting is embedded in the courses. Most courses are monodisciplinary, but there are also 13 interdisciplinary courses, for instance on sustainability, evolution and 'gender, science and technology'. In these courses, subjects are approached by incorporating and discussing concepts and aspects from various disciplines. The students point out in the SER that, in class assignments, they are also often able to link ideas and topics from other courses to a particular class. In their view this also facilitates interdisciplinary thinking. Still, they would like to see an interdisciplinary element embedded in more courses. The students also point out that it is harder to integrate UU courses in the UCU curriculum because UU has a different academic calendar.

UCU offers a set of special programmes, extracurricular honours courses for students who wish to collect more than 180 EC, and two double degree programmes: LAS & Law or LAS & Physics. The double degree programmes take four years, and upon completion students receive two diplomas: one from UCU and one from the faculty of law or science. This option is attractive for students who want to enter a disciplinary master's programme in law or physics. Special UCU programmes include the 'UCU East Africa Program', the 'Aruba Field Research project' and the newly constituted 'China program'. All of these programmes give students the opportunity to spend time abroad, experience cross-cultural differences and apply academic skills in a different setting.

At the end of the programme, students write a 15 EC thesis. Students can only start their thesis after they have completed level 2 and method courses in the same discipline. The method requirements depend on the topic. UCU fellows help students to find an appropriate thesis supervisor and see to it that the supervision complies with the thesis rules and regulations.

The panel explored the relationship between UCU's curriculum and its main goals and intended learning outcomes. The panel concludes that UCU offers a varied and stimulating curriculum, which enables students to choose from a wide range of subjects. Course outlines clearly describe the course objectives, course level, teaching formats and assessment form. In addition to course outlines, UCU has formulated learning goals at track level and intended learning outcomes at degree level. According to the students, the integration of course objectives and learning goals in individual curricula could be improved, because many students are currently insufficiently aware of their existence. The learning outcomes of the separate tracks are stated in track manuals . An 'end term matrix' links learning outcomes at course and track to those at degree level, thus ensuring that there is a clear link between the courses and the programme's overall aims. The requirement that students must follow at least one course in every discipline, as well as the other degree requirements and the language requirement, ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across and within disciplines.

In addition to curricular activities, UCU students participate in many co- and extracurricular activities. Students are automatically members of UCSA, the University College Student Association. USCA has

39 student committees and offers a broad range of activities. These allow students to develop new skills, for instance leadership or managerial skills, that they will benefit from in their course work and their future career. To promote and facilitate intercultural exchange, all students are required to live on campus, where they share housing units with groups of two to twelve students. To make sure that units are, indeed, diverse in terms of year of study, gender and nationality, UCU allocates new rooms to the students at the start of a new academic year.

Educational concept
As mentioned above, UCU describes its educational approach as 'student-centered and student-managed'. The programme sees successful teaching and learning as a process that involves active engagement of students, faculty and support staff. Two essential guiding mechanisms navigate students through their studies at UU: the structure of the curriculum with its degree requirements (described in the curriculum description below) and the tutor system. This tutor system plays a key role in the UCU programme. Each student is assigned a tutor from the start of the programme. They help students making curricular choices and reflecting critically on the courses they have taken so far.

In line with UCU's vision statement, 'A holistic approach to undergraduate education', students are encouraged to deal with issues from multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives, especially in the third year. The holistic approach to learning encompasses both intellectual and personal development. In the coming year the programme wants to create 'room to fail' as it notes that a holistic approach to education includes finding ways to render the community resilient to the idea that performance measures one's self-worth. The panel is pleased to hear that the programme values personal growth just as much as intellectual achievements. It believes that one way to create 'room to fail' is to prevent stress rather than teaching students to cope with it. Suggestions and recommendations to reduce the pressure are listed in the section 'study environment'.

The teaching methods at UCU follow UU's conditions for small-scale and intensive education. In order to create a safe environment to exchange ideas, arguments and feedback, the maximum class size is 28 students. This seemed rather large to the panel, but teaching staff explained during the site visit that this is the maximum, and that most classes are considerably smaller. The teaching format depends on the teacher, the course subject and the level. But in all courses, students are stimulated to participate actively in group discussions. Some level 3 courses use student-led sessions (up to 50% of the total) that can take any shape the students see fit. In addition, the programme used participatory design in another course ('Intercultural Communication for Global Citizenship') which was co-created by the students and the teacher. The programme also involves honours-led student courses, for which students choose a topic and organise a seminar.

The panel concludes that the educational philosophy of the programme links well with its educational practice. According to the panel, UCU follows a really innovative approach to student-led learning, not just on the level of an open curriculum, but including (honours) student-led courses and a course co-designed by staff and students. This co-creation is cutting-edge practice and, if extended and employed in small ways throughout the curriculum, could become an effective signature of the programme. In the SER, the students already show that they are keen to be more involved in course development. Finally, the panel is pleased to see that UCU is engaged in various university-wide education innovation projects, with a focus on E-labs, community service and engagement, intercultural competence, diversity and online peer feedback.

Curriculum development
According to the panel, UCU has clear plans for development. There are various student critiques of the programme that are evident from the self-evaluation: programme and assessment inflexibility, workload and student support. The panel considers it healthy that these views are represented so openly. The SER is admirably honest and reflective, indicating the confidence of a genuinely development-oriented mindset. The student voice is well integrated and there are lively and inspiring examples of good practice throughout.

The panel concludes that UCU has an impressive feedback cycle in place, with students being involved at different stages. There is a prominent role for the Academic Student Council (ASC), a group of elected students who participate in the UCU council as student representatives and as student assessor in the Board of Studies. Alongside regular end of term evaluations, ASC organises track focus groups, dialogues between teachers and students in a certain track, and it is running a pilot with mid-term evaluations. These two initiatives are aimed at providing overarching track feedback and midway course improvements. ASC is also the main contact point for students with questions and complaints about courses. UCU's management team regularly meets with both ASC and UCSA.

The panel is pleased to see that students and staff cooperate regularly at various levels to improve the quality of teaching, and the quality of the teaching-learning environment. The close involvement of students also becomes clear from their constructive feedback in the SER to improve the current evaluation forms. The students would also like to be better informed about the actions resulting from course feedback. From the SER and from its impressions gathered during the site visit, the panel concludes that UCU is a community where students take responsibility for their learning experience, where their input is taken seriously and where they have plenty of opportunity to pursue personal talents and develop new interests.

The panel is enthusiastic about the application of skills through outreach projects such as the UCU East Africa Project, the Aruba Program and the Alumni Internship Program. It also is pleased to hear that UCU has clear development plans for embedding civic engagement, making skills development more explicit, and enhancing the integration of disciplines and interdisciplinarity in the curriculum. The panel does point out that the latter was already one of the recommendations of the previous assessment panel. Though the panel appreciates that courses do not need to be labelled 'interdisciplinary' to have an interdisciplinary nature, it does recommend bringing the role that interdisciplinarity plays in the programme much more to the forefront. The panel thinks that the concluding capstone project should ideally include an interdisciplinary element.

Regarding skills training, the panel suggests to consider offering a set of core courses to the students before they go into their specialisations. The panel recommends to not only focus on academic writing, but, in line with students' wishes, also on research skills. A more substantial core curriculum can also help accommodate bringing across important messages on for example career advice and important LAS values. Finally, the students highlight that learning outcomes should be made more explicit at course level. It is clear to the panel that this important concern has been recognised and that work is ongoing in this area.

The panel asked the teachers to reflect on the students from UCU compared to their peers in disciplinary programmes at UCU. The panel specifically wanted to know if the teachers thought there were any skills that are currently underrepresented in the curriculum. The teachers were very enthusiastic about their students. According to the teachers, UCU students display a real interest in the courses and they seem well aware of the fact that they are often crossing paradigms. This interdisciplinary outlook on topics allows for different discussions in class. The teachers also felt they had more freedom at UCU to be a missionary for the programme, for what it sets out to do. They suggested that, based on the positions where graduates end up, the UCU Futures Centre could try to develop an updated academic vocabulary of the set of skills that graduates need. The panel supports this suggestion; it ties in with its suggestion to update the ILOs.

Workload
As mentioned above, every semester students at UCU follow four courses at the same time. Graduates described their time at UCU as 'a roller coaster'. They had the impression that the pressure at UCU has even increased since they left. The workload was discussed in much detail during the site visit. The panel thinks that asking 56 hours from students is a lot, given the fact that some students need a job to finance their study and given the fact that the programme would like to see students being involved in co-curricular and extracurricular activities to gain important skills. During the site

visit, the students said that UCU seems to have developed a grading culture where, for some students, only an A plus ('outstanding') is high enough. The students also offered two suggestions to reduce the workload for those who don't thrive under pressure. They would like more flexibility in the curriculum by allowing students to take 3 courses when they feel this is needed and by UCU offering more courses over a longer period of time.

The graduates told the panel that there used to be no classes scheduled on Wednesdays. They used the Wednesdays for reading and preparing assignments. At the moment, students only have the Tuesday afternoon off. The panel strongly advises UCU to start a dialogue with students and staff to look into the various possibilities of reducing the workload and creating more 'room to fail'. Creating this room is extra important, the panel feels, because it is crucial for students' learning curve that they have time to digest and reflect. The panel believes that the fact that alumni are doing so well, could also help students seeing that there is more to gain from studying at UCU than grades. The graduates stated a wish for UCU students to be properly informed about the workload of the programme, as well as about the transition to 'normal' life afterwards. Looking back, however, they felt very privileged they had been able to study at UCU.

Staff
In 2017-2018 UCU employed 48 staff members. That year, UCU staff provided roughly half of the classes, the other half was taught by colleagues from UU. This mix aims to ensure that UCU teaching is firmly embedded in research conducted at UU. UCU distinguishes between teachers, tutors and 'UCU fellows' – teachers that are responsible for the quality of courses in their track and that interact with both the head of the departments and the teachers in the discipline. The majority of UCU teachers holds a PhD, 30 UCU teachers have obtained a University Teaching Qualification, and another 8 UCU teachers (app. 17%) have a Senior Teaching Qualification. The majority of UCU teachers (70%) has a Dutch passport, 30% comes from abroad. Half of the teachers are also tutors. Eight teachers are track coordinators. As mentioned above, UCU invests extensively in innovative ways of teaching. 5 staff members have completed UU's educational leadership programme and 10 others completed the 'Honours Teaching programme'. New teachers at UCU are introduced to UCU's educational system and philosophy in a half-day workshop. UCU also takes the lead in offering a 'UC Liberal Arts program', a series of workshops tailored to teaching in an LAS environment.

The panel studied the research expertise of UCU staff members and concludes that they together represent a wide variety of fields. The available expertise is well tuned to the various academic demands of UCU's courses and tracks. The panel also notes that the teachers are deeply committed to the liberal arts and sciences values, and that their courses show various innovative, student-centred ways of learning. According to the panel, the teaching staff has the required level to teach in this small-scale, intensive programme. The panel also took into account that the students spoke well of their teachers, describing them as very dedicated and professional. Students who had taken courses at UU mentioned how they appreciated it that teachers at UCU had more time for them.

Recently, UCU has secured funding from the university to support faculty members in their role as 'teacher-scholars'. As a result, UCU members with at least a 0.6 fte appointment and without structural research tasks may spend 10% of their time 'to maintain and develop a scholarly approach to their teaching'. The amount of dedicated research time will go up to 15% by the end of 2019. Other measures taken to increase professional development opportunities for staff include regular sabbatical leaves (every tenth month), small research grants, enhanced mobility of teachers within UU, other University Colleges and international partner organisations, the appointment of a 'director of faculty development' and, finally, clear tenure criteria in the new staff hiring policy. The panel commends UCU on these initiatives; it appreciates UCU taking the lead in this important aspect of teaching at a University College.

The panel thinks it is regrettable that UCU was denied funding for research as a teaching institution, as the academic literature shows how important creating synergies between research and education and developing a lively research-rich culture are for offering high-quality research-based education.

The panel also finds it troublesome that it appears to have become harder for UCU to attract teachers from UU. It thinks that UCU benefits from being embedded in UU's research environment, and that UU can profit from UCU's teaching innovations. The panel supports UCU's plans to further increase the amount of research time. It believes that attention to staff retention and professional development is paramount and it sees the appointment of a Director of Faculty Development as a very positive step.

Study guidance
UCU's support system consists of tutors, a Student Life Officer, a Writing and Skills Center, a Futures Center and a student-run Wellbeing-team. Tutors typically have a 0.3 fte appointment to guide around 33 students. Most tutors also teach in one of the tracks, and their expertise is distributed over the curriculum, so they can easily refer students to a colleague-tutor for additional advice. Students meet with their tutor for at least 4 times a year. Tutors provide tailor-made academic advising, they help students finding their own niche in the curriculum and looking ahead at suitable master's programmes or other career options. The tutor also advises the student on taking extracurricular activities. Tutors are trained for their tutor role in special tutor training sessions, and they have regular tutorial team meetings. The senior tutor team coordinates both types of meetings. New tutors share office with experienced tutors, who function as mentors to their new colleagues. In the meeting with the panel, the tutors said that they also benefit from a new, national guidance network for all University Colleges in the Netherlands. UCU brings in external trainers to discuss topics that come up in their role. According to the tutors and teachers, these sessions seem to be meeting a need. The tutors see tutoring as the key integrative factor in the UCU programme. They feel that seeing how the students develop and sensing the mood on campus helps them in their teaching role. 'We are able to reflect on what we hear and pick up on it in our classes.'

Students appreciate the tutor immensely. However, the student representatives said they have mixed experiences concerning the amount and the nature of guidance. This is in line with the students' observation in the SER, that it is not always clear to everyone what the division of responsibility between student and tutor is. The fact that some tutors go above and beyond causes frustration amongst students that receive less support. The panel thinks that the variation in personal tutor quality/attentiveness may be connected to staffing issues. The new hiring policy of 'hiring for mission' and the development of the 'teacher-scholar' model should address this. The panel also recommends communicating the tutor guidelines clearly to the students at the start of the programme and possibly again halfway through the programme. This could help students seeing their own responsibilities more clearly.

UCU's Student Life Officer is there to help students with problems of a non-academic nature. He is qualified to offer counselling, mentoring, coaching and guidance and can also refer the students to other professional caregivers, either within or outside UU. The student officer has helped students to set up a 'Wellbeing Team', where students offer peer support to students that are experiencing difficulties. The Wellbeing Team has regular office hours and it is run entirely by volunteers. UCU's Writing and Skills Centre offers individual support in academic writing and in applying methodologies on data to students writing their theses, and the UCU Futures Centre offers one-on-one guidance, for instance for applying to master's programmes or preparing for interviews. The graduates noted that they found it hard to reflect on their next step while they were still studying at UCU. They suggested to keep reminding students to look ahead.

The panel concludes that UCU has a substantial student guidance system, with impressive attention to student wellbeing. The panel was in particular touched by the peer support system set up by the students and sees this as evidence of a supportive community. Nevertheless, there are limits to peer support. Even though students have access to the main UU psychologists, the panel strongly supports the students' request for a dedicated UCU psychologist who is trained and familiar with the situation at UCU. According to the panel, the tutor system provides good academic support, and UCU has clear rules for mitigating circumstances and learning accommodation agreements for students with disabilities or mental health issues. The dedicated Writing Centre and Futures Center are much

appreciated by the students as important additional support systems. A general point of improvement, according to the panel, is to communicate more clearly what the different support systems set out to do, and what the extent and limits of support are.

Programme-specific facilities
UCU's classrooms are housed in three separate buildings. Classrooms can house up to 28 students, and each building also has one or two computer rooms, which can be used by groups of students or individual students. The panel also visited UCU's teaching lab, which is part of UU's digital teaching innovation project Educate-it, and which aims to stimulate innovation through digital tools and media. The staff rooms, the Writing Centre and the Futures Center are distributed among the classrooms. This makes it easier for the students to contact the teachers or to use the support facilities.

The study spaces have been refurbished in the fall of 2018, but large-scale renovations will not take place until 2022. After hearing student and staff concerns regarding campus renovations, the panel encourages the university to bring the renovations forward. According to the students, the renovations should also include better access for wheelchair users, and better light and ventilation in some of the study spaces. In general, the panel concludes that UCU has a spacious learning environment which integrates staff and students and which includes a 'teaching lab' space for innovative pedagogies. The College offers a supportive community but is also flexible for those who want to live off-campus.

UCU does not have its own laboratory facilities, but shares these with Utrecht University. Because lab work demands students to be in the laboratory for whole days, science students take short lab courses outside of the semesters, in very concise periods of 2.5 weeks in the summer or winter period. These short periods do not allow for a lot of processing time. Therefore the student representatives wished the lab periods were longer. The panel understands this and recommends for UCU to look at long-term solutions to this dilemma in cooperation with UU.

Reflecting on their time at UCU, graduates noted that fellow students had become close friends, with whom they still continue to debate. The fact that many graduates move abroad helps alumni to benefit from a social network in many cities around the world. According to them, the 'bubble' at UCU is what students create themselves. A downside of life on campus is that the social pressure of always being on campus can be stressful. A huge benefit of the campus setting, the graduates pointed out, is that students can try many new things at the same time, without many logistical challenges.

Considerations
The panel was impressed with UCU's honest and reflective attitude, indicating the confidence of a genuinely development-oriented programme. It concludes that UCU's educational philosophy links well with its educational practice, and that the programme follows a really innovative approach to student-led learning, including (honours) student-led courses and a course co-designed by staff and students. UCU offers a varied and stimulating curriculum. Courses have clear outlines, and an 'end term matrix' links learning outcomes at course and track to those at degree level, ensuring that there is a clear link between the courses and the programme's overall aims. The requirement that students must follow at least one course in every discipline, as well as the other degree requirements and the language requirement, ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across and within disciplines. The communication of course objectives and end terms, however, can be improved, because many students are currently insufficiently aware of these. Also, the panel advises UCU to start a dialogue with students and staff to look into the various possibilities of reducing the workload and creating more 'room to fail'.

According to the panel, UCU has an impressive feedback cycle in place. UCU appears to be a community where students take responsibility for their learning experience, where their input is taken seriously and where they have plenty of opportunity to pursue personal talents and develop new interests. Students at UCU enjoy very favourable conditions; perhaps, the panel suggests, they are not always aware of the high costs the maintaining of all these support services causes for UCU

staff. More exchange with other programmes at UU and more experiences outside of UCU, where support and student-centered learning is less developed, would perhaps help them to understand better.

UCU has dedicated and professional staff members, who employ innovative teaching strategies. The panel enjoyed hearing about student-led and co-created courses. The panel considers co-creation as cutting-edge practice that could become an effective signature of the programme. It encourages UCU to share this good practice beyond the College. The panel also really appreciates the teacher-scholarship plans and supports UCU to advance these plans into the development of a model that might be useful to the other University Colleges. The tutorial system – central to the way UCU operates – seems to function well. In general, students really appreciate their tutors. Sometimes there are problems caused by different expectations. The panel recommends to, in general, communicating more clearly what the different support systems (tutors, Student Life Officers, Writing and Skills Center, Futures Centre) set out to do, and what the extent and limits of support are. Also, the panel believes that UCU students should have easy access to a dedicated psychologist who is familiar with the situation at UCU.

The programme has adequate facilities. However, to improve wheelchair accessibility and to improve the interior of the buildings, making them better places to study and work, renovations are needed. The panel supports the programme's wish to bring the renovations scheduled for 2022 forward. The panel observed that students are really involved in the UCU community. Outreach projects, extracurricular activities and residential housing allow students to develop valuable lifelong skills, for instance leadership, intercultural or managerial skills that feed back into the programme. UCU has a peer support system. The panel sees this as a positive sign of the community spirit and the sense of solidarity amongst students.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'good'.

Standard 3: Student assessment
The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Findings

Assessment system
UCU sees assessment as a tool to evaluate progress and to ensure that students meet the degree requirements. The programme has composed an Assessment Policy Plan for this accreditation round. Before that, general assessment principles were described in the Academic Rules and Regulations. The aim of the new Assessment Policy Plan (APP) is to record and synchronise current practice and to develop new policies. The APP explains, amongst other things, the responsibilities of all actors involved in the assessment process, UCU's five-letter grading system, the process of quality assurance, design of assessment material, assessment, mitigating circumstances and academic integrity. As mentioned before, an 'end term matrix' links learning objectives at course, track and degree level to assessment. Finally, UCU also has composed a document with the assessment procedure and assessment criteria of the thesis and track specific Assessment Plans ('track manuals') which contain the learning goals and assessment for all tracks offered within the three departments. All these documents are clear and in good order, according to the panel.

UCU uses continuous assessment; all courses are assessed by a variety of assignments. In addition to written exams, students write papers, make homework exercises, give presentations and take part in project assignments. In some courses students also attend workshops, write research proposals or peer-review essays. The honours courses, finally, experiment with alternative forms of assessment, such as peer assessment or oral exams. To make sure that assessment is, indeed, continuous and balanced, no assessment component weighs more than 40% of the total mark.

During the site visit, the panel spoke with the students about continuous assessment and feedback. The students were appreciative of both; they said that continuous assessment kept them motivated to work throughout the semester. Continuous assessment also allows the students to balance the assignments that they performed less well in with other assignments. The students were pleased that more and more teachers use grading rubrics, as this provides more clarity on how the marks are established. Though they had had excellent feedback, on the whole this could be improved, and so could the communication regarding feedback to manage students' expectations. The panel was pleased to hear that the improvements in the assessment system were also experienced as such by the students. This demonstrates that assessment at UCU is student-centred and well-communicated.

In general, the panel concludes that assessment has clearly been an area of focus and development, culminating in the new Assessment Policy Plan. The panel sees this as a very positive development that looks to address student concerns about assessment. According to the SER, students were particularly concerned about the variety and lack of consistency in grading criteria and the timeliness and quality of feedback. The panel concludes that assessment tasks are designed to appropriately measure student attainment against learning outcomes for each module. The rule that no assessment can be more than 40% allows for knowledge and skills to be applied in multiple settings is also sensible and guarantees that students have ample opportunity to improve their performance during modules. The panel is pleased with the variety of assessment tools that UCU employs, and with the experiments with alternative forms of evaluation.

Another practice that the panel was impressed with is peer consultation within the tracks. This is a newly set-up system in which teachers consult colleagues for the design of assessment and the assessment itself, including grading. The panel also heard of plans to introduce an interdisciplinary capstone project at UCU, with clear criteria for its assessment. These plans are appreciated by the panel. Though it values continuous assessment, the panel concludes that sometimes the number of assessments per course seems too high. It suggests considering if and where the number could be reduced. Such measures would meet the students' wishes to lower the workload in places and would lower the work pressure for staff.

The panel observed that the assessment criteria on the feedback rubrics are clear. The next stage of development in assessment could be, the panel suggests, to develop a more sophisticated set of universally applied criteria with clear statements for successful performance in each area, differentiated by grade band and level of study. The panel thinks that this would make the students even more aware of their study progress during their time at UCU.

The previous assessment panel concluded that thesis assessment required further attention. At the time of the previous site visit, there was no uniform assessment form, and the panel felt that assessment criteria and feedback mechanisms should be made more transparent. It also recommended to sharpen the guidelines for blind reading by a second examiner, and to include an inter- or multidisciplinary component in all theses. The current panel establishes that most of these points have been addressed in the new thesis guidelines and assessment form. The 'Thesis Guideline' is a good document, clearly stating the responsibilities of the student, supervisor and second reader, as well as the procedures and assessment criteria of the thesis. As always, room for further improvement remains, in particular with respect to harmonising assessment practices and to work towards even larger standardisation in feedback practices. UCU staff and management indicated to be aware of this need.

The panel is pleased to hear that the Exam Board has already proposed a complete revision of the current assessment form, and it strongly advises UCU's management to take the Exam Board's suggestions on board. Written feedback is an important tool for external assessors to check the quality and transparency of assessment. The current form could be further improved by including rubrics that calculate the grade in a pre-set manner, so that for similar research projects the different criteria account for the same percentage in the final grade for the different graders. The panel trusts UCU to further address variety in assessment practices in the coming years.

Finally, the panel is enthusiastic about the 'reflexive group meetings' that one supervisor has started offering to supervisees. In these meetings, students are encouraged to reflect on all aspects of the learning process more explicitly so that the thesis process becomes more meaningful for themselves and others. The panel considers this an excellent practice that could beneficially be rolled out to all students, though not necessarily delivered by all supervisors. The panel also approves of UCU's development plans for the thesis: to develop third-year integrative and interdisciplinary courses that students can take as capstones to graduate, and to offer students the possibility to write a shorter thesis (7.5), accompanied by another capstone experience and including a civic engagement component. At the moment and in spite of suggestions by the previous assessment panel, such an interdisciplinary element is often still lacking in the theses.

Exam Board
UCU's Exam Board consists of four faculty members (every department and both women and men are equally represented), an external member and a secretary. UCU has recently formalised the organisation of the Exam Board, which is responsible for safeguarding the quality of assessment in the programme. The members are appointed by the Dean and receive training at central university level.

The Board meets regularly to deal with many individual requests (there is an electronic system to deal with exemption requests) and to give advice to management. The Exam Board, for instance, supported the suggested change to the thesis trajectory and it took a lead in developing the Assessment Policy Plan. This was because the Exam Board also believed that assessment criteria could be phrased more transparently and that they needed to be better linked to the intended learning outcomes. Course descriptions now more clearly state the learning objectives as well as the means of assessment. By matching assessment with the degree requirements, the Exam Board has a direct overview if students have, indeed, gained the relevant skills upon graduation. Next to its regular tasks, the Exam Board evaluates assessment in three tracks each semester. The Exam Board also collects theses in order to provide a sample check of the quality of assessment.

The panel concludes that UCU's Exam Board works well. All in all, the programme has a robust quality assurance cycle, with the Exam Board overseeing the APP and structurally checking the quality of course, track and thesis assessment. The panel values the initiatives taken by the Exam Board. According to the panel, this demonstrates the way in which the Exam Board has been professionalised over the period under consideration. The Exam Board safeguards the quality of assessment at UCU in an active way. The panel also noted clear signs of further development and professionalisation. The panel asks UCU to support the Exam Board in its plans, in particular its plans to further develop the assessment forms.

Considerations
UCU has spent considerable attention to assessment in the past years. The panel is pleased to see that the programme now has a good Assessment Policy Plan in place, which aims to ensure, amongst other things, that assessment and grading practices become more transparent. It commends the programme on these changes and on its plans to keep prioritising the coordination of assessment in the near future. The panel concludes that UCU's Exam Board has significantly contributed to an improvement of the assessment system. It supports increasing the Exam Board's capacity in such a manner that the Board can continue contributing to further development and innovation of assessment quality. The panel concluded that the quality of assessment is monitored and safeguarded by the Exam Board at a good level.

UCU offers many examples of good assessment practices. UCU uses a good variety of assessment methods, including innovative ways of assessment such as peer assessment and oral exams. Assessment is aimed at an appropriate level (first, second or third year courses) and assessment methods generally tie in well with the learning objectives. Though continuous assessment seems to be working well, the panel thinks that the number of assignments in some courses may be reduced. The panel is enthusiastic about the system of peer consultation within the tracks, which can also help

streamlining grading practices, about the Exam Board checking the quality of course and track assessment in no less than three tracks each semester, and about the new plans for an interdisciplinary capstone project. The assessment of the thesis trajectory has much improved. A new document clearly states the responsibilities of all parties concerned and the procedures and assessment criteria involved. The panel considers the reflexive thesis meetings as offered by one teacher as an excellent practice that could beneficially be rolled out to all UCU students.

The thesis assessment form, on the other hand, could be further developed. This is acknowledged by the programme; the Exam Board is already developing a new form. According to the panel, the current form could be further improved by including a more sophisticated set of universally applied assessment criteria in the feedback form, with clear statements for successful performance in each area, differentiated by grade band and level of study. This should further add to the transparency of grading, while at the same time enabling students to monitor their progress throughout their studies more clearly than already is the case. The panel strongly supports the changes that the Exam Board wants to make in this respect and trusts the programme to further develop their form based on the many positive changes introduced during the period under consideration. It therefore concludes that UCU has a good assessment system in place.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'good'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes
The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Final achievement level
UCU's 'assessment policy plan' and its 'end term matrix' aim to ensure that there is a clear link between course and track objectives and the programme's intended learning outcomes. As mentioned under standard 2, some of the more ambitious intended learning outcomes (intercultural and reflective skills, civic engagement) are achieved through extracurricular activities and/or through UCU's campus setting and the student support system. The panel concludes that the well-designed curriculum with breadth requirements, skills modules, a supportive academic community, and constructively aligned learning outcomes and assessments means that students can achieve the intended learning outcomes. The Exam Board and the Board of Studies check that individual students satisfy the degree requirements.

The panel studied a selection of 15 theses. In the selected theses, the panel looked at research questions, research methodology, argumentation, academic writing, referencing, and data collection. With the exception of two, all theses meet the required standards or easily surpass them. In general, the panel thought the theses displayed interesting, sometimes surprising and challenging topics. In most cases, students tackled these well by bringing together relevant material and presenting persuasive ideas, with accurate referencing and presentation. The two weaker (also lower graded) theses stood out by a lack of analytical depth and clear research question. Here, referencing was incomplete and inconstant. However, there also was a thesis that the panel was extremely impressed with and which it considered an authoritative and erudite piece of work. The panel agreed with the grades given. When the thesis project will be changed into a capstone project, the panel strongly recommends including an interdisciplinary element or another form of cross-programme reflection, as is to a certain degree already being done in the reflexive thesis meetings.

The panel was very impressed by the agency and activity of the student body as represented in the SER. They highlight their 'complaints', but also a clear sense of their willingness to take responsibility for co-creating enhancements, including an awareness of the importance of and commitment to

quality assurance. Their attitude, the panel thinks, is a credit to the programme and shows how successfully they have been trained as independent thinkers and citizens of the College.

Performance of graduates
Most UCU graduates (almost 90%) continue their studies with a master degree, a quarter subsequently continues with a PhD. The panel concludes that most students have a successful academic career after UCU. A high percentage of graduates enrol in highly ranked post-graduate programmes, such as the London School of Economics, Oxford and Cambridge. Approximately 40% of students continue their studies abroad. From talking to graduates, the panel understood that it is relatively easy for them to enter prestigious programmes abroad, as alumni before them have already paved the way. In the graduates' opinion, Dutch universities are less open to the LAS concept. The panel suggests that this is a point of special interest that UCU, together with graduates, could explore further. However, the panel concludes that UCU offers sufficient support to try and get graduates enrolled in the master's programmes that they desire. As stated before, the panel in particular appreciates the role of the Future Centre in this respect.

When comparing themselves to peers, the graduates noted that they seem to have much more experience in academic skills such as writing, presenting and peer reviewing than their peers. Though UCU graduates had followed fewer courses in the discipline of their master's degree programme, they were able to quickly catch up with students from monodisciplinary bachelor's programmes. All were very grateful for the support they had received during their time at UCU and felt they had benefitted a lot from what they had learned at UCU. Without exception, they would choose to follow the same programme again.

UCU has an alumni network (University College Alumni Association), an alumni facebook group and an alumni officer who has constructed a database with addresses. According to the graduates, the alumni network has recently become a lot more active. In November 2017 the College hosted the first Homecoming Day for alumni. Contacts with alumni allow UCU to see how the programme connects to graduates' experiences. Since 2016, UCU alumni have also been involved in organising around 10-15 summer internships for current students. This is another way for UCU to cement its relationship with graduates. The panel is pleased to see that the programme considers its connection to alumni important for the college's future. Alumni are, after all, also able to see in which areas the College stands out and in which it could perform even better.

Considerations
The panel concludes that UCU graduates achieve the learning outcomes, including the more ambitious ones regarding intercultural and reflective skills. In the majority of the theses that the panel read, the student work easily reached or surpassed what may be expected of a monodisciplinary programme at bachelor's level. In most cases, students tackled daring topics by convincingly bringing together relevant material and presenting persuasive ideas. Most UCU graduates continue their studies in a master's programme, often at Utrecht University or abroad and frequently in highly ranked programmes. The fact that graduates perform well in these monodisciplinary programmes, and the fact that 25% continues in a PhD trajectory, is seen as further evidence of the high quality of graduates of this programme.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'good'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel concludes that UCU's approach is truly student-centred: students are encouraged and supported to develop their own programme within and across disciplines. By doing so, students are kept motivated to further develop their intellectual abilities while broadening their interests. The panel considers the programme's 16 end terms clearly articulated and convincingly linked to the Dublin descriptors. The panel is impressed with the attention for international, intercultural and

reflective skills in the ILOs. At the same time, it feels that the ILOs describing 'disciplinary depth', 'broad knowledge' and 'communication skills', could be phrased more precisely, specifying for instance the level achieved or the disciplinary skills acquired. The ILOs could also better specify the role of interdisciplinarity/the interdisciplinary skills that students should have obtained upon graduation (standard 1).

The panel was impressed with UCU's honest and reflective attitude, indicating the confidence of a genuinely development-oriented programme. UCU's educational philosophy links well with its educational practice. UCU offers a varied and stimulating curriculum. Courses have clear outlines, and an 'end term matrix' links learning outcomes at course and track to those at degree level, ensuring that there is a clear link between the courses and the programme's overall aims. The degree requirements ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across and within disciplines. The communication of course objectives and end terms, however, can be further improved. Also, the role that interdisciplinarity plays in the programme needs to be brought more to the foreground. Outreach projects, extracurricular activities and residential housing allow students to develop valuable lifelong skills, for instance leadership, intercultural or managerial skills, which feed back into the programme. UCU has dedicated and professional staff members, who employ innovative teaching strategies. The panel appreciates the teacher-scholarship plans and encourages UCU to further develop these plans. The tutorial system functions well, but the panel recommends communicating more clearly what the different support systems (tutors, Student Life Officers, Writing and Skills Center, Futures Centre) set out to do, and what the extent and limits of support are. UCU has a peer support system and meditation rooms. The panel sees the fact that students initiated and organise these initiatives as a testimony of the community spirit and the sense of solidarity amongst students (standard 2).

UCU has spent considerable attention to assessment in the past years. The panel is pleased to see that the programme now has a good Assessment Policy Plan in place, which aims to ensure, amongst other things, that assessment and grading practices become more transparent. It commends the programme on these changes and on its plans to keep prioritising the coordination of assessment in the near future (standard 3).

The panel concludes that UCU graduates achieve the learning outcomes, including the more ambitious ones regarding intercultural and reflective skills. In the majority of the theses that the panel read, the student work easily reached or surpassed what may be expected of a monodisciplinary programme at bachelor's level. In most cases, students tackled daring topics by convincingly bringing together relevant material and presenting persuasive ideas. Most UCU graduates continue their studies in a master's programme, often at Utrecht University or abroad and frequently in highly ranked programmes. The fact that graduates perform well in these monodisciplinary programmes, and the fact that 25% continues in a PhD trajectory, is seen as further evidence of the high quality of graduates of this programme (standard 4).

The panel assesses all standards as 'good'. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, the panel therefore assesses the programme as 'good'.

Conclusion
The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences* as 'good'.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF SMALL-SCALE AND INTENSIVE EDUCATION

Introduction
The bachelor's programme under review is offered by Utrecht University. UCU was founded in 1998. It is a small-scale, selective, intensive, English-taught honours college and a separate track of the Liberal Arts and Sciences programme at Utrecht University. Given the prominence of its educational approach, the bachelor's programme was awarded the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education in 2012. This allows UCU to select new students up to its full College capacity of students. A four-step admission procedure has been established for this purpose. In addition to the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme, which is discussed separately in the preceding chapter of this report, the panel performed a practice-based assessment to verify whether the distinctive, small-scale and intensive character of the bachelor's programme can be reaffirmed. Two panel members were specifically trained and appointed by the NVAO to lead the assessment of this Distinctive Feature. The practice-based assessment took place on 24-25 September 2018 in combination with the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme.

The practice-based assessment pays attention to the following 'areas of improvement' as formulated by the panel of the initial assessment of the Distinctive Feature in 2012:
- revision and reformulation of some of the intended learning outcomes
- status and implementation of inter- and multidisciplinarity in the curriculum
- engagement of UU-staff in extracurricular activities
- career development opportunities for UCU staff
- laboratory facilities for students

These areas of improvement will be discussed under Standards A, B, C, E, and G.

A. Intended learning outcomes
The intended learning outcomes are not only aimed at achieving a high level in the relevant academic discipline and/or professional practice, but also have a broader aim: to train socially skilled and initiative-rich scholars and/or professionals with a wide interest in social developments and issues within a multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary context.

Findings
Standing in the liberal arts tradition that seeks to free the individual through intellectual and ethical engagement, Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) programmes encourage inquiry through profoundly open curricula that allow students to explore a diversity of academic fields. Often conducted in a strongly international context, LAS programmes promote intercultural understanding, abilities, and societal engagement.

The self-evaluation report describes the three goals of 'liberal learning' at UCU as follows: (1) to free students from pre-set aims and perspectives so as to flourish as individuals and citizens; (2) to prepare students for a meaningful, continued education and career; (3) to enable students to become part of a vibrant, intercultural community. The programme has a strong international outlook and takes a student-centred and student-managed approach: guided by their tutor, students compose their curriculum within and across the three disciplinary based departments: Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities.

UCU has formulated sixteen 'end terms'. These intended learning outcomes are divided over nine categories: (1) Disciplinary depth (ILO 1-2), (2) Broad knowledge (ILO 3), (3) Thinking skills (ILO 4-6), (4) Communication skills (ILO 7), (5) Learning skills (ILO 8-9), (6) Research skills (ILO 10), (7) International and intercultural orientation (ILO 11-13), (8) Societal orientation (ILO 14), and (9)

Other skills (ILO 15-16). A table in the SER links the sixteen end terms to the Dublin Descriptors. The panel notes that the intended learning outcomes are clearly articulated and convincingly linked to the Dublin descriptors.

The ILOs include specific skills associated with liberal arts and sciences, such as international, intercultural and reflective skills. The panel is in particular enthusiastic about learning outcomes 12-14 ('Graduates understand and can reflect on cultural differences', 'Graduates reflect on their own value system in relation to that of others' and 'Graduates are able to apply knowledge and skills towards solutions for societal solutions'), which it considers ambitious. Having said that, the panel recommends including 'societal diversity' in learning outcome 12. More importantly, the panel feels that ILOs 1-3, 7 and 11 could be phrased in a less generic and more specific way. For instance, ILO11 ('Graduates can speak foreign languages') could specify the level of proficiency that students are expected to reach. On a more general level, the panel also felt that interdisciplinarity could be more explicitly addressed in the ILOs. It is now mentioned implicitly in ILO3: 'Graduates can apply knowledge and skills obtained in different disciplines to an academic problem'. Finally, the ILOs could be more explicitly oriented at academic bachelor level.

The previous assessment panel shared some of the current panel's concerns regarding the ILOs. That panel also advised to make the status of interdisciplinarity in the end terms clearer. In addition, the previous panel recommended formulating the ILOs concerning 'a broad knowledge base and skills in multi- and interdisciplinary thinking' in a clearer, more comprehensive way. The current panel concludes that, even though UCU has revised and improved its ILOs by including the breadth of an LAS education more structurally, it could have improved even more by taken the panel's recommendations regarding interdisciplinarity to heart.

Considerations

UCU's intended learning outcomes reflect the College's interpretation of liberal learning. UCU appears to be an admirably honest and self-reflective organisation. Its ILOs are clearly described and pay sufficient attention to disciplinary depth, a broad knowledge base, skills associated with thinking, communication, learning and research, intercultural and reflective skills. Some ILOs could be phrased more precisely and the panel advises the programme to address interdisciplinarity more explicitly in the ILOs. Currently, UCU is in the process of further fine-tuning its profile and ILOs. The panel has every faith in this process and in the changes that will follow from it. As a result, it is confident that UCU meets the standard.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard A as 'meets the standard'.

B. Relationship between the goals and content of the programme
The content of the programme is inseparably connected to relevant extra-curricular activities, which ensures a high level and broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes.

Findings

The panel explored the relationship between UCU's curriculum and its main goals and intended learning outcomes. The panel concludes that UCU offers a varied and stimulating curriculum, which enables students to choose from a wide range of subjects. Course outlines clearly describe the course objectives, course level, teaching formats and assessment form. In addition to course outlines, UCU has formulated learning goals at track level and intended learning outcomes at degree level. The learning outcomes of the separate tracks are stated in track manuals. An 'end term matrix' links learning outcomes at course and track to those at degree level, thus ensuring that there is a clear link between the courses and the programme's overall aims. The requirement that students must follow at least one course in every discipline, as well as the other degree requirements and the

language requirement, ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across and within disciplines.

The panel is enthusiastic about the application of skills through outreach projects such as the UCU East Africa Project, the Aruba Program and the Alumni Internship Program. It also is pleased to hear that UCU has clear development plans for embedding civic engagement, making skills development more explicit, and enhancing the integration of disciplines and interdisciplinarity in the curriculum. The panel does point out that the latter was already one of the recommendations of the previous assessment panel. That panel advised UCU to make inter- and multidisciplinarity more clear in the curriculum and in course descriptions, so students learn to act and think in an interdisciplinary way. Though the current panel appreciates that courses do not need to be labelled 'interdisciplinary' to have an interdisciplinary nature, it does recommend bringing the interdisciplinarity of the programme much more to the forefront. The panel is pleased to see that the curriculum now includes 13 interdisciplinary courses and that this number will grow further. It thinks that the concluding capstone project should ideally also include an interdisciplinary element.

Of course, a 'broadening of interest' also means that students are encouraged to step outside their comfort zone and try and explore new subjects and activities. The students at UCU testified that this clearly is the case at UCU. In addition to curricular activities, students participate in many co- and extracurricular activities. They are automatically members of UCSA, the University College Student Association. USCA has 39 student committees and offers a broad range of activities. ranging from theatre to games night, and from different kinds of sport to meditation and yoga sessions. Extra-curricular activities allow students to develop new skills that they will benefit from in their course work and their future career.

Considerations
The panel concludes that there is a clear link between course objective, track outlines, extra-curricular activities and intended learning outcomes. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. Outreach projects and extracurricular activities feed back into the programme and help students to develop academic and personal skills and a sense of civic responsibility. The panel is pleased to hear that UCU has clear development plans for embedding civic engagement and for making skills development more explicit.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard B as 'meets the standard'.

C. Structure and didactic concept
The concept of the programme is aimed at creating an academic and/or professional community. Key terms are small-scale and intensively organised education, leading to a high number of hours of face-to-face teaching, close involvement between students and teachers and between students among themselves and socially relevant extra-curricular activities.

Findings
The teaching methods at UCU follow UU's conditions for small-scale and intensive education. The maximum class size is 28 students, in order to create a safe environment to exchange ideas, arguments and feedback. However, in most classes the number of students is considerably lower. The teaching format depends on the teacher, the course subject and the level. But in all courses, students are stimulated to participate actively in group discussions. Some level 3 courses use student-led sessions (up to 50% of the total) that can take any shape the students see fit. In addition, the programme used participatory design in another course ('Intercultural Communication for Global Citizenship') which was co-created by the students and the teacher. The programme also involves honours-led student courses, for which students choose a topic and organise a seminar.

At UCU, students complete approximately 24 courses, 4 courses per semester. Students have 16 hours of face-to-face teaching per week (4 classes times 4 hours). In addition, they are expected to spend 40 hours on self-study. This results in an intensive workload of 56 hours per week. In the SER, students point out that a workload of 56 hours is very high. Though some students thrive under pressure, others do not. In the regular assessment report, the panel has discussed the workload in more detail, suggesting possibilities to reduce the number of assignments and creating more flexibility for students that are struggling. UCU students have set up a peer support system and meditation rooms. The panel sees the fact that students initiated and organise these initiatives as a positive sign of the community and the sense of solidarity amongst students.

As mentioned under Standard B, UCU students are closely involved in many extracurricular activities. UCU also has a meditation/prayer room, a drama room, a gym, a sport pitch and basketball court, and a student-run bar. Some activities are more socially relevant than others. Two student-led groups that explicitly aim for community engagement are Enactus UCU (since 2005) and Town and Gown (2016). The first aims at using enterpreneurial power to create a better world, the second at interaction with the local community through dialogue activities. The panel appreciates these initiatives, and concludes that these are in line with one of the hallmarks of a LAS programme, civic engagement.

During the site visit, the panel met very dedicated and committed teachers who felt very much involved with their students and UCU's community at large. This seems to be at odds with the students' observation that there could be more interaction with the teachers outside class, but may be the result of differences in perception and expectation. The panel is aware that UCU, as the oldest university college of the Netherlands, is now a mature college, with longstanding traditions and established events – both among staff and students. It may be fruitful for the interaction between students and staff to look at the range of events and traditions and discuss them together. Also, UCU may want to look for fresh connections and, perhaps, new initiatives to avoid losing some of the freshness, in the way it perceives and defines its community, which perhaps comes more natural to a young institution. Having said that, the panel was very impressed with the involvement of students in the programme and with the way the student voice is generally heard. The panel saw, in that respect, plenty of respect for the perceived need for community spirit at UCU. It thus fully trusts staff and students to solve this puzzle within the community.

Considerations
The panel verified that the set-up of the programme, including its residential setting, is aimed at creating a social, academic challenging community. Classes are small-scale, and students have 16 hours of face-to-face teaching during semester. Another 40 hours are reserved for self-study. This results in an intensive workload during term time. Students are well represented at all levels of the programme and the student voice is generally well heard. Students are closely involved in curriculum development and sometimes also in course development. The panel encourages staff and students to look for fresh connections and new initiatives to foster and renew the community spirit that UCU has successfully developed over the years.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard C as 'meets the standard'.

D. Intake
The programme has a sound selection procedure in place, aimed at admitting motivated and academically and/or professionally talented students.

Findings
UCU has a four-step selection process. After checking all applications for completeness and pre-requisites, students are selected for interviews, which are then conducted (either in person or via

Skype) by members of staff. The final step is deciding whether students are accepted, rejected or placed on a waiting list. Various groups are involved at various stages of this selection process, which, according to UCU, involves most of the teaching and support staff. In 2017-2018, the interviews were for the first time scheduled on designated days. UCU feels that this has increased the sense of responsibility among interviewers and created a sense of solidarity between the candidates who were interviewed on the same day. The interviews explicitly focused not only on grades and English proficiency, but also on broader motivation regarding liberal arts and sciences, learning in general, and living at a residential college. The candidates' cultural background was also taken into account, but not as a selection criterion.

The number of complete applications that UCU received in the assessment period has fluctuated between 802 (2012/2013) and 951 (2016/2017). In 2017-2018, 875 prospective students completed the application. The number of students selected for an interview has gradually gone down, from 82% of the total number of applicants in 2012/2013 to 66% in 2017/2018 (the SER incorrectly states 60%). After the interview, on average 46% of the applicants were invited to study at UCU. Most years, more than half of them accepted this offer and started the programme. This equals approximately 29% of the total applicants. In 2012-2013, 256 students started the programme, and in 2017-2018 there were 251 new students. On the basis of the description of the selection process and the admission data, the panel concludes that UCU has a robust selection process in place. There is a lot of attention for students' personal interests and motivation to study at this particular LAS college. The panel thinks scheduling the interviews on one day is a good initiative for the same reasons that UCU already mentions.

The domain-specific framework of reference states that LAS programs 'strive for diversity in their student population in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender and cultural and socio-economic backgrounds'. As a result, the assessment panel discussed the diversity of students and staff at the various LAS colleges. UCU is doing very well in terms of attracting different nationalities. Roughly 75 nationalities are represented at UCU. Around half of the students come from the Netherlands, the other half comes from abroad and/or has a double nationality (including Dutch). UCU itself acknowledges that the programme is above all attractive to students 'whose backgrounds are relatively privileged'. The students agree that there is a lack of socio-economic diversity.

This subject was discussed in more detail during the site visit. The students said that, in the discussion, they were missing the viewpoint that LAS can be a less attractive prospect for students from less affluent backgrounds. There are more scholarships (including partial scholarships) needed than there are available, and the workload makes it hard to have a paid job alongside UCU. But above all, LAS is perceived as a less attractive option, as it does not prepare students for a particular profession. From the SER, the panel learned that UCU has already set up a diversity task force in 2016 to raise additional funds and re-examine admissions procedure, as well as to collaborate with local schools and make the curriculum more global and inclusive. In the meeting with the programme management, the management also explained that UCU is involved in a UU programme that aims to address diversity issues versus UCU's expectations.

The panel is pleased with the initiatives UCU has taken to increase diversity at the College. It remarked that the 'holistic approach' that UCU prides itself on, could be utilized more here: UCU is able to offer a global diversity of experiences, due to students' different backgrounds. The panel also believes that the diversity task group can help identify patterns in the selection process that UCU might be unaware of. An 'unconscious bias training' might perhaps helps interviewers to see such patterns. In addition, the panel thinks the programme may benefit from the task force conducting an equalities analysis of student retention and attainment, and staff contracts/status/pay to highlight any 'gaps' or inequalities that correlate to gender, socio-economic background, ethnicity/overseas status, disability, or age. For example, are more women than men on teaching-only contracts and are women therefore being disadvantaged by the known lack of opportunities for progression? Summing up, the panel's recommendation is to think through social diversity in mission, admission, learning outcomes, and learning environment.

Considerations

The panel is satisfied with the quantity and quality of UCU's intake. UCU has a good selection procedure in place, resulting in a good match between students entering the programme and the programme's main goals and intended learning outcomes. The panel appreciates the initiatives UCU has taken to increase diversity at the College, and it suggested that the programme might also benefit from conducting an equalities analysis to identify possible gaps and inequalities.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard D as 'meets the standard'.

E. Quality of staff

The teachers have high-quality knowledge of the relevant subject and feel involved in the distinctive nature of the programme.

Findings

UCU's curriculum is delivered by UCU teachers and teachers based at Utrecht University. This mix aims to ensure that UCU teaching is firmly embedded in research conducted at UU. The majority of UCU teachers holds a PhD, 30 UCU teachers have obtained a University Teaching Qualification, and another 8 UCU teachers (app. 17%) have a Senior Teaching Qualification. The majority of UCU teachers (70%) has a Dutch passport, 30% comes from abroad. Half of the teachers are also tutors, usually to around 33 students each. Eight teachers are track fellows. UCU invests extensively in innovative ways of teaching. 5 staff members have completed UU's educational leadership programme and 10 others completed the 'Honours Teaching programme'. New teachers at UCU are introduced to UCU's educational system and philosophy in a half-day workshop. UCU also takes the lead in offering a 'UC Liberal Arts program', a series of workshops tailored to teaching in an LAS environment.

The panel studied the research expertise of UCU staff members and concludes that they together represent a wide variety of fields. The available expertise is well tuned to the various academic demands of UCU's courses and tracks. The panel also notes that the teachers are deeply committed to the liberal arts and sciences values, and that their courses show various innovative, student-centred ways of learning. According to the panel, the teaching staff has the required level to teach in this small-scale, intensive programme. The panel also took into account that the students spoke well of their teachers, describing them as very dedicated and professional. Students that had taken courses at UU mentioned how much they appreciated the fact that teachers at UCU had more time for them.

The previous assessment panel urged UCU to pay more attention to career development plans for UCU staff. Recently, the College has secured funding from the university to support faculty members in their role as 'teacher-scholars'. As a result, UCU members with at least a 0.6 fte appointment and without structural research tasks have been allotted 10% of their time 'to maintain and develop a scholarly approach to their teaching'. The amount of dedicated research time will go up to 15% by the end of 2019. Other measures taken to increase professional development opportunities for staff include regular sabbatical leaves (every tenth month), small research grants, enhanced mobility of teachers within UU, other University Colleges and international partner organisations, the appointment of a 'director of faculty development' and, finally, clear tenure criteria in the new staff hiring policy. The panel commends UCU on these initiatives and think they are an appropriate response to the recommendation made by the previous panel. From talking to the teachers, the panel learned that they find the notion of scholarship a very fruitful one, as it opens up a less predetermined understanding of research and scholarship and gives them the opportunity to connect disciplines. They see combining a teaching and research path as a good horizon to work towards. The teachers highly valued the options for personal development that UCU already offers, and they hope that the

new criteria will also make it easier for them to move forward in a tenure track. Finally, the panel is pleased to hear that the diversity of staff is also one of the aims of the new hiring policy.

Considerations
The panel notes that the teachers are deeply committed to the liberal arts and sciences values, and that their courses show various innovative, student-centred ways of learning. Teachers are properly trained and qualified to deliver small-scale, intensive teaching and the available expertise is well tuned to the various academic demands of UCU's courses and tracks. The programme has shown impressive progress regarding career opportunities for staff.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard E as 'meets the standard'.

F. Number of staff
There is sufficient staff available to provide small-scale and intensive education and to ensure and develop individual contact between teachers and students.

Findings
In 2017-2018 UCU employed 48 staff members. That year, UCU staff provided roughly half of the classes, the other half was taught by colleagues from UU. In addition, there was 10.5 fte support staff on a population of 710 students. The staff-student ratio, including UU staff and support staff, ranged from 1:15 (2012-2013) to 1:14 (2017-2018). If the available hours of non-academic support staff are added to these calculations, the staff-student ratio is 1:12. The panel considers this a good ratio for intensive, small-scale teaching.

Considerations
UCU has sufficient staff to fulfil the demands posed upon a small-scale, intensive programme. Staff is professional and dedicated and the programme benefits from a low staff to student ratio.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard F as 'meets the standard'.

G. Available facilities
The programme has its own infrastructure with facilities for small-scale and intensive education and common extra-curricular social activities.

Findings
UCU is housed in former military barracks within close reach of Utrecht City Centre. UCU is a residential college, but students may request to live off-campus in the last year of the programme. Approximately a quarter of third year students live off campus, the majority lives on campus. The panel visited the student housing during the site visit, and it considers these facilities fit for purpose. It appreciates how UCU is actively trying to encourage the community spirit by mixing the students at the start of every new academic year; this seems to be working well. To ease the transition from high school to UCU and to welcome exchange students, the College and USCA organise an UCU introduction week at the start of every new semester. These and other social events (start and end of semester dinners and parties, performances, festivals) are also meant to foster the community feeling at UCU. The panel values these initiatives.

The panel received a tour of the educational buildings and classrooms. UCU's classrooms are housed in three separate buildings around a quad. Classrooms can house up to 28 students, and each building also has one or two computer rooms, which can be used by groups of students or individual

students. The panel also visited UCU's teaching lab, which is part of UU's digital teaching innovation project Educate-it, and which aims to stimulate innovation through digital tools and media. The staff rooms, the Writing Centre and the Futures Center are distributes among the classrooms. This makes it easier for the students to contact the teachers or to use the support facilities.

The study spaces have been refurbished in the fall of 2018, but large-scale renovations will not take place until 2022. After hearing student and staff concerns regarding campus renovations, the panel encourages the university to bring the renovations forward. According to the students, the renovations should also include better access for wheelchair users, and better light and ventilation in some of the study spaces. In general, the panel concludes that UCU has a spacious learning environment which integrates staff and students and which includes a 'teaching lab' space for innovative pedagogies. The College offers a supportive community but is also flexible for those who want to live off-campus.

The previous assessment panel noted that students and graduates would (have) liked the opportunity to follow laboratory classes, preferably as part of the curriculum. This suggestion has been taken to heart. UCU now offers science students short lab courses in very concise periods of 2.5 weeks in the summer or winter period.

As mentioned before, UCU has a very active student association that organises many activities on campus, ranging from theatre to games night, and from different kinds of sport to meditation and yoga sessions. Students also benefit from additional facilities such as a meditation/prayer room, a drama room, a gym, a sport pitch and basketball court, and a student-run bar.

Reflecting on their time at UCU, graduates noted that fellow students had become close friends, with whom they still continue to debate. The fact that many graduates move abroad helps alumni to benefit from a social network in many cities around the world. According to them, the 'bubble' at UCU is what students create themselves. A downside of life on campus can be that the social pressure of always being on campus can be stressful. A huge benefit of the campus setting, the graduates pointed out, is that students can try many new things at the same time, without many logistical challenges.

Considerations
The panel concludes that UCU's facilities help create a good teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard G as 'meets the standard'.

H. Level realised
The content and the level of the final projects are in line with the level and the broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes. Graduates are admitted to prestigious postgraduate programmes and/or jobs. The success rates are substantially higher than those of other relevant programmes.

Findings

Final achievement level
The panel studied a selection of 15 theses. With the exception of two, all theses meet the required standards or easily surpass them. In general, the panel thought the theses displayed interesting, sometimes surprising and challenging topics. In most cases, students tackled these well by bringing together relevant material and presenting persuasive ideas, with accurate referencing and presentation. The two weaker (also lower graded) theses stood out by a lack of analytical depth and

clear research question. Here, referencing was incomplete and inconstant. However, there also was a thesis that the panel was extremely impressed with and which it considered an authoritative and erudite piece of work. The panel agreed with the grades given. When the thesis project will be changed into a capstone project, the panel strongly recommends including an interdisciplinary element or another form of cross-programme reflection, as is to a certain degree already being done in the reflexive thesis meetings.

Performance of graduates
Most UCU graduates (almost 90%) continue their studies with a master degree, a quarter subsequently continues with a PhD. The panel concludes that most students have a successful academic career after UCU. A high percentage of graduates enrol in highly ranked post-graduate programmes, such as the London School of Economics, Oxford and Cambridge. Approximately 40% of students continue their studies abroad. From talking to graduates, the panel understood that it is relatively easy for them to enter prestigious programmes abroad, as alumni before them have already paved the way. In the graduates' opinion, Dutch universities are less open to the LAS concept. The panel concludes that UCU offers sufficient support to try and get graduates enrolled in the master's programmes that they desire. As stated before, the panel in particular appreciates the role of the Future Centre in this respect.

Success rates
Approximately 75% of UCU students complete the programme in three years, and approximately 90% graduates within 4 years. The average study duration is 6.3 semesters. The dropout rates are low, most students that quit the programme without a diploma do so in the first year. In the assessment period, on average 6.4% of 'drop out students' left during the first year, and 3.4% left after the first year. The number of students leaving the programme prematurely is more or less stable, with a peak in 2016-2017 when 25 students left UCU during the first year. This number went down significantly in the following year, when only 5 students left UCU during the first year. The panel interprets this a sign that students have more realistic expectations and/or are better supported during their first year at UCU.

Considerations
The level of the selected theses, studied by the panel, is considered good. In their theses, students often tackle daring subjects and they succeed well in doing so. Graduation rates have been very high from the start, at approximately 90%. The majority of students (75%) graduates without any study delay. Graduates enrol in highly ranked master's programmes in the Netherlands or abroad. No less than a quarter subsequently starts a PhD trajectory. The fact that they have no major problems in being admitted into master's programmes, and the fact that graduates perform well in these programmes, compared with their peers, is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard H as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

UCU's intended learning outcomes reflect the College's interpretation of liberal learning. UCU appears to be an admirably honest and self-reflective organisation. Its ILOs are clearly described and pay sufficient attention to disciplinary depth, a broad knowledge base, skills associated with thinking, communication, learning and research, intercultural and reflective skills. Some ILOs could be phrased more precisely and the panel advises the programme to address interdisciplinarity more explicitly in the ILOs. Currently, UCU is in the process of further fine-tuning its profile and ILOs. The panel has every faith in this process and it the changes that will follow from it. As a result, it is confident that UCU meets the standard (Standard A).

The programme's content is inseparably connected to relevant extra-curricular activities and co-curricular activities. The panel concludes that there is a clear link between course objectives, track outlines, extra-curricular activities and intended learning outcomes. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. Outreach projects and extracurricular activities feed back into the programme and help students to develop academic and personal skills and a sense of civic responsibility. The panel is pleased to hear that UCU has clear development plans for embedding civic engagement and for making skills development in the curriculum more explicit (Standard B).

The panel verified that the set-up of the programme, including its residential setting, is aimed at creating a social, academic challenging community. Classes are small-scale, and students have 16 hours of face-to-face teaching during semester. Another 40 hours are reserved for self-study. This results in an intensive workload during term time. Students are well represented at all levels of the programme and the student voice is generally well heard. Students are closely involved in curriculum development and sometimes also in course development. The panel encourages staff and students to look for fresh connections and new initiatives to foster and renew the community spirit that UCU has successfully developed over the years (Standard C).

The panel is satisfied with the quantity and quality of UCU's intake. UCU has an elaborate admission procedure in place, resulting in a good match between students entering the programme and the programme's main goals and intended learning outcomes (Standard D).

The panel notes that the teachers are deeply committed to the liberal arts and sciences values, and that their courses show various innovative, student-centred ways of learning. The available expertise is well tuned to the various academic demands of UCU's courses and tracks. The programme has shown impressive progress regarding career opportunities for staff (Standard E).

UCU has sufficient staff to fulfil the demands posed upon a small-scale, intensive programme. Staff is professional and dedicated and the programme benefits from a low staff to student ratio (Standard F).

The panel concludes that UCU's facilities help create a good teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities (Standard G).

The level of the selected theses, studied by the panel, is considered good. In their theses, students often tackle daring subjects and they succeed well in doing so. Graduation rates have been very high from the start, at approximately 90%. The majority of students (75%) graduates without any study delay. Graduates enrol in highly ranked master's programmes in the Netherlands or abroad (40%). No less than a quarter subsequently starts a PhD trajectory. The fact that they have no major problems in being admitted into master's programmes, and the fact that graduates perform well in these programmes, compared with their peers, is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard (Standard H).

Practice-based assessment
With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that UCU meets all standards. The panel was impressed with the graduates that UCU delivers and the quality of their work. In its assessment under Standards A, B, C, E, and G, the panel also paid specific attention to the formulation of intended learning outcomes, status and implementation of inter- and multidisciplinarity in the curriculum, engagement of UU-staff in extracurricular activities, career development opportunities for UCU staff, and laboratory facilities for students, as these were identified as 'areas of improvement' in the 2012 assessment.

The panel sees that the programme has clearly improved by incorporating inter- and multidisciplinary more clearly in the curriculum, for instance in the 13 dedicated interdisciplinary courses (a number

that is growing) and in the new plans for interdisciplinary capstone project. The panel also appreciates the programme's plans to better highlight what it is already doing in terms of inter- and multidisciplinarity in the intended learning outcomes, and to keep improving in this respect.

Following previous recommendations, UCU now offers laboratory courses as part of the curriculum.

The panel believes that the perceived lack of UU-staff participating in extra-curricular activities, as expressed by the students, might be the result of differences in perception by and expectations of students and staff. The panel saw two very committed groups jointly working towards the same goals within UCU's highly international and tight-knit community. Nevertheless the panel suggested it may be fruitful for the interaction between students and staff to look at the range of events and traditions together and discuss anew what defines and what could possibly strengthen UCU' sense of community.

Finally, UCU has made important steps forward regarding career development opportunities for staff members. Despite these important improvements, career development will remain a point of special attention at UCU in the coming years. The panel appreciates that UCU relies on Utrecht University's support to offer UCU staff members clear career tracks. Therefore, the panel does not see career development as a topic that should prevent the programme from successfully passing the practice-based assessment.

The improvement shown, the development plans, and the fact that all criteria meet the standard, result in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature by the panel and a positive advice regarding the practice-based assessment.

Conclusion
The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

This reference framework is intended for the Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) programs in the Netherlands. This includes selective University Colleges as well as non-selective LAS programs situated within a university. These programmes are a constituent part of Dutch "scientific" or "scholarly" education (wetenschappelijk onderwijs). The LAS education framework articulated here distinguishes itself from (emerging) broad programs through its proximity to academic inquiry and research and through its commitment to wide-ranging intellectual formation not chiefly aimed at preparing students for particular professions.

As this accreditation process is reviewing an ever more diverse range of programs, this framework of reference is short rather than extensive. Rather, it is a reference framework that reflects shared educational aims with each of the programs under review.

Liberal arts and Sciences emphasises intellectual growth through both broad and deep learning as the foundation of the curriculum. Standing in the liberal arts tradition that seeks to free the individual through intellectual and ethical engagement, LAS encourages inquiry through profoundly open curricula that allows students to explore a diversity of academic fields from the Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. This enables them to attain depth in disciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary concentration areas of their own choosing. By combining the disciplinary depth and multi- or interdisciplinary learning with undergraduate research and communication skills, students develop their creativity, initiative-taking, skills in working together. Often conducted in a strongly international context, LAS programs regardless of setting promote intercultural understanding abilities and societal engagement.

LAS takes place within distinct learning and social communities. The formal program and extracurricular activities are often linked and in such cases students, faculty and staff participate actively in the governance of the program and the community. Teaching and learning experiences are typically characterized by small-scale and intensive education, with a high level of interaction between students and teachers and among students themselves. Giving this emphasis on active discussion and debate, LAS programs strive for diversity in their student population in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender and cultural and socio-economic backgrounds and offer dynamic environments that invite curricular experimentation and educational innovation and attract academics dedicated to excellence in teaching.

Liberal Arts & Sciences programs have intended learning outcomes that include:
a. multidisciplinary familiarity in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences combined with depth of knowledge in a chosen concentration area;
b. ability to approach complex questions or issues in an inter- or multidisciplinary way;
c. advanced academic skills in communication, quantitative and qualitative methods, critical thinking, research and learning;
d. attitudes and skills for engaged citizenship, including international and intercultural understanding, social skills and a will to contribute to solving societal issues;
e. intellectual curiosity, reflexivity, integrity and an open mind, learning skills necessary for subsequent graduate studies and the workplace.

Approved in Tilburg on October 25, 2017 by
• Dean Amsterdam University College: prof. dr. Murray Pratt
• Dean Erasmus University College: prof. dr. Maarten Frens
• Dean Leiden University College The Hague: prof. dr. Judi Mesman
• Dean University College Groningen: prof. dr. Hans van Ees
• Dean University College Maastricht: prof dr. Matthieu Zegers
• Dean University College Roosevelt: prof. dr. Bert van den Brink
• Dean University College Tilburg: prof dr. Alkeline van Lenning
• Dean University College Twente: prof. dr. Jennifer Herek

- Dean University College Utrecht: prof. dr. James Kennedy
- Director Liberal Arts and Sciences @ Utrecht University: dr. Iris van der Tuin

APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Disciplinary depth
1. Graduates can demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant questions, theories, and conventions of the domain and its embedding
2. Graduates can use the domain knowledge, and apply the concepts and theories to concrete problems

Broad knowledge
3. Graduates can apply knowledge and skills obtained in different disciplines to an academic problem

Thinking skills
4. Graduates can demonstrate a cohesive, consistent, and logical reasoning
5. Graduates have a critical approach to problems
6. Graduates can demonstrate a reflective and self-critical attitude

Communication skills
7. Graduates can communicate efficiently following proper conventions for the discipline

Learning skills
8. Graduates know how and where to search for material and assess the relevance of resources
9. Graduates can demonstrate metacognitive skills such as time management, monitor their progress, and reflect on this

Research skills
10. Under supervision, graduates can formulate a relevant research question, translate this to a research plan; conduct the study, analyze, interpret and report in the results following proper conventions

International and intercultural orientation
11. Graduates can speak foreign languages
12. Graduates understand and can reflect on cultural differences
13. Graduates reflect on their own value system in relation to that of others

Societal orientation
14. Graduates are able to apply knowledge and skills towards solutions for societal issues

Other skills
15. Graduates can collaborate professionally with others and provide and receive constructive feedback
16. Graduates can make well-informed choices for their future plans after graduation

APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

(Source: Liberal Arts and Sciences University College Utrecht, Self-evaluation report 2018, chapter 2.)

The structure of the curriculum

The essential curricular building block is a 7.5 EC course. Students take four courses per semester (15 weeks around a one-week midterm break). The three-year bachelor program consists of six regular semesters, but students can also take courses or do internships during the shorter winter and summer terms.

Students build their curricular pathways by means of the courses offered by the three departments (Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities). In their individualized curricular trajectories, UCU students acquire in-depth disciplinary knowledge and an understanding of the breadth of academic fields. The latter is essential for us as Liberal Arts and Sciences college; therefore, the students have a breadth requirement, having to complete at least one 7.5 EC course from each of the three departments in their first year. An additional breadth requirement is taking a 7.5 EC Language & Culture course, academically introducing students to a different culture.

Students declare a major, which means that they complete two tracks within the different disciplines. In most cases, the disciplines are classic academic disciplines, but they may also be thematic fields of study. The requirement for a major is achieved by completing 75 EC (ten courses) and a 15 EC thesis.

See overview for courses, tracks and EC.

OSIRIS	Level	Dept.	Track	Course name	Fall	Spring	Winter	Summer	EC
UCACCACA11	1	ACC	ACA	Research in Context	8	1			7.5
UCACCMAT01	1	ACC	MAT	Mathematics for Liberal Arts and Science	1	1			7.5
UCACCMET12	1	ACC	MET	Research in Practice: M&S for Social Scientists	3	3			7.5
UCACCMET22	2	ACC	MET	Applied Multivariate Statistics (summer)				2	7.5
UCACCMET23	2	ACC	MET	Applied Multivariate Statistics	1	2			5
UCACCMET24	2	ACC	MET	Qualitative Inquiry in Everyday Life	1	0			7.5
UCACCMET25	2	ACC	MET	The Humanities Lab: Logic and Discourse	1	1			7.5
UCACCMET2A	2	ACC	MET	Analysis of Behavioral Data	0	1			2.5
UCACCMET2B	2	ACC	MET	Analysis of Societal Data	1	0			2.5
UCACCMET2C	2	ACC	MET	Analysis of Econometric Data	1	0			2.5
UCACCMET2D	2	ACC	MET	Qualitative Research Techniques	0	1			2.5
UCACCMET2E	2	ACC	MET	Predicate Logic	1	1			2.5
UCACCMET2F	2	ACC	MET	Rhetoric	0	1			2.5
UCACCMET2G	2	ACC	MET	Stylistics	1	0			7.5
UCACCMET2J	2	ACC	MET	Data Analysis for Liberal Arts and Science	0	0	1		5
UCACCMET31	3	ACC	MET	Structural Equation Modeling	0	1			7.5
UCACCPHY2A	2	ACC	MET	Advanced Exercises Physics and Mathematics 1	1	0			2.5
UCACCPHY2B	2	ACC	MET	Advanced Exercises Physics and Mathematics 2	0	1			2.5
UCACCSTA21	2	ACC	MET	Biostatistics	1	1			7.5
UCACCWRI21	2	ACC	WRI	Creative Writing	0	1			7.5
UCACCWRI31	3	ACC	WRI	International Journalism	1	0			7.5
UCHUMCHI11	1	HUM	CHI	Introduction to Chinese Language and Culture	1	0			7.5
UCHUMCHI22	2	HUM	CHI	Chinese Language and Culture II - TUTORIAL ONLY	0	1			7.5
UCHUMCHI32	3	HUM	CHI	Chinese Language and Culture III - TUTORIAL ONLY	1	0			7.5
UCHUMCHI33	3	HUM	CHI	Chinese Language and Culture IV - TUTORIAL ONLY	0	1			7.5
UCHUMCLA11	1	HUM	CLA	Latin Language and Culture I	1	0			7.5
UCHUMCLA12	1	HUM	CLA	Ancient Literature and History	0	1			7.5
UCHUMCLA22	2	HUM	LIT	The Tragic Condition: Greek Drama and Beyond	1	0			7.5
UCHUMCLA31	3	HUM	CLA	Latin Language and Culture III	1	0			7.5
UCHUMDUT10	1	HUM	L&C	Beginner Dutch	1	1			7.5
UCHUMDUT11	1	HUM	L&C	Dutch Language and Culture I	1	1			7.5
UCHUMDUT21	2	HUM	L&C	Dutch Language and Culture II	0	1			7.5
UCHUMDUT22	2	HUM	L&C	Dutch L&C II for bi-linguals (max 10)	1	0			7.5
UCHUMFRE11	1	HUM	L&C	French Language and Culture I	1	1			7.5
UCHUMFRE21	2	HUM	L&C	French Language and Culture II	1	1			7.5
UCHUMGER11	1	HUM	L&C	German Language and Culture I	1	0			7.5
UCHUMGER21	2	HUM	L&C	German Language and Culture II	0	1			7.5
UCHUMHAR11	1	HUM	HAR	Introduction to Art History and Museum Studies	1	1			7.5
UCHUMHAR21	2	HUM	HAR	Dutch 17th Century Painting	0	1			7.5
UCHUMHAR22	2	HUM	HAR	Museum Studies	1	0			7.5
UCHUMHAR31	3	HUM	HAR	Modern Art	1	0			7.5
UCHUMHAR32	3	HUM	HAR	Heritage': Dynamics of Collections	0	1			7.5
UCHUMHIS12	1	HUM	HIS	Medieval History: 400-1500	1	0			7.5
UCHUMHIS13	1	HUM	HIS	Early Modern History: 1450 - 1850	0	1			7.5

OSIRIS	Level	Dept.	Track	Course name	Fall	Spring	Winter	Summer	EC
UCHUMHIS14	1	HUM	HIS	Modern History	2	1			7.5
UCHUMHIS21	2	HUM	HIS	The Cold War	1	0			7.5
UCHUMHIS22	2	HUM	HIS	Nazi Germany	0	1			7.5
UCHUMHIS24	2	HUM	HIS	Cultural History of Magic and Science	0	1			7.5
UCHUMHIS35	3	HUM	HIS	Great Powers in the Modern World	1	0			7.5
UCHUMHIS36	3	HUM	HIS	Origins and Crises of the Global Economy	1	0			7.5
UCHUMHIS37	3	HUM	HIS	Transitional Justice	0	1			7.5
UCHUMITA10	1	HUM	L&C	Beginner Italian	0	1			7.5
UCHUMITA11	1	HUM	L&C	Italian Language and Culture I	1	0			7.5
UCHUMITA21	2	HUM	L&C	Italian Language and Culture II - TUTORIAL ONLY		1			7.5
UCHUMLIN11	1	HUM	LIN	Introduction to Linguistics	1	1			7.5
UCHUMLIN21	2	HUM	LIN	Language Form and Meaning	1	0			7.5
UCHUMLIN22	2	HUM	LIN	Psycholinguistics	0	1			7.5
UCHUMLIN31	3	HUM	LIN	Language Acquisition	1	0			7.5
UCHUMLIN32	3	HUM	LIN	Multilingualism and Language Contact	0	0			7.5
UCHUMLIT11	1	HUM	LIT	Introduction to Literature	1	1			7.5
UCHUMLIT26	2	HUM	LIT	The Literary Canon Contested	0	1			7.5
UCHUMLIT27	2	HUM	LIT	Literature in Focus: Environmental Science Fiction				1	7.5
UCHUMLIT32	3	HUM	LIT	Gothic Traditions and Cultural Critique	0	0			7.5
UCHUMLIT35	3	HUM	LIT	Cultural Memory	0	1			7.5
UCHUMLIT36	3	HUM	LIT	Postcolonial Interventions: Literature, Media & Politics	0	0			7.5
UCHUMLIT37	3	HUM	LIT	Literature and the City	1	0			7.5
UCHUMMAP11	1	HUM	MAP	Introduction to Performance Studies	0	1			7.5
UCHUMMAP12	1	HUM	MAP	Introduction to Comparative Media Studies	1	0			7.5
UCHUMMAP21	2	HUM	MAP	Compose Yourself: Making Performance	1	0			7.5
UCHUMMAP22	2	HUM	MAP	Adaptation Studies: from text to screen	0	0			7.5
UCHUMMAP23	2	HUM	MAP	Visual Culture Studies	0	1			7.5
UCHUMMAP31	3	HUM	MAP	Contemporary Performance: Mapping The Everyday	1	0			7.5
UCHUMMAP32	3	HUM	MAP	Ludic Culture	0	0			7.5
UCHUMPHI11	1	HUM	PHI	Introduction to Philosophy	2	2			7.5
UCHUMPHI12	1	HUM	PHI	World Philosophies	1	0			7.5
UCHUMPHI21	2	HUM	PHI	Metaphysics and Epistemology: Plato to Peirce	1	0			7.5
UCHUMPHI23	2	HUM	PHI	Twentieth Century Theoretical Philosophy	0	1			7.5
UCHUMPHI25	2	HUM	PHI	Philosophical Views on Humans and Gods	0	1			7.5
UCHUMPHI33	3	HUM	PHI	Senior Seminar in Philosophy I	0	0			7.5
UCHUMPHI34	3	HUM	PHI	Senior Seminar in Philosophy II	0	0			7.5
UCHUMPHI35	3	HUM	PHI	Senior Seminar in Philosophy III - Richard Rorty	1	0			7.5
UCHUMPHI36	3	HUM	PHI	Senior Seminar in Philosophy IV - Aristotle	0	1			7.5
UCHUMREL12	1	HUM	REL	Introduction to Religious Studies	0	1			7.5
UCHUMREL23	2	HUM	REL	Religions in the Public Domain	1	0			7.5
UCHUMREL24	2	HUM	REL	Ethics and Religion	0	0			7.5

OSIRIS	Level	Dept.	Track	Course name	Fall	Spring	Winter	Summer	EC
UCHUMREL34	3	HUM	REL	Religion and (Post)secularity	1	0			7.5
UCHUMSIG11	1	HUM	L&C	Sign Language and Perspectives on Deaf Culture	0	0		0	7.5
UCHUMSPA10	1	HUM	L&C	Beginner Spanish	1	1			7.5
UCHUMSPA11	1	HUM	L&C	Spanish Language and Culture I	1	1			7.5
UCHUMSPA21	2	HUM	L&C	Spanish Language and Culture II	1	1			7.5
UCINTARC11	2	INT	INT	The Civil City and its Architecture				1	7.5
UCINTCAR21	2	INT	INT	Caribbean Studies				1	7.5
UCINTCHI13	1	INT	CHI/ GEO	Introduction to China		1			7.5
UCINTDEV21	2	INT	INT	Theory and Practice of Development	0	1			7.5
UCINTDEV31	3	INT	INT	Field course in East Africa	0	0		1	7.5
UCINTDUT11	1	INT	INT	Discovering the Dutch (Priority for exchange students)	1	1			7.5
UCINTEVO31	3	INT	INT	Evolution, culture and human nature	0	1			7.5
UCINTGEN11	1	INT	INT	Gender, Science and Technology				1	7.5
UCINTHIS21	2	INT	HIS	Understanding Conflict				1	7.5
UCINTHIS32	3	INT	HIS	Arab-Israeli Conflict	0	1			7.5
UCINTHON32	3	INT	INT	Student-designed Honors Seminar	0	1			7.5
UCINTLIN33	3	INT	LIN	Speech Production and Perception	0	0			7.5
UCINTMAP33	3	INT	MAP	Digital Citizens		1			7.5
UCINTPOL32	3	INT	POL, HIS, REL	Politics and Religion in the Modern World		1			7.5
UCINTSUS21	2	INT	INT	Sustainability	1	0			7.5
UCSCIBIO01	1	SCI	BIO	That's Life: Biology Today	1	0			7.5
UCSCIBIO11	1	SCI	BIO	Molecular Cell Biology I	1	1			7.5
UCSCIBIO13	1	SCI	BIO	Human and Animal Biology	1	1			7.5
UCSCIBIO21	2	SCI	BIO	Molecular Cell Biology II	1	1			7.5
UCSCIBIO23	2	SCI	BIO	Human and Animal Physiology	1	1			7.5
UCSCIBIO24	2	SCI	BIO	Bio-inspired Science and Design	0	1			7.5
UCSCIBIO31	3	SCI	BIO	Advanced Molecular Cell Biology	1	0			7.5
UCSCIBIO32	3	SCI	BIO	Advanced Biotechnology	0	1			7.5
UCSCIBIO33	3	SCI	BIO	Advanced Physiology	1	0			7.5
UCSCIBIO34	3	SCI	BIO	Stem Cells, Development, and Cancer	0	1			7.5
UCSCICHE11	1	SCI	CHE	Introduction to Chemistry	1	1			7.5
UCSCICHE21	2	SCI	CHE	Chemistry II	0	1			7.5
UCSCICHE22	2	SCI	CHE	Physical Chemistry	1	0			7.5
UCSCICHE23	2	SCI	CHE	Biochemistry	1	0			7.5
UCSCICHE31	3	SCI	CHE	Advanced Chemistry	0	1			7.5
UCSCICHE32	3	SCI	CHE	Medicinal Chemistry	0	1			7.5
UCSCICOG11	1	SCI	COG	Cognitive Neuroscience I	2	2			7.5
UCSCICOG21	2	SCI	COG	Cognitive Neuroscience II	1	1			7.5
UCSCICOG31	3	SCI	COG	Spatial Cognition	0	1			7.5
UCSCICOG32	3	SCI	COG	Imaging Human Brain Functions	1	0			7.5
UCSCIEAR11	1	SCI	EAR	Introduction to Earth and Environment	1	1			7.5
UCSCIEAR21	2	SCI	EAR	Global Processes and Sustainability	1	0			7.5
UCSCIEAR22	2	SCI	EAR	Atmosphere and Climate	0	1			7.5
UCSCIEAR31	3	SCI	EAR	Resources and their Sustainable Management	0	1			7.5
UCSCIGLO21	2	SCI	GLO	Global Health		1			7.5
UCSCIHIS11	1	SCI	HIS	History and Philosophy of Science	0	1			7.5
UCSCIMAT01	1	SCI	MAT	Mathematics for Poets	0	0			7.5

OSIRIS	Level	Dept.	Track	Course name	Fall	Spring	Winter	Summer	EC
UCSCIMAT11	1	SCI	MAT	Calculus and Linear Algebra	2	2			7.5
UCSCIMAT14	1	SCI	MAT	Foundations of Mathematics	1	0			7.5
UCSCIMAT21	2	SCI	MAT	Mathematical Methods	1	0			7.5
UCSCIMAT22	2	SCI	MAT	Mathematical Modeling: Networks	0	1			7.5
UCSCIMAT31	3	SCI	MAT	Advanced Mathematics	0	1			7.5
UCSCIMED21	2	SCI	MED	Mechanisms of Diseases	1	1			7.5
UCSCIMED31	3	SCI	MED	Immunology and Infectious Diseases	0	1			7.5
UCSCIMED32	3	SCI	MED	Pharmacology	1	0			7.5
UCSCIPHY01	1	SCI	PHY	Energy Systems and Sustainability	1	0			7.5
UCSCIPHY12	1	SCI	PHY	Relativistic and Classical Physics	1	1			7.5
UCSCIPHY21	2	SCI	PHY	Classical Electrodynamics	0	1			7.5
UCSCIPHY23	2	SCI	PHY	Astrophysics & Cosmology	1	0			7.5
UCSCIPHY31	3	SCI	PHY	Advanced Physics	1	0			7.5
UCSCIPHY32	3	SCI	PHY	Advanced Astrophysics and Cosmology	0	1			7.5
UCSSCANT11	1	SSC	ANT	Introduction to Anthropology	2	1			7.5
UCSSCANT21	2	SSC	ANT	Violence, Trauma and Memory	2	0			7.5
UCSSCANT22	2	SSC	ANT	Gender and Sexuality	0	1			7.5
UCSSCANT23	2	SSC	ANT	The Materiality of Culture	0	1			7.5
UCSSCANT25	2	SSC	ANT	Anthropology of Conservation	0	1			7.5
UCSSCANT31	3	SSC	ANT	Anthropology of Power	1	1			7.5
UCSSCECO01	1	SSC	ECO	Beginner Economics	1	0			7.5
UCSSCECO11	1	SSC	ECO	Introduction to Economics	1	1			7.5
UCSSCECO21	2	SSC	ECO	Macroeconomics	1	0			7.5
UCSSCECO22	2	SSC	ECO	Behavioral & microeconomics, game theory	0	1			7.5
UCSSCECO24	2	SSC	ECO	International Economics	0	1			7.5
UCSSCECO31	3	SSC	ECO	Economics of the Public Sector	0	1			7.5
UCSSCECO32	3	SSC	ECO	Advanced Economics: Economic Growth	1	0			7.5
UCSSCGEO11	1	SSC	GEO	Introduction to Human Geography	2	1			7.5
UCSSCGEO21	2	SSC	GEO	Urban Geography	0	1			7.5
UCSSCGEO22	2	SSC	GEO	Development Studies	1	0			7.5
UCSSCGEO32	3	SSC	GEO	Globalization and Regional Development	1	0			7.5
UCSSCGEO33	3	SSC	GEO	European Integration	0	1			7.5
UCSSCGEO35	3	SSC	GEO	Geographical Field Course: Shanghai	0	0		1	7.5
UCSSCLAW11	1	SSC	LAW	Law, Society and Justice	0	1			7.5
UCSSCLAW12	1	SSC	LAW	Introduction to Law	2	1			7.5
UCSSCLAW13	1	SSC	LAW	Criminal justice systems	0	0		1	7.5
UCSSCLAW21	2	SSC	LAW	International Law	1	1			7.5
UCSSCLAW22	2	SSC	LAW	Comparative Constitutional Law	0	1			7.5
UCSSCLAW26	2	SSC	LAW	Property Law and Contract Law	1	0			7.5
UCSSCLAW27	2	SSC	LAW	International and European Labor Law	0	1			7.5
UCSSCLAW31	3	SSC	LAW	International Human Rights	1	1			7.5
UCSSCLAW33	3	SSC	LAW	European Union Law	1	0			7.5
UCSSCLAW34	3	SSC	LAW	International Commercial Arbitration	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPOL11	1	SSC	POL	Introduction to Political Theory	3	1			7.5
UCSSCPOL13	1	SSC	POL	Introduction to Comparative Politics	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPOL21	2	SSC	POL	Political Science: State of the Art	1	1			7.5
UCSSCPOL23	2	SSC	POL	International Relations	1	1			7.5

OSIRIS	Level	Dept.	Track	Course name	Fall	Spring	Winter	Summer	EC
UCSSCPOL31	3	SSC	POL	Comparative Political Institutions	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPOL33	3	SSC	POL	Advanced International Relations	1	1			7.5
UCSSCPOL36	3	SSC	POL	International Organizations	1	0			7.5
UCSSCPSY11	1	SSC	PSY	Introduction to Psychology	2	2			7.5
UCSSCPSY21	2	SSC	PSY	Social Psychology	1	1			7.5
UCSSCPSY22	2	SSC	PSY	Developmental Psychology	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPSY23	2	SSC	PSY	Clinical Psychology	2	1			7.5
UCSSCPSY26	2	SSC	PSY	Criminology	0	0			7.5
UCSSCPSY27	2	SSC	PSY	Cross-cultural Psychology	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPSY28	2	SSC	PSY	The Psychology of Teaching and Learning	1	0			7.5
UCSSCPSY31	3	SSC	PSY	The Psychology of Ethnic Relations	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPSY33	3	SSC	PSY	The Psychology of Human Motivation	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPSY34	3	SSC	PSY	Crime and Context	1	0			7.5
UCSSCPSY37	3	SSC	PSY	Health Psychology	0	1			7.5
UCSSCPSY39	3	SSC	PSY	Adolescent Development	1	0			7.5
UCSSCSOC11	1	SSC	SOC	Introduction to Sociology	2	1			7.5
UCSSCSOC21	2	SSC	SOC	Human Trafficking				1	7.5
UCSSCSOC28	2	SSC	SOC	Social Inequality	1	0			7.5
UCSSCSOC29	2	SSC	SOC	Criminology	0	1			7.5
UCSSCSOC35	3	SSC	SOC	Organizing Solidarity	0	1			7.5
UCSSCSOC36	3	SSC	SOC	Sociology of Migration and Integration	1	0			7.5

Science Lab modules (subject to change on short notice)

OSIRIS	Level	Dept.	Track	Course name	Fall	Spring	Winter	Summer	EC
UCSCIBIOL2	2	SCI	BIO	Cell Biology and Cellular Signaling				1	2.5
UCSCIBIOL3	2	SCI	BIO	Microbiology			1		2.5
UCSCIBIOL4	2	SCI	BIO	Biochemical pharmacology				1	2.5
UCSCICHEL5	2	SCI	CHE	Metabolic Biochemistry Lab				1	2.5
UCSCICHEL6	2	SCI	CHE	Chemistry and Art			1		2.5
UCSCICHEL7	2	SCI	CHE	Chemistry: a little bit of everything				1	2.5
UCSCICOGL1	2	SCI	COG	Visual psychophysics			1	1	2.5
UCSCICOGL4	2	SCI	COG	fMRI Data Analysis				1	2.5
UCSCIEARL1	2	SCI	EAR	Geology Project Lab course			1		2.5
UCSCIEARL5	2	SCI	EAR	Geographical Information Systems (GIS)				1	2.5
UCSCIENVL1	2	SCI	ENV	Environmental Health				1	2.5
UCSCIEPIL1	2	SCI	EPI	Epidemiology				1	2.5
UCSCIMATL2	2	SCI	MAT	Computation Physics				1	2.5
UCSCIMATL3	2	SCI	MAT	Group Theory			1	1	2.5
UCSCIMATL4	2	SCI	MAT	Introduction to Probability and Statistics				1	2.5
UCSCIMEDL2	2	SCI	MED	Human Anatomy: macroscopically and microscopically			1		2.5
UCSCIMEDL3	2	SCI	MED	Human Anatomy and Pathology				1	2.5
UCSCIPHYL6	2	SCI	PHY	Modeling and Analysis of Astronomical Data		1			2.5
UCSCIPHYL8	2	SCI	PHY	Waves and Optics				1	2.5
UCACCPHY2A	2	ACC	MET	Advanced Exercises Physics and Mathematics 1	1				2.5
UCACCPHY2B	2	ACC	MET	Advanced Exercises Physics and Mathematics 2		1			2.5

Liberal Arts and Sciences, Utrecht University College

Research/internship codes

OSIRIS	Level	Dept.	Track	Course name	EC
UCACCINT21	2	ACC		Internship	7.5
UCACCINT2A	2	ACC		Internship (2.5 ECTS)	2.5
UCHUMHON31	3	HUM		Honors Thesis in Humanities	7.5
UCHUMINT21	2	HUM		HUM Academic Internship	7.5
UCHUMRES31	3	HUM		HUM Research Thesis (7.5 ECTS)	7.5
UCHUMRES32	3	HUM		HUM Research Thesis (15 ECTS)	15
UCSCIHON31	3	SCI		Honors Thesis in Science	7.5
UCSCIINT21	2	SCI		SCI Academic Internship	7.5
UCSCIRES31	3	SCI		SCI Research Thesis (7.5 ECTS)	7.5
UCSCIRES32	3	SCI		SCI Research Thesis (15 ECTS)	15
UCSSCHON31	3	SSC		Honors Thesis in Social Science	7.5
UCSSCINT21	2	SSC		SSC Academic Internship	7.5
UCSSCRES31	3	SSC		SSC Research Thesis (7.5 ECTS)	7.5
UCSSCRES32	3	SSC		SSC Research Thesis (15 ECTS)	15

APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Wednesday 26 September 2018 – UCU

8.15 - 8.30	Arrival panel
8.30 - 9.00	Welcome with coffee
9.00 - 9.45	Initial panel meeting UCU
9.45 - 10.30	Development dialogue
10.30 - 11.15	Programme management
11.00 - 12.15	Tour + treasure trove
12.15 - 13.00	Lunch and break
13.00 -13.45	Students*
13.45 - 14.30	Teachers and tutors*
14.30 - 14.45	Break
14.45 - 15.15	Board of Examiners
15.15 - 16.00	Alumni + work lab
16.00 - 17.00	Internal panel meeting
17.00 - 17.30	Programme management
17.30 - 17.45	Presentation findings
17.45 - 18.00	Goodbye and thank you

APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences. 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):
- Annual report Opleidingscommissie
- Annual report Examencommissie
- Onderwijs- en Examenregeling (OER)
- Courses available during the visit:
    - Research in Context
    - Chemistry & Art
    - Advanced Molecular Cell Biology
    - Human Trafficking: An International Perspective
    - Anthropology of Power
    - Visual Culture Studies
    - Twentieth Century Theoretical Philosophy

LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ROOSEVELT

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

This report was finalised on 25 March 2019

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE ROOSEVELT

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessments (September 2016) and the Assessment Framework for the Distinctive feature of small-scale and intensive education (4 November 2011) as a starting point.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Name of the programme:	Liberal Arts and Sciences
CROHO number:	50393
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	Major in Arts & Humanities (resulting in a BA degree)
	Major in Social Science (resulting in a BA degree)
	Major in Science (resulting in a BSc degree)
	Interdepartmental major (resulting in a BA degree)
Location(s):	Middelburg
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline:	01/05/2019

The visit of the assessment panel Liberal Arts and Sciences to University College Roosevelt of Utrecht University took place on 24 - 25 September 2018.

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

Cluster Liberal Arts and Sciences
The assessment of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Roosevelt is part of the assessment of Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Sciences degree. The assessment of Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Sciences degree is part of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences.

From May to December 2018, a panel of expertise members assessed bachelor's programmes Liberal Arts and Sciences at eight universities. A panel of six to nine members was appointed for each site visit, based on the expertise and availability of each panel member and taking into account possible conflicts of interest.

The full panel Liberal Arts and Sciences consisted of eighteen members:

- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of the Radboud University [chair]
- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice chair]
- Prof. S. (Samuel) Abraham, co-founder and managing director of ECOLAS and founder, professor and rector of Bratislava International School of Liberal Education (BISLA, Slovakia)
- Dr. S.I. (Sylvia) Bergh, associate professor in Development Management and Governance at the International Institute of Social Studies in The Hague
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom)
- Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen
- Prof. W.M. (Wayne) Cranton, assistant dean (research) at the Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering and Sciences of Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom)
- C. (Carl) Gombrich, MSc programme director of the BASc Art and Sciences at the University College London (United Kingdom)
- Dr. K. (Katherine) Goodman, assistant professor and associate director of Inworks at the University of Colorado Denver (United States)
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany)
- Dr. A. (Alyssa) Schneebaum, lecturer and researcher at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and Universität Wien (Austria)
- Em. prof. A.H.A. (Fred) Soons, emeritus professor in International Public Law at Utrecht University
- Dr. M. (Mark) Sommerville, associate dean of Faculty Affairs and Development and associate professor in Electrical Engineering and Physics at Olin College of Engineering (United States)
- Dr. J.(Jos) Willems, former member of the board of Zuyd University of Applied Sciences and educational advisor for Higher Education
- Drs. S.C. (Sylvia) Witteveen, academic director of the Psychobiology programme at the Faculty of Science of the University of Amsterdam
- I. (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, University College Groningen
- Y. (Yara) van Ingen, bachelor's student Maastricht Science Programme, Maastricht University
- M. (Maya) Ouwehand, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, Utrecht University

For the assessment of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, two panel members (Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T.A Brus) were trained by the NVAO and appointed to head the assessment of the Distinctive Feature. Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen was involved in all site visits. Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. Brus was involved in the site visits at Leiden University College, University College Utrecht, University College Roosevelt, Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and Maastricht Science Programme.

The panel was supported by dr. Els Schröder as project coordinator of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences. She also acted as secretary during the visit to Leiden University College, University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme. She was supported by dr. Joke Corporaal at University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme, who also wrote the reports of the first five colleges. Dr. Marianne van der Weiden acted as secretary during the site visits to Groningen University College, University College Tilburg and University College Twente.

Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University
The bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Roosevelt has been assessed as part of a combined site visit to Utrecht University's three Liberal Arts and Science programmes, which form separate 'tracks' within Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Science degree programme. In this report, these tracks will be referred to as 'programmes'.

The Utrecht University Liberal Arts and Sciences programmes are: Liberal Arts and Sciences at the Faculty of Humanities (hereafter: LAS), Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Utrecht (hereafter: UCU) and Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Roosevelt (hereafter: UCR). The programmes prepared individual self-evaluation reports. The panel visited the programmes at their individual premises in a combined site visit, which took place between 24-27 September in Middelburg and Utrecht. The panel's findings will be presented in three programme-specific reports.

The panel that visited Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University consisted of six members:
- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of Radboud University [chair];
- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice-chair];
- Prof. mr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen;
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany).;
- I. (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's student of Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Groningen [student member];

The following panel members were consulted as referees:
- Prof. C. (Carl) Gombrich, programme director of the BASc Art and Sciences at University College London (United Kingdom) [referee Sciences];
- Drs. S.C. (Sylvia) Witteveen, academic director of the Psychobiology programme at the Faculty of Sciences of the University of Amsterdam [referee Life Sciences];
- Dr. A. (Alyssa) Schneebaum, lecturer and researcher at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and Universität Wien (Austria) [referee Economics].

The panel was supported by dr. J. (Joke) Corporaal, who wrote the report, and dr. E. Schröder, who supervised the site visit and reporting process as project manager and secretary.

For the assessments of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education at UCR and UCU, two panel members (Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T.A Brus) were trained by the NVAO and appointed to head the assessments of the Distinctive Feature. The practice-based assessments at these two programmes took place on 24-26 September 2018 combined with the regular assessments of the bachelor's programmes.

The NVAO approved the composition of the panel on 16 April 2018.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

Preparation
The panel chair, secretary and representatives of the three programmes jointly composed a schedule for the site visit. Prior to the site visit, the programmes selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 4 for the definitive schedule.

Before the assessment panel's visit to Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University, the project coordinator received the programmes' self-evaluation reports. She sent these to the panel and secretary, after checking them for completeness of information. Upon reading the self-evaluation reports, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings, which they send to the secretary and project coordinator.

Final projects
The panel also studied a selection of final projects for all three programmes. All selections were made by the panel's chair with the assistance of the project coordinator, and took into account the expertise and interests of the panel members and referees. The panel chair and project coordinator took care that a variety of topics and disciplines were covered. Also, they ascertained that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades over all presented projects. At UCR, students finish their studies with a capstone. A capstone consists of three parts: a thesis or internship report (assessed with a grade), a reflection on student learning for the whole program (pass/fail) and a portfolio of a student's best work (pass/fail). The panel studied the capstones of 15 students, including the the reflection reports and portfolios of these students.

Site visit
The panel visited the programmes between 24-27 September 2018. It visited UCR on 24-25 September, UCU on 26 September and LAS on 27 September. During these visits, UCR and UCU were also assessed by the panel on the Distinctive Feature of Small-Scale and Intensive Educations.

At the start of the site visit on 24 September, the panel held a preparatory meeting during which it was instructed regarding all assessment frameworks and procedures. After this, the panel discussed its working method and its preliminary findings for the site visit with respect to the regular assessments of all three programmes and the assessments of the Distinctive Feature (if applicable). It also paid attention to the content and use of the programmes' domain-specific framework of reference, which is included in Appendix 1.

After its initial meetings, the panel focused on its individual assessments of the programmes. At each location, the panel started with a dedicated panel meeting, in which the panel discussed its preliminary findings for each programme followed by a programme-specific development conversation. In it, the panel and representatives of the visited programme discussed various developments routes for the programme. The result of these conversations are summarised in three separate reports, which will be published through the programmes' communication channels. The information received during the development conversations are not part of the conducted assessments.

The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes at their premises visited the available facilities. It also examined materials provided by each programme. An overview of these materials for UCR is given in Appendix 5, and for the other programmes in their own programme-specific report.

At all three locations, the panel used the final part of the visit to discuss its programme-specific findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards the panel chair gave an oral presentation, in which he expressed the panel's preliminary impressions and general observations.

Reports
After the site visit, the secretary wrote three draft reports: each programme received its own report. The draft report for LAS focuses on the regular NVAO programme assessment. The draft reports for UCR and UCU include two separate chapters: the first part of these reports focuses on the regular NVAO programme assessment of the bachelor's programme, and the second part of the report specifically addresses the standards related to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education.

Subsequently, the secretary sent the reports to the assessment panel and project coordinator for feedback. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project coordinator sent the draft reports to the university in order to have these checked for factual irregularities. The secretary discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and adapted the reports accordingly before its finalisation.

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 both the standards and the programme as a whole.

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

Unsatisfactory
The programme does not meet the generic quality standard and shows shortcomings with respect to multiple aspects of the standard.

Satisfactory
The programme meets the generic quality standard across its entire spectrum.

Good
The programme systematically surpasses the generic quality standard.

Excellent
The programme systematically well surpasses the generic quality standard and is regarded as an international example.

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for the distinctive feature of small-scale and intensive education, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the standards:

Meets the standard
The programme meets the generic quality 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
All the criteria are scored as "meets the standard".

Negative
One or more of the criteria are scored as "does not meet the standard".

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Summary Judgement Framework for Limited Programme Assessments

Standard 1
UCR strives for students to reach academic excellence, personal growth and a sense of civic responsibility. It has a clear, unique profile that is recognised and appreciated by prospective and current students, and graduates. The programme emphasises a broad education, a multi- and interdisciplinary approach, strong academic skills and attention to societal engagement. The panel is enthusiastic about the programme's strong sense of what it intends to do, which areas to focus on and what concrete plans to develop in new directions without stepping away from an LAS approach. The intended learning outcomes (ILOs) clearly articulate UCR's high ambitions and have been carefully phrased and convincingly mapped to both the LAS principles and the Dublin Descriptors. The ILOs easily surpass what may be expected of an academic bachelor degree programme in Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Standard 2
According to the panel, UCR's educational philosophy is well tuned towards the aims of the programme. The panel appreciates how UCR has formulated six educational principles for teachers, stressing the importance of regular feedback to and an active role for students during classes. This, together with continuous assessment, ensures that students are able to improve and build on what they learn during a semester.

The panel thinks that the curriculum is well structured with a good disciplinary balance. It incorporates numerous innovative elements around undergraduate research, civic and global engagement, as well as inspiring artistic, music performance and pre-medical opportunities and exciting research projects that are not seen elsewhere. There is a lot of room for students to pursue personal interests, both in- and outside of class. The practice of asking students to bring their best work together in a portfolio and to reflect on their learning journey is evidently a highly productive and worthwhile one. The panel believes other LAS programmes could do well to emulate this practice. The panel is confident that the clear instructions regarding which courses students have to take within each of the departments, depending on their chosen specialisation, help to ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across disciplines.

The amount of extracurricular activities at UCR is impressive, and the panel notes that they tie in well with the programme's intended learning outcomes and thus strengthen the programme. The workload at UCR is feasible, but high. The panel applauds the changes that have been and are being made to keep to workload bearable. It is confident that the programme management is able to tackle workload issues.

The panel describes the fit between curriculum and core faculty as excellent. Faculty members are experts in their field with a thorough knowledge of the subjects they teach. A considerable number of teachers have a Senior Research Qualification. The panel was pleased to hear that staff are able to balance their teaching and research well and it is impressed with the various professional development opportunities for staff. UCR has a well-established support system to guide students through their studies, with an important and much appreciated role for tutors. The panel suggests setting clear tutoring guidelines so students know how much support and guidance they may expect from their tutors.

The panel concludes that, over the past two years, there have been a lot of changes and on-going processes at UCR. One of these initiatives will lead to a new Joint Research Centre, with brand new laboratories for UCR's science students. In addition, the teaching facilities and communication platforms will be upgraded. In the curriculum, more interdisciplinary courses are underway and the capstone project (7.5 EC) will be revised into a senior project (15 EC, see standard 3) – allowing students more time to reflect. The panel appreciates all of these changes. It also recommends,

however, not to lose sight of the good work that has already been done and which has resulted in a strong programme and a vibrant community, enabling students to reach their full potential. Finally, the panel appreciates the fact UCR invites an External Evaluation Panel to Middelburg every year. This is a good way to further improve the programme.

Standard 3
The panel concludes that UCR has a good assessment policy in place, that it uses a sufficiently varied amount of assessment methods, and that assessment is very well geared towards course level and objectives. The programme has much improved its assessment system by introducing a new assessment policy, by freeing up time to train staff members, by introducing a new capstone assessment form, and by making changes to the capstone project itself. This has, among other things, led to more reflection on assessment and grading practices, and to *ex ante* checks of assessment for new courses. According to the panel, the newly introduced capstone evaluation form increases the transparency of the capstone assessment and makes more clear the role of the second assessor. The panel firmly supports further standardisation and formalisation of assessment, including assessment of the capstone project. Finally, the panel noticed that the Board of Examiners fulfils its legal duties, but could be more actively engaged in monitoring the quality of assessment.

Standard 4
The set up of the programme, the teaching-learning environment and the extra- and co-curricular activities make sure that all students obtain the ambitious ILOs. Most theses reach or easily surpass bachelor level. The panel is especially enthusiastic about the role of the portfolio and the reflection document in the capstone project. The panel concludes that students are able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their civic responsibilities and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs. UCR graduates enrol in prestigious master's programmes. The fact that the majority has no problems in being admitted into their master's programme of first choice, and the fact that they perform well in these programmes is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard.

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

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	good
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	good
Standard 3: Student assessment	satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	good

General conclusion	good

The chair, prof. dr. Theo Engelen, and the secretary of the panel, dr. Els Schröder, 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: 25 March 2019

Summary judgment Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education

Standard A
The programme's intended learning outcomes are carefully phrased and they are suitably mapped to the domain-specific framework and the Dublin descriptors. The ILOs cover the appropriate areas for breadth, specialisation, and skills, and they demonstrate a high level of reflection on the skills needed to pursue interdisciplinary research and learning.

Standard B
The panel concludes that there is a clear link between intended learning outcomes, track outlines, course objectives, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. The many extracurricular activities feed back into the programme and help students to develop academic and personal skills and a sense of civic responsibility as set out in the intended learning outcomes.

Standard C
The panel concludes that UCR is a vibrant teaching-learning community with, as they call it at UCR, true 'RASA spirit'. This community feeling is created and upheld by the students, study association RASA, staff and programme management. Class sizes are small, and students play an active role in class. Every week, students have at least 16 face-to-face teaching hours. Together with weekly course assignments, exam preparation and extracurricular activities, this leads to an intensive education.

Standard D
The programme has a thorough admissions procedure in place. According to the panel, UCR succeeds in selecting motivated and talented students. The panel is satisfied with the number of students that UCR admits every year and it is pleased that UCR is trying to increase the diversity of student intake. The admissions procedure generally results in a good match between students and programme.

Standard E
The panel verified that UCR's staff is more than qualified to deliver the courses within the 'Small-scale and Intensive Educational Framework'. They hold relevant teaching qualifications and are active researchers in relevant disciplines. Staff members feel very committed to the UCR community and have good opportunities to work on their own teaching and research career while teaching at UCR. These good teaching and research opportunities are reflected in the number of faculty members with a Senior Research Qualification.

Standard F
The panel concludes that UCR has a professional, dedicated and supportive staff team, more than capable of delivering the curriculum while maintaining the standards of intensive and small-scale teaching at UCR.

Standard G
The panel concludes that UCR's facilities – the class rooms, lecture halls, music rooms, computer facilities, study places, laboratory facilities, common house Elliott – help create a suitable teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities. The panel is convinced that any former concerns regarding UCR's science facilities are adequately addressed.

Standard H
Based on the portfolios, graduates' testimonies and the material it studied during the site visit, the panel concludes that students and graduates meet the ambitious intended learning outcomes. Graduation rates are higher than those of other bachelor's programmes at Utrecht University. Theses were generally of a very high level and students show being able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their civic responsibilities and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that

they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs. UCR graduates enrol in prestigious master's programmes. The fact that the majority has no problems in being admitted into their master's programme of first choice, and the fact that they perform well in these programmes is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard.

Practice-based assessment
With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that UCR meets all standards. In its assessment under Standards A, G and H, it paid specific attention to the formulation of programme outcomes at track level, the laboratory facilities and the portfolio, as these were identified as 'areas of improvement' in the 2013 assessment. The panel has established that UCR has shown excellent progress on all points. The improvement shown, the development plans, and the fact that all criteria meet the standard, result in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature by the panel.

The panel assesses the standards from the *Assessment framework for the Distinctive Feature of Small-scale and Intensive Education* in the following way:

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Standard A: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard B: Relationship between the goals and content	meets the standard
Standard C: Structure and didactic concept	meets the standard
Standard D: Intake	meets the standard
Standard E: Quality of staff	meets the standard
Standard F: Number of staff	meets the standard
Standard G: Available facilities	meets the standard
Standard H: Level realised	meets the standard
General conclusion	positive

The chair, prof. dr. Theo Engelen, and the secretary of the panel, dr. Els Schröder, 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: 25 March 2019

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

Organisational context

UCR is a small-scale, selective, intensive, English-taught honours college, situated in Middelburg. It started in 2004 as a separate track of the Liberal Arts and Sciences programme at Utrecht University, which today consists of three programmes; two honours colleges (University College Roosevelt and University College Utrecht) and a university-wide Liberal Arts and Sciences programme (LAS).

UCR has its own Executive Board, comprising a Dean and a Managing Director. The Dean is responsible for all academic matters, whereas the Board of Studies is the main academic policy-making body. The Board of Studies consists of the heads of the four departments within UCR (Academic Core, Arts & Humanities, Social Science and Science), a student member and the Director of Education, who acts as chair. .Finally, there are two advisory bodies representing students, faculty and staff members; the Programme Committee and the UCR Council. The first primarily deals with educational advice, the latter with advice on management issues.

> **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

UCR has defined three main goals: academic excellence, personal growth and a sense of civic responsibility. The self-evaluation report describes academic excellence as the opportunity for students to find the fields in which they can do their best work. Rather than being the best at everything, the College strives for students to reach their full potential. The other two aims, personal growth and a sense of civic responsibility, are supported through the UCR community, in which students play a prominent role. They do so in student association RASA, which functions as an umbrella organization for a multitude of student committees, but also through engagement in the governance of the academic programme (for instance in the Academic Affairs Council, Programme Committee, UCR Council and Board of Studies) and through their engagement in other extracurricular events such as volunteer work and engaging with refugees.

UCR is planning to strengthen its science department in the 'Engineering and Innovation initiative'. This initiative will lead to new courses in the field of applied physics, chemistry, engineering, and data science with a special focus on sustainability in delta areas (water, energy and food/bio-based economy). The plans include a new, 4.500 square metre 'Joint Research Centre' in Middelburg (expected delivery date September 2020), which UCR will share with partner institutions such as the HZ University of Applied Sciences and Scalda. The plans will allow UCR to attract an additional 100 students per year by 2027. These plans were discussed with the panel in more detail during the tour of the facilities.

The panel has studied the main goals and the future plans of the programme. It appreciates the strong focus that UCR places on community, civic engagement, and personal growth. It also notes that the programme has a strong sense of areas of focus by indicating concretely how they plan to move forwards in each area of activity. UCR emphasises research-based education and – vice versa – encourages students to engage with research cultures and practices. The aims of the programme suit the LAS philosophy and the DSFR very well. Finally, the panel is enthusiastic about the plans for shared laboratories and collaboration in the Engineering and Innovation initiative, and for more interdisciplinary courses through co-teaching.

Intended learning outcomes

UCR distinguishes between intended learning outcomes at three levels. The programme has formulated six 'Liberal Arts and Sciences Objectives' at UCR level, 11 'Program outcomes' at the level of the various disciplines/tracks (groups of courses within a specific discipline) within UCR, and intended learning outcomes at course level. A 'track outline' describes which outcomes are covered in which courses. The ILOs at UCR level have been tailored to the principles of LAS education; they emphasize a broad education across and within multiple disciplines (ILO1), a thorough understanding of the student's area of specialisation (ILO2), strong academic skills (ILO3), the ability to reflect (ILO4), societal engagement (ILO5) and the ability to deal with multifaceted problems, dilemma and ethical issues (ILO6). The second set of 11 ILOs is linked to the Bachelor Dublin Descriptors. They encompass a mastery of disciplinary knowledge and skills, understanding and exercising academic attitudes and values, and understanding the connection with other disciplines.

The panel notes that the learning outcomes are clearly articulated and that they are suitably mapped to the domain-specific framework and the Dublin descriptors. The ILOs cover the appropriate areas for breadth, specialisation, and skills, and they demonstrate a high level of reflection on the skills needed to pursue interdisciplinary research and learning. The latter is evidenced in, for instance, UCR ILO6: 'Students place the results of research and knowledge in the context of other disciplines and society [...] Students have respect for others, are open to learn from people with different perspectives, and are willing and able to contribute to a better world for all' and Programme outcome 9 (understanding the discipline's role in the world): 'Reflect in logical, social and/or ethical terms on interaction between the discipline and the natural world, society and/or self'. Finally, given the focus that UCR places on multi- and interdisciplinarity, the panel recommends explicitly addressing 'interdisciplinarity' and the programme's understanding of this concept in one of the ILOs.

Considerations
UCR strives for students to reach academic excellence, personal growth and a sense of civic responsibility. It has a clear, unique profile that is recognised and appreciated by prospective students, current students and graduates. The panel is in particular enthusiastic about the programme's strong sense of what it intends to do (focus areas), including concrete plans for development in new directions without stepping away from the LAS approach. The emphasis will remain on a broad education, a multi- and interdisciplinary approach, strong academic skills and attention to societal engagement. The ILOs clearly articulate UCR's high ambitions. They exceed the generic quality of academic bachelor degree programmes. The ILOs have been carefully phrased and convincingly mapped to both the LAS principles and the Dublin Descriptors.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'good'.

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
At UCR the academic year is divided into two semesters of 15 weeks each. All courses account for 7.5 EC. Students take 4 courses per semester and 24 courses in total. For each course, they meet for four hours every week. After the first year, students choose in which of three majors they want to specialise: Arts & Humanities, Social Science or Science. For the first two specialisations this will lead to a BA degree, for the Science major to a BSc degree. In addition, students can request to follow an Interdepartmental Major, a combination of related of courses in two or three departments. The specialisations equal three academic departments (Arts & Humanities; Social Science; Science) which each entail multiple disciplines. There is a fourth department that offers Academic Core courses, such as courses on research methods & statistics, academic writing and language courses.

UCR offers approximately 200 courses, 100 courses per semester. Within the academic disciplines, these courses are grouped in tracks; clusters of courses that form a coherent set. The programme's 'academic rules and procedures' describe, depending on the chosen specialisation, how many courses within each of the four departments students must take to meet UCR's breadth and depth requirements. All students must choose two tracks in their major department, with at least three courses at 300-level. In addition, they must follow at least one course in each department and six courses in the Academic Core department. In addition to choosing a major, students can take part in UCR's music programme (courses in musicology and practical musical training) and/or pre-medical programme, and they can opt for courses on civic engagement and global citizenships. For a full description of the programme, see Appendix 3.

All UCR courses are offered at introductory level (100-level), intermediate level (200-level) and highest bachelor level (300-level). These courses build on each other; a 300-level is course is only open to students that have previously completed a 200-level course in the same subject. A 'track outline' for each discipline describes which program outcomes are covered in what courses. The tracks are designed in such a way that, upon completion, students can enter master's programmes in the same academic discipline.

Students complete their study with a final work that is called 'capstone' and accounts for 7.5 EC. The assessment of the capstone consists of three parts: (1) the capstone report, (2) a portfolio with the students' best papers written at UCR and (3) a reflection report, a set of fixed questions that encourage students to reflect on the benefits of a Liberal Arts and Sciences education, as well as on their programme, specialisation, academic and interdisciplinary skills, and extracurricular activities. Up until recently and depending on their average grade, students could choose from three or four options for the capstone project: an honour thesis (for students with the highest GPA), an individual research project, a joint research project ('capstone'), and an academic internship. All capstones required students to write an individual paper and present their work at the Capstone Day. UCR has decided that, from 2018 onwards, internships count as 200-level courses and that internships reports can no longer qualify as a capstone. The panel understands and supports UCR's decision to re-designate internships at 200-level.

The panel has studied the curriculum as a whole and a few courses in more detail. It concludes that the curriculum offers students a wide range of courses, and a good disciplinary divide. The list of courses is substantial, and students benefit from a broad choice of tracks, a good balance between the different components in individual curricula, and unique programmes such as the music programme. In the self-evaluation report, the students state that the programme outcomes and course objectives are not always clear to them. Apparently they are insufficiently aware of the track outlines. The panel therefore suggests communicating these more clearly to them at the start and end of each track. In the panel's opinion, the main goals of the programme are certainly recognisable in the courses on offer, for instance in courses on civic engagement and research courses. Supervised by faculty members, students are, for example, involved in research projects like the NWO Vici project 'Cities of Refuge' (2017-2020) about local authorities, international law and the rights of refugees in Europe. Students can also take summer internships at other universities, research institutes, hospitals, museums, et cetera. The panel thinks that the 'Capstone Day' and 'Student Research Conference' can be very productive learning experiences for students. It also believes that there are exciting curricular opportunities on the horizon in the areas of engineering and technology. Finally, panel believes that the programme pays sufficient attention to the relationship between the various disciplines and (disciplinary) master's programmes.

The panel has taken notice of the plans to develop the capstone project into an (obligatory) senior project. At the time of the site visit, UCR was running its first pilot with the senior project, which can take one or two semesters, depending on what the student wants to do. The senior project should give students more time to reflect/dig deeper/consult someone else. The panel supports these plans. It does, however, recommend making sure that the senior project has an interdisciplinary element.

From that perspective, it might also be worth considering asking a second supervisor from another discipline.

The panel is enthusiastic about the role of the portfolio and the reflection document in the curriculum. The practice of asking students to bring their best work together, to reflect on their learning journey and reflect on how their individual programme has fitted together from an interdisciplinary perspective is evidently highly productive and worthwhile. The panel believes this is a practice other LAS programmes could do well to emulate.

Educational concept
According to the Self-Evaluation Report, UCR aims to create a context that 'not only supports but actively stimulates student learning and personal development'. Central in its teaching philosophy are six guidance principles for instructors, namely to (1) have 'concern and respect for students and student learning'; (2) engage with students and create active learning situations; (3) clearly state what students need to learn, (4) design clear and compelling assignments and tests, (5) use varied methods of continuous assessment and (6) give regular feedback. Courses are interactive; students are expected to play an active role in class. Throughout the semester, they work on six to twelve assessments for each course. This system of continuous assessment, the SER explains, focuses on improvement during the semester, rather than reproducing knowledge at the end. The panel considers UCR's teaching philosophy very apt for the main goals of the programme and it appreciates the fact that UCR has defined six educational principles. Continuous assessment is a central feature of UCR's educational approach. The panel queried the workload that continuous assessment might cause for both students and staff. It also talked about the relation between UCR's educational system and students from different backgrounds.

From studying the curriculum, looking at course descriptions and talking to students and graduates, the panel concludes that the programme's workload is feasible, but high. Students follow four classes per semester; every class meets for four hours, resulting in 16 contact hours per week. The combination of courses, course preparation, weekly assignments and extra-curricular activities can result in a high workload. Following advice from the previous assessment panel, to keep monitoring the workload carefully, this subject was discussed in more detail during the site visit with programme management, students, staff (see section below) and graduates. As mentioned above, UCR uses continuous assessment with, on average, 6-12 assignments per course. Programme management explained that UCR has chosen multiple assessments to reduce the pressure on students. Nevertheless, the programme has also started lowering the amount of assignments in some courses following student evaluations.

The students with whom the panel met all said that the workload was 'quite manageable' because teachers, friends and tutors could provide support if you felt overwhelmed. The small class sizes made it easier to approach the teacher directly in case of difficulties, the students explained, though this partly depended on the teacher. However, all students also knew fellow-students that suffered or had suffered from a high workload. Perhaps, the students suggested, because these fellow-students had held different expectations or because they were lacking certain planning skills. They also said that some students were very strict with themselves: 'If you demand an A for all assignments, it can be hard.' The panel is not concerned that there is insufficient support for students that are having a hard time (see the section 'study guidance' below for more details on support systems and tutoring), but it is concerned that peer pressure can create an atmosphere in which students are overly focused on grades and/or pressured into thinking that experiencing problems equals being less capable or strong. This is in line with graduates' testimonies, that UCR is a high-achieving and high-paced study environment that doesn't suit everyone equally well. The panel suggests addressing competition between students on a regular basis within the community in order to raise awareness amongst students and staff of its possible detrimental effects. In addition, it recommends for UCR to investigate in what places the workload could be further reduced.

To conclude, the panel appreciates the good support systems in place and applauds the changes that have been and are being made to keep to workload bearable. It is pleased to hear students say that, despite the fact that UCR is a high-pressure bubble, it is a very rich bubble with a lot of opportunities. The panel is confident that programme management is able to tackle workload issues. Qualities of this particular college, according to the panel, are that they give students a lot of room to become independent learners and to learn from the mistakes they make along the way. The study environment offers many opportunities and helps students being able to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Curriculum development
The panel is confident that the clear instructions regarding which courses students have to take within each of the departments, depending on their chosen specialisation, help to ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across disciplines. This is especially true for the Interdepartmental Major, for which students combine related courses in two or three departments and for which they must argue how this specific combination helps prepare them for a master's programme or other form of professional training. UCR does not yet offer specific interdisciplinary courses. The panel is pleased to hear that some interdisciplinary co-taught courses are under way, starting in the fall semester of 2018. According to the panel, the fact that students complete two tracks within one department supports them to reach sufficient depth in their specialisation.

The panel is well aware of the fact that, in addition to the opportunities that UCR's curriculum offers, there are many extracurricular activities in which students take part. The panel was impressed with the many activities that students undertake and it also applauds the many co-curricular activities UCR organises with both local organisations and international partners. These extracurricular activities, the panel thinks, also strengthen the programme and help students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. It is therefore pleased to see that UCR's management strongly encourages and supports new initiatives.

According to the panel, students are sufficiently represented in advisory boards as the Programme Committee and UCR Council. From hearing various examples, it has gained the impressions that student issues are taken very seriously at UCR. The panel was also impressed that UCR invites an External Evaluation Panel to Middelburg every year. This panel consists of academics with a strong reputation in undergraduate teaching. Panel members review a part of the UCR curriculum that covers their expertise and they meet with teachers and students to discuss the curriculum. According to the panel, this is a good way to further improve the curriculum every year.

The panel asked the alumni how they would change the programme if they became Dean tomorrow. They said that they would investigate what direction UCR should take, and they considered the community's support for future plans such as the Engineering and Innovation Initiative crucial. The students fully agreed with this viewpoint. They feared that the core of the programme and/or the tracks may become less stable while expanding in a new direction. The panel shared these views with the programme management, which already proved well aware of these concerns. It stressed that the focus of the Engineering and Innovation initiative is to successfully integrate new courses within the current LAS approach.

Staff
Staff members at UCR ('UCR faculty') and 'visiting faculty' deliver the programme together. Visiting faculty are staff members who teach one or more courses at UCR on a part-time contract. From studying the UCR faculty data, the panel concludes that there is an excellent fit between the curriculum and the core faculty. Faculty members are considered experts in their field with a thorough knowledge of the subjects they teach. The majority holds a PhD (85%) and a Basic Teaching Qualification, many also have a Senior Teaching Qualification (approximately 30%). In addition, UCR faculty have research time, time for tutoring and for other 'services to the academic community'. New staff members at UCR start on a temporary two-year contract, which becomes permanent if everyone is satisfied after these two years.

The panel was impressed with the professional development opportunities for staff: the Teaching and Learning Seminars, the 'Excellent learning through teaching excellence' summer school (both organised in-house, the latter together with Harvard University) and the cooperation with the Roosevelt Centre for Excellence in Education and Utrecht University's Center of Excellence in University Teaching. These good teaching and research opportunities are also reflected in the number of faculty members with a Senior Research Qualification (18%).

The staff explained that the workload is, at times, high. However, they also concluded that it is still possible to find the right balance between teaching and research. According to faculty, this is to a large degree because UCR prioritises teaching; there are no publication targets that distract from teaching. The panel concludes that faculty members feel very committed to the UCR community. Conversely, they involve UCR students in their own research, for instance by trying to find internships within their research networks. When asked if all staff members have equal opportunities, UCR faculty said they were not always aware of the fact which colleagues did or did not have a full-time appointment at UCR. In their view, part-time colleagues were often just as committed to UCR and also had an important influence on the curriculum. UCR faculty considered sharing experiences with part-time colleagues a 'great added value' of teaching at UCR.

The students with whom the panel spoke were enthusiastic about their teachers, they considered them knowledgeable, committed, helpful and easy to contact/approach. They, too, did not perceive a difference in the quality of teaching between visiting faculty and UCR staff. Sometimes new teachers did have to get adjusted to teaching at UCR, the students felt, as they sometimes started giving too many assignments. They also noted that UCR faculty would respond to emails quickly, for part-time lecturers this could take up to a few days. The panel concludes that UCR has a professional, dedicated and supportive staff team, more than capable of delivering the curriculum while maintaining the standards of intensive and small-scale teaching at UCR.

Study guidance
All students are assigned a tutor at the start of the programme. He/she is the first port of call regarding selecting courses and practical matters such as course scheduling. Tutors also monitor study performance and contact the student if there are any concerns about the student's wellbeing. In that case, students are referred to either the senior tutor, the UCR counsellor or a medical professional. In addition to the tutor support system, which primarily focuses on academic advice at an individual level, students at UCR can benefit from time management and study skills workshops. There is also an Academic Writing Centre where students make individual appointments to receive help when writing papers.

The students explained that the support they receive from their tutors is mostly practical. For course questions, students directly approached the teachers. In addition to formal support systems, students also benefit from informal support by peers. The students said they experienced a lot of support from fellow students and friends. In order to smooth the transition to master's programmes, the students have developed a Master Guide with basic information on requirements for master's programmes. In addition, the programme is also in the process of developing a 'master advice tool' to better inform students on the programmes they can qualify for with a particular combination of courses. The graduates with whom the panel spoke were enthusiastic about the support they received during their individual bachelor thesis trajectory and during their preparation for particular master's programmes.

The panel can see that the programme, indeed, does support students far beyond their courses. It particularly appreciates the important role of the tutors in this respect. The students noted that all tutors have their own tutoring style. The panel thinks it important to set clear guidelines so students know how much support and guidance they may expect. This is in line with the student view in the self-evaluation report: 'the role of the tutor may be better defined in order to prevent unrealistic expectations'.

Given the interdisciplinary focus of the programme, the panel asked the teachers (who also act as thesis supervisors) if UCR had a particular strategy to make sure that the theses are broad and bring together various disciplines. It also wondered how the coherence in the supervision team was ensured. The teachers explained that, normally, both first and second examiners are known from start. If the students have not found a second supervisor themselves, the first supervisor will approach a colleague in or outside UCR. Having both supervisors involved from the start prevents them from being surprised about, for instance, the chosen methodology. The teachers also explained that this process is currently being structuralized now the capstone project is being changed into a senior project. The teachers noted that they want to carefully monitor that students, indeed, have more have time to reflect. The panel suggests, as mentioned above, to involve a second supervisor from another discipline.

Programme-specific facilities
The panel considers UCR's teaching facilities fit for purpose. The classrooms are suitable for small-scale teaching and can accommodate approximately twenty-five students each. UCR also has an 'outdoor classroom'. The programme organises its laboratory courses at the HZ University of Applied Sciences in Vlissingen, a six-kilometre cycle from Middelburg. Here there are various kinds of wet and dry lab facilities, a biomedical lab, and ecology lab, et cetera. UCR also boasts a 'living lab'; to gain practical science skills training students do fieldwork and/or go on excursions to the Oosterschelde, Westerschelde and the Ardennen.

Though the facilities are adequate, two major improvements are scheduled. As said before, together with the HZ University of Applied Sciences, UCR has taken the initiative for a 4.500 square meters 'Joint Research Centre' in Middelburg. The Joint Research Centre will be within walking distance of UCR and have state of the art equipment. The programme is also planning a major update of its IT systems and the development of a unified communication platform, accompanied by a new website. This is done to better streamline the information that is now fragmented in different newsletters and on various social media. The panel is impressed with the changes that the programme has made and is planning to make. The programme has clearly taken previous recommendations to heart.

Considerations
According to the panel, UCR's educational philosophy is well tuned towards the aims of the programme. The panel appreciates how UCR has formulated six educational principles for teachers, stressing the importance of regular feedback to and an active role for students during classes. This, together with continuous assessment, ensures that students are able to improve and build on what they learn during a semester.

The panel thinks that the curriculum is well structured with a good disciplinary balance. It incorporates numerous innovative elements around undergraduate research, civic and global engagement, as well as inspiring artistic, music performance and pre-medical opportunities and exciting research projects that are not seen elsewhere. There is a lot of room for students to pursue personal interests, both in- and outside of class. The practice of asking students to bring their best work together in a portfolio and to reflect on their learning journey is evidently a highly productive and worthwhile one, the panel thinks. It believes other LAS programmes could do well to emulate this practice. The panel is confident that the clear instructions regarding which courses students have to take within each of the departments, depending on their chosen specialisation, help to ensure that students comply with the LAS principles of studying across disciplines.

The amount of extracurricular activities at UCR is impressive, and the panel notes that they tie in well with the programme's intended learning outcomes and thus strengthen the programme. The workload at UCR is feasible, but high. The panel applauds the changes that have been and are being made to keep to workload bearable. It is confident that the programme management is able to tackle workload issues.

The panel describes the fit between curriculum and core faculty as excellent. Faculty members are experts in their field with a thorough knowledge of the subjects they teach. A considerably number of teachers has a Senior Research Qualification. The panel was pleased to hear that staff are able to balance their teaching and research well and it is impressed with the various professional development opportunities for staff. UCR has a well-established support system to guide students through their studies, with an important and much appreciated role for tutors. The panel suggests setting clear tutoring guidelines so students know how much support and guidance they may expect from their tutors.

The panel concludes that, over the past two years, there have been a lot of changes and on-going processes at UCR. One of these initiatives will lead to a new Joint Research centre, with brand new laboratories for UCR's science students. In addition, the teaching facilities and communication platforms will be upgraded. In the curriculum, more interdisciplinary courses are underway and the capstone project (7.5 EC) will be revised into a senior project (15 ec, see standard 3) – allowing students more time to reflect. The panel appreciates all of these changes. It also recommends, however, not to lose sight of the good work that has already been done and which has resulted in a strong programme and a vibrant community, enabling students to reach their full potential. Finally, the panel appreciates the fact UCR invites an External Evaluation Panel to Middelburg every year. This is a good way to further improve the programme.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'good'

Standard 3: Student assessment
The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Findings

Assessment system
UCR's most recent assessment policy dates from August 2017. The SER lists its seven key elements. The assessment policy (1) describes assessment across the curriculum (number, variety and level of assessment); (2) explains how examiners should link course objectives to UCR programme outcomes in track outlines; (3) explains how examiners can design valid, reliable and transparent assessments (4) defines UCR's grading scale and its use in continuous assessment; (5) describes the procedures, standards and forms for the Capstone assessment; (6) provides a definition of academic dishonesty and how to deal with this; (7) explains the role of the Board of Examiners. The panel has studied the assessment policy and concludes that it provides a good starting point for assessment. The document aims to make sure that assessment is a fair reflection of what students have learned during the course, that it is clear how the grades have been established, that assessment is sufficiently varied across the curriculum and aimed at the appropriate level, and that all course and track objectives are demonstrably linked to the programme's intended learning outcome. That way, students that fulfil the graduation requirements (academic core courses, two completed tracks, et cetera, depending on the choice of major) automatically will have obtained all intended learning outcomes.

In addition to more traditional exams and essays, students work on homework and research problems, present their work to each other, create poster presentations, reflect on academic skills and they create videos and artistic performances. The programme explains that there is no programme-wide assessment plan because each student completes a different set of courses. Instead, UCR has an assessment matrix for every track in place. Because all students complete at least two tracks, they need to demonstrate their mastery of all intended learning outcomes at least twice.

As previously mentioned, continuous assessment is central to UCR's educational philosophy. During the site visit, programme management explained that the concept is rooted in educational science.

Continuous assessment is believed to add to deeper learning while preventing peek periods at the end of semesters. In general, the students were also enthusiastic about the use of continuous assessment in the courses. They said they experienced less pressure because they were continuously working. It also put their mind at rest knowing that, if they performed badly in one assignment, they would not immediately fail a class. However, some of them also said they preferred the courses in which they worked on one end project while receiving a lot of feedback on the way. The panel clearly sees the advantages of continuous assessment. It also concludes that continuous assessment seems to be working well at UCR. However, the panel recommends keeping good track of the workload involved for both students and staff/examiners.

During the meeting with the Board of Examiners, two aspects of the assessment system were discussed in more detail: UCR's resit policy and its absence policy. The panel noted that both policies seem rather strict. The Board of Examiners confirmed that students who fail a course are not allowed to take a resit. According to the Board of Examiner, this does not happen often because the system of continuous assessment prevents it. In rare cases that students do not pass a course, examiner and student have to find a solution together. The Board of Examiner also clarified that students are allowed to miss some classes. Students can miss a maximum of 6 classes before failing the course. The Board of Examiners also explained that some examiners are more lenient than others, for instance if they are aware of special circumstances. The Board of Examiner also noticed that some examiners have very clear descriptions of active participations, whereas in other courses this is not yet the case. It has reported this observation back to the Board of Education.

In general, the panel is of the opinion that UCR has a clear assessment policy, that it uses a good variety of assessment methods, and that these are very well suited to the course objectives and course level. Board of Examiners, Board of Studies and Programme Committee regularly check the quality of assessment. The panel also appreciates that UCR has recently devoted a lot of attention to assessment in general, and that it plans to continue to do so in the following years by further developing and implementing rubrics and assessment tools. For example, UCR's new assessment protocols have been discussed in a number of staff meetings, and all staff have been required to follow a 'Quality in Assessment' workshop at Utrecht University. The attention for assessment has, among other things, led to staff reflecting on their own assessment and grading practices, and to the Board of Studies looking at assessment when approving new courses, and requiring changes when these are deemed necessary.

Though the panel is enthusiastic about these developments, it also notes that these changes are an appropriate response to students' complaints, namely that standardisation in assessment and grading was lacking and that improvement was needed. The panel thinks that, if there are strict policies regarding resits and absence, examiners should adhere to them. But rather it suggests changing the resit policy and giving students the chance to resit exams. Furthermore, the panel believes that the students are right when asking for the participation grade to be a fair and transparent reflection of their actual participation, and for grades to be returned on time. Finally, the panel strongly supports further standardisation and formalisation of assessment, for instance by developing rubric forms and digital assessment tools, as the programme is already intending to do.

Capstone assessment
In their last year at UCR, students complete a capstone. As mentioned above, the assessment of consists of three parts: (1) the capstone report, (2) a portfolio with the students' best papers written at UCR and (3) a reflection report. The programme has chosen this set-up to better illustrate the study process and end-level of the graduates. The reflection element was added after the previous assessment panel had requested such a reflective element, in order for the portfolio to reflect 'in an integrative way, that a specific student has met the different learning and programme outcomes.' The panel notes that the portfolio questions are well designed and that the instructions provide helpful guidance.

The panel noted that the amount of feedback on the assessment forms that they studied differed greatly. In general, feedback was brief and the forms did not yet contain information on the portfolio and research questions In some cases, students received good feedback (thorough, constructive, transparent), but in most cases the panel thought the amount of feedback was too limited. Though the panel understands that students probably get a lot of oral feedback from their supervisors during the capstone process, it still thinks it is important for students to receive written feedback that indicates how they may develop and improve in the future. Written feedback also enhances the transparency of assessment. The panel is pleased to hear that UCR has recently introduced a new capstone evaluation form that both examiners fill in independently before the student presents his or her capstone work at the Capstone Day. This new form has been introduced to provide students with more written feedback, to increase the transparency of the capstone assessment and to better make clear what the second assessor's role and assessment is. The panel applauds these changes. It is also glad to hear that the Board of Examiners now plays an active role in checking whether the form has been filled in a correct manner.

Finally, the panel asked how the portfolio is assessed. It learned that, at the moment, only the tutor checks the quality of the portfolio. The amount of feedback that students get on the portfolio and reflection therefore also depends on the tutor. The Board of Examiners checks if the portfolio and reflection questions are complete, but it does not have the capacity to check all portfolios more in-depth. The Board has asked for better (digital) tools to assess them. The panel seconds this question.

Board of Examiners
The Board of Examiners is an independent legal body within UCR consisting of four members. After having applied, they have been selected and appointed by the Dean of UCR for a period of three years. When asked how often they convene, the Board of Examiners explained that the chair and the secretary meet on a weekly basis to discuss current matters, and that the Board as a whole meets once a month. The external member, who is very experienced in the legal position of Examination Boards, joins the meetings twice a year. The Board of Examiners safeguards the quality of assessment by: appointing examiners; discussing expectations with the Director of Education; reviewing cases of suspected academic dishonesty and plagiarism; dealing with individual students' requests; and by producing reports on the quality control of assessment – typically two times a year. The Board of Examiners also takes random samples of assessed student work from courses that score above and below average in student evaluations. The Board members said that they feel sufficiently supported by the management to fulfil their tasks within the allocated time. Conversely, the SER states that the Board of Studies is grateful for the Board of Examiners' reports. These have helped install new policies and procedures and improve assessment in general.

The panel concludes that the Board of Examiners is well organised and appears to be working efficiently. However, the panel feels that this committee could adopt a more visionary, active role in order for UCR to fully profit from its expert advice. The Board of Examiners should, for instance, also monitor the alignment of courses, tracks and intended learning outcomes, it could initiate discussions about research ethics, and review a more extensive random sample of course assessment, as well as capstone assessment. The panel is well aware of possible time constraints. It therefore suggests creating an annual plan specifying what activities are undertaken at what time and delegating certain tasks (for instance an annual check of a sample of capstone projects, including portfolios) to focus groups that are established for this purpose.

Considerations
The panel concludes that UCR has a good assessment policy in place, that it uses a sufficiently varied amount of assessment methods, and that assessment is very well geared towards course level and objectives. The programme has much improved its assessment system by introducing a new assessment policy, by freeing up time to train staff members, by introducing a new capstone assessment form, and by making changes to the capstone project itself. This has, among other things, led to more reflection on assessment and grading practices, and to *ex ante* checks of assessment for new courses. According to the panel, the newly introduced capstone evaluation form

increases the transparency of the capstone assessment and makes better clear what the role of the second assessor is. The panel firmly supports further standardisation and formalisation of assessment, including assessment of the capstone project. Finally, the panel noticed that the Board of Examiners fulfils its legal duties, but could be more actively engaged in monitoring the quality of assessment.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes
The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Final achievement level
As described above, UCR's assessment policy aims to make sure that all course and track objectives are linked to the programme's intended learning outcomes. That way, students that fulfil UCR's graduation requirements automatically will have obtained all intended learning outcomes. The Board of Studies and the Board of Examiners see to it that the assessment rules and policies are followed properly and that students do, indeed, meet the graduation requirements.

The panel studied a selection of 15 capstone projects and portfolios. It noted that the term 'capstone' is slightly confusing, because it implies a thesis with a strict multi- or interdisciplinary approach. Such an approach was lacking in most of the theses that the panel studied. When the capstone project is changed into a senior project, it recommends including such an interdisciplinary element. In the selected works, the panel looked at research questions, research methodology, academic writing skills, data collection and referencing. It also examined how students reflected on personal growth. Most theses reached or easily surpassed bachelor level. There were four theses that the panel was very impressed with, they went far beyond what the panel expects of students at undergraduate level and gave evidence of a very mature approach to the research at hand. There were also two theses that the panel rated as 'weak'. In over half of the theses the panel would have scored the work they read slightly lower and in two cases it would have scored them higher. The portfolios that the panel has studied testify that UCR is succeeding in its aims to produce graduates who can critically and articulately reflect on their learning and achievements.

Based on the portfolios, graduates' testimonies and the material it studied during the site visit, the panel concludes that students and graduates meet the ambitious intended learning outcomes. Because students develop their own set of courses and regularly reflect on the choices they have made along the way, with peers, academic staff and most of all with their tutor, students are required to regularly scrutinise their academic progress and personal ambitions. The portfolio serves as a very helpful tool for students to reflect on their time at UCR and formulate ambitions for the future.
Students are strongly encouraged to develop a sense of civic responsibility in extracurricular activities and curricular 'outreach projects' that benefit both UCR's academic community and the wider community. UCR students have for instance set up a student sustainability community and they have become involved in several community projects. Some students volunteer at the local food bank, others are buddies for Alzheimer patients or work with refugees that came to Zeeland during the refugee crisis, and yet others have become involved with the local green party by advising them on the use of public space in Middelburg. The panel concludes that students feel very much involved in UCR's academic community and the community of Middelburg/Zeeland, that they are able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their role as global citizens and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs.

Performance of graduates

UCR monitors the performance of its graduates quite closely. In the annual Alumni Survey the programme asks every cohort that graduated three years ago what they did after UCR, what their current occupation is, and how they look back at their time at UCR. This survey has been carried out since 2010, three years after the first cohort graduated. The average response rate is just over 50%. In 2017, independent research centre ROA also carried out an alumni survey amongst all LAS graduates in the Netherlands. 748 UCR students (out of 2003 UCR graduates) completed the survey. Both surveys paint a similar picture. The majority of UCR students continue their studies with a master's degree programme, both in the Netherlands and abroad, usually at high-ranking universities such as Oxford, Cambridge or the London School of Economics.

The SER states that nearly 80% of alumni are accepted in their graduate programme of first choice. This is in line with what the graduate representatives told the panel, that they had had no trouble being accepted into master's programmes. Most of them experienced the support they were given during this period as outstanding. The graduates could easily adjust to a monodisciplinary master's programme. In comparison to their peers, they noted that they took more initiative and did not wait for problems to be solved for them. They also noticed they had a good work ethic, that their English language skills were good compared to their peers, and that the same was true for academic skills such as reading, writing and presenting. The panel concludes that UCR graduates are more than sufficiently prepared to continue their study in a master's or PhD programme. According to the panel, they are equally qualified to directly enter the labour market.

Considerations

The setup of the programme, the teaching-learning environment and the extra- and co-curricular activities make sure that all students obtain the ambitious ILOs. Most theses reach or easily surpass bachelor level. The panel is very enthusiastic about the role of the portfolio and the reflection document in the capstone project. The panel concludes that students are able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their civic responsibilities and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs. UCR graduates enrol in prestigious master's programmes. The fact that the majority has no problems in being admitted into their master's programme of first choice, and the fact that they perform well in these programmes is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'good'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

UCR strives for students to reach academic excellence, personal growth and a sense of civic responsibility. It has a clear, unique profile that is recognised and appreciated by prospective and current students, and graduates. The programme emphasises a broad education, a multi- and interdisciplinary approach, strong academic skills and attention to societal engagement. The panel is enthusiastic about the programme's strong sense of what it intends to do, which areas to focus on and what concrete plans to develop in new directions without stepping away from an LAS approach. The ILOs clearly articulate UCR's high ambitions and have been carefully phrased and convincingly mapped to both the LAS principles and the Dublin Descriptors. The ILOs easily surpass what may be expected of an academic bachelor degree programme in Liberal Arts and Sciences (standard 1).

UCRs educational philosophy is well tuned towards the aims of the programme. The six educational principles for teachers and the system of continuous assessment ensure that students are able to improve and build on what they learn during a semester. The curriculum is well structured with a good disciplinary balance. It incorporates numerous innovative elements around undergraduate research, civic and global engagement, as well as artistic, music performance, and pre-medical opportunities that are not seen elsewhere. There is a lot of room for students to pursue personal

interests. The amount of extracurricular activities is impressive, and the panel notes that they tie in well with the programme's intended learning outcomes and thus strengthen the programme. The fit between curriculum and core faculty is excellent. Faculty members are experts in their field with a thorough knowledge of the subjects they teach. The panel is impressed with the various professional development opportunities for staff at UCR. It appreciates that staff members are able to find the right balance between teaching and research (standard 2).

UCR has a good assessment policy in place. The programme has much improved its assessment system. This has, among other things, led to more reflection on assessment and grading practices, and to *ex ante* checks of assessment for new courses. The panel firmly supports further standardisation and formalisation of assessment, including assessment of the capstone project. Finally, the panel noticed that the Board of Examiners fulfils its legal duties, but could be more actively engaged in monitoring the quality of assessment (standard 3).

The set up of the programme, the teaching-learning environment and the extra- and co-curricular activities make sure that all students obtain the ambitious ILOs. Most theses reach or easily surpass bachelor level. The panel is very enthusiastic about the role of the portfolio and the reflection document in the capstone project. The panel concludes that students are able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their civic responsibilities and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs. UCR graduates enrol in prestigious master's programmes. The fact that the majority has no problems in being admitted into their master's programme of first choice, and the fact that they perform well in these programmes is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard. (standard 4).

The panel assesses standard 1, 2 and 4 as 'good' and standard 3 as 'satisfactory'. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, the panel therefore assesses the programme as 'good'.

Conclusion
The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences* as 'good'.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF SMALL-SCALE AND INTENSIVE EDUCATION

Organisational context

The bachelor's programme under review is offered by Utrecht University. UCR is a small-scale, selective, intensive, English-taught honours college, situated in Middelburg. It is a separate track of the Liberal Arts and Sciences programme at Utrecht University. UCR has formulated three main goals that students should achieve: academic excellence, personal growth and a sense of civic responsibility. UCR was founded in 2004; the first cohort graduated in 2007.

Given the prominence of its educational approach, the bachelor's programme was awarded the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education in 2013. This allows UCR to select new students up to its full College capacity of 600 students. A four-step admission procedure has been established for this purpose. In addition to the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme, which is discussed separately in the preceding chapter of this report, the panel performed a practice-based assessment to verify whether the distinctive, small-scale and intensive character of the bachelor's programme can be reaffirmed. Two panel members were specifically trained and appointed by the NVAO to lead the assessment of this Distinctive Feature. The practice-based assessment took place on 24-25 September 2018 in combination with the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme.

The practice-based assessment pays considerable attention to the following three 'areas of improvement' as formulated by the panel of the initial assessment of the Distinctive Feature in 2012:
- The formulation of programme outcomes at track level
- Laboratory facilities
- Portfolio

These 'areas of improvement' will be discussed under Standard A, G en H.

A. Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes are not only aimed at achieving a high level in the relevant academic discipline and/or professional practice, but also have a broader aim: to train socially skilled and initiative-rich scholars and/or professionals with a wide interest in social developments and issues within a multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary context.

Findings

UCR distinguishes between intended learning outcomes at three levels. The programme has formulated six 'Liberal Arts and Sciences Objectives' at UCR level, 11 'Program outcomes' at the level of the three disciplines/tracks (groups of courses within a specific discipline) within UCR, and intended learning outcomes at course level. A 'track outline' describes which outcomes are covered in which courses. The ILOs at UCR level have been tailored to the principles of LAS education; they emphasize a broad education across and within multiple disciplines (ILO1), a thorough understanding of the student's area of specialisation (ILO2), strong academic skills (ILO3), the ability to reflect (ILO4), societal engagement (ILO5) and the ability to deal with multifaceted problems, dilemma and ethical issues (ILO6). The second set of 11 ILOs is linked to the Bachelor Dublin Descriptors. They encompass a mastery of disciplinary knowledge and skills, understanding and exercising academic attitudes and values, and understanding the connection with other disciplines.

The previous assessment panel considered the intended learning outcomes at track level (UCR calls these 'programme outcomes') to be formulated 'in a less concrete and operational manner' than the learning outcomes of the courses. It therefore suggested reformulating them in a 'more relatable,

concrete and observational' manner. UCR has taken this suggestion to heart by rephrasing the programme outcomes and by specifying, for each track, how each programme outcome is defined in terms of the language and concepts of that discipline. This 'track outline' also describes what program outcomes are covered in which courses. Though the current panel sees this as a big improvement, it also concludes that students could be better informed about the track outlines, as well as about the ILOs in general. The management indicated to plan to act upon this suggestion.

The panel noted that the learning outcomes are clearly articulated and that they are suitably mapped to the domain-specific framework and the Dublin descriptors. The ILOs cover the appropriate areas for breadth, specialisation, and skills, and they demonstrate a high level of reflection on the skills needed to pursue interdisciplinary research and learning. The latter is evidenced in, for instance, UCR ILO6: 'Students place the results of research and knowledge in the context of other disciplines and society [...] Students have respect for others, are open to learn from people with different perspectives, and are willing and able to contribute to a better world for all' and Programme outcome 9 (understanding the discipline's role in the world): 'Reflect in logical, social and/or ethical terms on interaction between the discipline and the natural world, society and/or self'.

Considerations
UCR strives for students to reach academic excellence, personal growth and a sense of civic responsibility. It has a clear, unique profile that is recognised and appreciated by prospective students, current students and graduates. The panel is in particular enthusiastic about the programme's strong sense of what it intends to do (focus areas), including concrete plans for development in new directions. The emphasis will remain on a broad education, a multi- and interdisciplinary approach, strong academic skills and attention to societal engagement. The ILOs clearly articulate UCR's high ambitions. They exceed what may be expected of academic bachelor degree programmes. These ILOs have been carefully phrased and convincingly mapped to both the LAS principles and the Dublin Descriptors.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard A as 'meets the standard'.

B. Relationship between the goals and content of the programme
The content of the programme is inseparably connected to relevant extra-curricular activities, which ensures a high level and broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes.

Findings
UCR offers approximately 200 courses, 100 courses per semester. Within the academic majors (Sciences, Social Sciences, Arts & Humanities), these courses are grouped in tracks; clusters of courses that form a coherent set. All UCR courses are offered at introductory level (100-level), intermediate level (200-level) and highest bachelor level (300-level). The programme's 'academic rules and procedures' describe, depending on the chosen specialisation, how many courses within each of the four departments students must take to meet UCR's breadth and depth requirements. This forces students to take classes outside their comfort zone. In addition to choosing a major, students can take part in UCR's music programme (courses in musicology and practical musical training) and/or pre-medical programme, and they can opt for courses on civic engagement and global citizenship.

Students take an active role in the programme's management and in curriculum design. The panel was very impressed with the amount of extracurricular activities that students and staff are involved in. Many activities find place within the framework of study association RASA. RASA helps organise and financially supports 19 societies, 9 teams and 7 student initiatives: for example different kinds of sports clubs, a theatre and debating society and UCR's own peer-reviewed scientific journal, *Ad Astra*. Most activities are by and for students and staff, but some also involve people from outside of

UCR, for instance UCR's Amnesty committee, 'open mic at the spot' evenings and the yearly UCR film festival.

The panel establishes that UCR is a very strong and vibrant community that actively supports students and gives them ample opportunity to broaden their interests and develop new skills. For instance, by running their own scientific journal, students practise their organisational, reviewing and editing skills, and these skills then feed back in the student's individual programmes. The co- and extracurricular activities strengthen the programme and help students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Considerations
The panel concludes that there is a clear link between intended learning outcomes, track outlines, course objectives, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. The many extracurricular activities feed back into the programme and help students to develop academic and personal skills and a sense of civic responsibility as set out in the intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard B as 'meets the standard'.

C. Structure and didactic concept
The concept of the programme is aimed at creating an academic and/or professional community. Key terms are small-scale and intensively organised education, leading to a high number of hours of face-to-face teaching, close involvement between students and teachers and between students among themselves and socially relevant extra-curricular activities.

Findings
UCR aims to educate students who excel academically, are able to reflect on their personal growth, and feel a sense of civic responsibility. These aims are geared towards creating a responsible, self-critical academic community and they are therefore well in line with the distinctive feature framework. The panel appreciates how UCR has formulated six educational principles for teachers, stressing the importance of regular feedback to and an active role for students during classes.

UCR enjoys a very favourable staff to student ratio of 1:12.6. Class sizes are small, the average class size is 20 and the maximum is 26 students. Students have at least 16 hours of face-to-face teaching every week, and they are expected to take an active role in class. In addition, they prepare course work, participate in group assignments, and take part in many extra-curricular activities. Especially in times of exams, this can lead to a high workload. Following advice from the previous assessment panel, to keep monitoring the workload carefully, this subject was discussed in more detail during the site visit with programme management, students, staff and graduates. The students said that the workload was 'quite manageable' because teachers, friends and tutors could provide support if you felt overwhelmed. The small class sizes made it easier to approach the teacher directly in case of difficulties, the students explained, though this partly depended on the teacher. Graduates called UCR 'high-achieving and high-paced'. The panel does not question the good support systems in place, but it does recommend that UCR continues to investigate in which places the workload can be further managed.

Students design their own study programme, assisted by their tutors. In these tutor meetings, students reflect on their learning process and decide on which courses they want to take next. This, together with continuous assessment, ensures that students are able to improve and build on what they have learned before. The panel thinks that the curriculum is well structured with a good disciplinary balance. It incorporates numerous innovative elements around undergraduate research, civic and global engagement.

All students are required to live on campus, which gives them opportunity to socialise outside classes, to learn from and support one another and to develop new skills, such as organisational, intercultural and leadership skills. The residential living and study association RASA help to shape UCR's vibrant community. Teaching staff confirmed to regularly take part in community activities with students, which was ascertained by students.

The students with whom the panel spoke were enthusiastic about their teachers, they considered them knowledgeable, committed, helpful and easy to contact/approach. The panel concludes that UCR has a professional, dedicated and supportive staff team, more than capable of delivering the curriculum while maintaining the standards of intensive and small-scale teaching at UCR.

During the assessment visit, the panel asked the teachers if they can guarantee that students really meet some of the more ambitious intended learning outcomes, such as 'contributing to a better world for all'. They explained that, for instance, civic engagement is achieved differently in every discipline, but that all teachers actively support students to develop a sense of civic responsibility. For instance, in a course on public politics, the teacher has taken the students to the food bank in Middelburg to show them some of the problems with our food supply system. In another course, students became buddies of Alzheimer's patients. In both cases, students continued to volunteer after the course had finished. Another example of an outreach activity is the 'Going Glocal program' in which students travel to Mexico and Africa to engage with students there. The teachers said that there is no overall master plan (nor does the panel think there should be such a plan), but that there are many initiatives, often initiated by the students themselves.

Considerations
The panel concludes that UCR is a vibrant teaching-learning community with, as they call it at UCR, true 'RASA spirit'. This community feeling is created and upheld by the students, study association RASA, staff and programme management. Class sizes are small, and students play an active role in class. Every week, students have at least 16 face-to-face teaching hours. Together with weekly course assignments, exam preparation and extracurricular activities, this leads to an intensive education. UCR's educational philosophy, its tutor and assessment system are student-centred. Under the guidance of UCR staff, students are asked to take responsibility for and reflect on their own learning process. Each discipline also encourages students to look outside UCR's bubble and engage with the wider academic and social community around them. In the panel's view, UCR's staff and students succeed very well in doing so.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard C as 'meets the standard'.

D. Intake
The programme has a sound selection procedure in place, aimed at admitting motivated and academically and/or professionally talented students.

Findings
Every year UCR admits between 180 and 210 new students and turns down roughly the same number of applicants (170-190). According to the self-evaluation report, the selection procedure aims to select students 'who love to learn, work together, improve themselves and contribute to a better world'.

The admission procedure currently consists of four-steps:
1. Prospective students complete an application file.

2. A member of staff comments on the student's application file (is the file complete? does the applicant have a relevant education?) and identifies key questions to be asked during a personal interview with the applicant.
3. Another member of staff conducts the interview and records their findings.
4. A third faculty member combines all information and decides whether applicants are admitted.

This four-step admission procedure was discussed in more detail during the site visit. The panel does not dispute the thoroughness of the process, in which different faculty members are involved at different stages. This, the panel thinks, helps to give applicants a fair chance. However, when it comes to diversity the panel recommends not letting one person conduct the interviews with prospective students, because scientific research into unconscious bias has shown that they will most likely select students that are similar to them. Instead, it would be better to interview applicants together with at least one other staff member. Programme management agreed that, even though the current system seems to work, meetings between prospective candidates with at least two members of staff would be better for some specific interviews. Such meetings will in future be scheduled on a more regular basis. The panel is pleased with this promise and it concludes that the admission procedure generally results in an adequate fit between students and programme.

The panel considers UCR's student population sufficiently diverse. In 2017, two thirds of the students were female and 40% came from abroad, mostly from other European countries (Germany, Italy, France, UK) and America. To increase the number of students from non-European countries or from different socioeconomic backgrounds remains a challenge, but from the information received the panel is confident that UCR is at least trying to address these issues. The panel congratulates UCR on its diversity report, which it considers a really impressive document. It not only raises the issue of diversity in students but also in staff, and defines diversity more broadly than often is the case. It also appreciates that UCR has appointed a Diversity Fellow and that UCR offers study loans to non-EU students that lack the funds to come to UCR. Students start paying back after seven years. At the time of the site visit the first graduates had just started doing so.

Considerations
The programme has a thorough admissions procedure in place. According to the panel, UCR succeeds in selecting motivated and talented students. The panel is satisfied with the number of students that UCR admits every year and it is pleased that UCR is trying to increase the diversity of student intake. The admissions procedure generally results in a good match between students and programme.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard D as 'meets the standard'.

E. Quality of staff
The teachers have high-quality knowledge of the relevant subject and feel involved in the distinctive nature of the programme.

Findings

Staff members at UCR ('UCR faculty') and 'visiting faculty' deliver the programme together. Visiting faculty are staff members who teach one or more courses at UCR on a part-time contract. From studying the UCR faculty data, the panel concludes that there is an excellent fit between the curriculum and the core faculty. Faculty members are considered experts in their field with a thorough knowledge of the subjects they teach. The majority holds a PhD (85%) and a Basic Teaching Qualification, many (approximately 30%) also have a Senior Teaching Qualification. Together UCR faculty teach 200 courses; the College allocates 0.15 fte per class. In addition, UCR faculty have research time, time for tutoring and for other 'services to the academic community'. New staff

members at UCR start on a temporary two-year contract, which becomes permanent if everyone is satisfied after these two years.

The panel was impressed with the professional development opportunities for staff: the Teaching and Learning Seminars, the 'Excellent learning through teaching excellence' summer school (both organised in-house, the latter together with Harvard University) and the cooperation with the Roosevelt Center for Excellence in Education and Utrecht University's Center of Excellence in University Teaching. These good teaching and research opportunities are also reflected in the number of faculty members with a Senior Research Qualification (18%).

The staff explained that the workload is, at times, high. However, they also concluded that it is still possible to find the right balance between teaching and research. According to faculty, this is to a large degree because UCR prioritises teaching; there are no publication targets that distract from teaching. The panel concludes that faculty members feel very committed to the UCR community. Conversely, they involve UCR students in their own research, for instance by trying to find internships within their research networks. When asked if all staff members have equal opportunities, UCR faculty said they were not always aware of the fact which colleagues did or did not have a full-time appointment at UCR. In their view, part-time colleagues were often just as committed to UCR and also had an important influence on the curriculum. UCR faculty considered sharing experiences with part-time colleagues a 'great added value' of teaching at UCR.

The students with whom the panel spoke were enthusiastic about their teachers, they considered them knowledgeable, committed, helpful and easy to contact/approach. They, too, did not perceive a difference in the quality of teaching between visiting faculty and UCR staff. Sometimes new teachers did have to get adjusted to teaching at UCR, the students felt, as they sometimes started giving too many assignments. They also noted that UCR faculty were easier to reach; they often responded to email within an hour, for part-time lecturers this could take up to a few days. The panel concludes that UCR has a professional, dedicated and supportive staff team, more than capable of delivering the curriculum while maintaining the standards of intensive and small-scale teaching at UCR.

Considerations
The panel verified that UCR's staff is more than qualified to deliver the courses within the 'Small-scale and Intensive Educational Framework'. They hold relevant teaching qualifications and are active researchers in relevant disciplines. Staff members feel very committed to the UCR community and have good opportunities to work on their own teaching and research career while teaching at UCR. These good teaching and research opportunities are reflected in the number of faculty members with a Senior Research Qualification.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard E as 'meets the standard'.

F. Number of staff
There is sufficient staff available to provide small-scale and intensive education and to ensure and develop individual contact between teachers and students.

Findings
On October 1st 2017 UCR employed 71 staff members for a total of 43.7 fte. The number of students registered at UCR at that time was 552, resulting in a staff to student ratio of 1: 12.6. Staff members at UCR ('UCR faculty') and 'visiting faculty' deliver the programme together. Students did not perceive a difference in the two groups of teachers. They considered both groups knowledgeable, committed, helpful and easy to contact/approach. Sometimes new teachers did have to get adjusted to teaching at UCR, the students felt, as they started giving too many assignments. The panel concludes that UCR has a professional, dedicated and supportive staff team, more than capable of

delivering the curriculum while maintaining the standards of intensive and small-scale teaching at UCR.

Considerations
The panel concludes that UCR has a professional, dedicated and supportive staff team, more than capable of delivering the curriculum while maintaining the standards of intensive and small-scale teaching at UCR.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard F as 'meets the standard'.

> **G. Available facilities**
> The programme has its own infrastructure with facilities for small-scale and intensive education and common extra-curricular social activities.

Findings
UCR is a residential college, students are required to live on campus. Spread out over four locations, all UCR buildings are in close proximity of Middelburg town hall, also known as UCR's Franklin building. The students have been very involved in finding, maintaining and improving student housing. They have organized themselves in a Housing Affairs Committee, been in charge of renting one of their buildings, 'Common house Elliott' themselves and have set up a student-run restaurant here. According to the students, a quarter of UCR students volunteers in Elliott. Study association RASA is housed here, there is a class room for (guest) lectures that UCR rents, a study area, and a large basement for social activities.

UCR has classrooms and study areas in the Franklin, Eleanor, Elliott and Theodore buildings and in De Burg. It also has an 'outdoor classroom'. The classrooms are suitable for small-scale teaching and can accommodate approximately twenty-five students each. The SER states that the programme is in the process of improving the classrooms and study areas as well as increasing the amount of study spaces. They will be refurnished and get a better noise reduction and ventilation system, making them more pleasant places to work. Outside of UCR, there are a few institutes nearby where students are welcome to study: the Zeeland Archives, the Institute of American Studies, and the provincial library ('Zeeuwse Bibliotheek'). The panel is pleased to hear that programme and students are in close contact to update the facilities so they meet the wishes of current and future students. Two other plans for upgrading programme-specific facilities include a major update of UCR's IT systems and the development of a unified communication platform, accompanied by a new website. This is done to better streamline the information that is now fragmented in different newsletters and on various social media. The panel appreciates these improvement plans.

The previous assessment panel noted that 'it remains a challenge to improve the opportunities for hands-on laboratory experience for science students'. At that time, the lack of science laboratories at UCR was solved by encouraging students to use the summer period for internships. UCR now organises its laboratory courses at the HZ University of Applied Sciences in Vlissingen, a six kilometre cycle from Middelburg. Here there are various kinds of wet and dry lab facilities, a biomedical lab, and ecology lab, et cetera. UCR also boasts a 'living lab'; to gain practical science skills training students do fieldwork and/or go on excursions to the Oosterschelde, Westerschelde and the Ardennen. Though the facilities are adequate, a downside is that UCR has limited access to them because of HZ timetables

Together with the HZ University of Applied Sciences, UCR has taken the initiative for a 4.500 square meters 'Joint Research Centre' in Middelburg. The Joint Research Centre will be within walking distance of UCR and have state of the art equipment. The programme management presented its plans for the centre to the panel. These look very promising and will be realised in the direct future.

The panel is impressed with the changes that the programme has made here and with the future plans for the Joint Research Centre. The programme has clearly taken previous recommendations to heart.

Considerations
The panel concludes that UCR's facilities – the class rooms, lecture halls, music rooms, computer facilities, study places, laboratory facilities, common house Elliott – help create a suitable teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities. The panel is convinced that any former concerns regarding UCR's science facilities are adequately addressed.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard G as 'meets the standard'.

H. Level realised
The content and the level of the final projects are in line with the level and the broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes. Graduates are admitted to prestigious postgraduate programmes and/or jobs. The success rates are substantially higher than those of other relevant programmes.

Findings

Final achievement level
The panel studied a selection of 15 capstone projects and portfolios. In the selected works, the panel looked at research questions, research methodology, academic writing skills, data collection and referencing. It also examined how students reflected on personal growth. Most theses reached or easily surpassed bachelor level.

Based on the portfolios, graduates' testimonies and the material it studied during the site visit, the panel concludes that students and graduates meet the ambitious intended learning outcomes. Because students develop their own set of courses and regularly reflect on the choices they have made along the way, with peers, academic staff and most of all with their tutor, students are required to regularly reflect on their academic progress and personal ambitions.

The portfolio serves as a very helpful tool for students to reflect on their time at UCR and formulate ambitions for the future. The previous assessment committee pointed out that the portfolio should include a reflective element. Because all students follow a different programme, the panel thought it important that the portfolio reflects 'in an integrative way, that a specific student has met the different learning and programme outcomes.' This suggestion has been followed up.

Students are strongly encouraged to develop a sense of civic responsibility in extracurricular activities and curricular 'outreach projects' that benefit both UCR's academic community and the wider community. UCR students have for instance set up a student sustainability community and they have become involved in several community projects. Some students volunteer at the local food bank, others are buddies for Alzheimer patients or work with refugees that came to Zeeland during the refugee crisis, and yet others have become involved with the local green party by advising them on the use of public space in Middelburg. The panel concludes that students feel very much involved in UCR's academic community and the community of Middelburg/Zeeland, that they are able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their role as global citizens and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs.

Performance of graduates
UCR monitors the performance of its graduates quite closely. In the annual Alumni Survey the programme asks every cohort that graduated three years ago what they did after UCR, what their current occupation is, and how they look back at their time at UCR. This survey has been carried out since 2010, three years after the first cohort graduated. The average response rate is just over 50%. In addition, independent research center ROA carried out an alumni survey amongst all LAS graduates in the Netherlands in 2017. 748 UCR students (out of 2003 UCR graduates) completed the survey. Both surveys paint a similar picture.

The majority of UCR students continue their studies with a master's degree programme, both in the Netherlands and abroad, usually at high-ranking universities such as Oxford, Cambridge or the London School of Economics. The top five of most popular study fields are Psychology (9.5%), Law (8.6%), Medicine (6.8%), International Relations (5.6%) and Economics (4.8%). At the time of the survey, a substantial amount of respondents had entered PhD programmes (9.2%) or had started working, with the five main common fields of work being: Research occupation (16.7%), Advisory occupation (10.7%), Commercial occupation (10.2%), Medical or social work occupation (8.9%) and Financial/business occupation (8.6%). Finally, it is worth mentioning that UCR has an alumni network, which has recently become more official. A digital platform allows students and graduates to see where people are studying and/or working and there is a message board listing opportunities.

The SER states that 78.9% of alumni are accepted in their graduate programme of first choice. This is in line with what the graduate representatives told the panel, that they had had no trouble being accepted into master's programmes. Some of them were accepted for as many as five master's programmes. Most of them experienced the support they were given during this period as outstanding. One graduate had been able to start a master's programme while still being at UCR, so she was able to graduate from her master's programme a few weeks after she had graduated at UCR. The graduates had no trouble adjusting to a master's programme. In comparison to their peers, they noted that they took more initiative for their own study path: they would not sit back and wait for problems to be solved for them. They also noticed they had a good work ethic, that their English language skills were good compared to their peers, and that the same was true for academic skills such as reading, writing and presenting. On average, 57.3% of graduates ranks themselves in the upper third of students of their master's programme. The panel concludes that UCR graduates are more than sufficiently prepared to continue their study in a master's or PhD programme. According to the panel, they are equally qualified to directly enter the labour market.

Success rates
Graduation rates for the UCR programme have consistently been high from the start of the programme in 2004. On average 92.8% of students that enter the second year then continue to successfully complete the programme. The majority (74%) graduates in three years. This number is substantially higher than that of other bachelor's programmes at Utrecht University. The number of students leaving the programme prematurely is low and has steadily gone down from 38 students in the cohort starting in August 2013 to 7 students in the August 2017 cohort. The panel interprets this a sign that students have realistic expectations and/or are well supported during their first year at UCR.

Considerations
Based on the portfolios, graduates' testimonies and the material it studied during the site visit, the panel concludes that students and graduates meet the ambitious intended learning outcomes. Graduation rates are high. Theses were generally of a very high level and students show being able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their civic responsibilities and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs. UCR graduates enrol in prestigious master's programmes. The fact that the majority has no problems in being admitted into their master's programme of first choice, and the fact that they perform well in these programmes is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard H as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The programme's intended learning outcomes are carefully phrased and they are suitably mapped to the domain-specific framework and the Dublin descriptors. The ILOs cover the appropriate areas for breadth, specialisation, and skills, and they demonstrate a high level of reflection on the skills needed to pursue interdisciplinary research and learning (standard A).

The panel concludes that there is a clear link between intended learning outcomes, track outlines, course objectives, co-curricular and extra-curricular activities. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. The many extracurricular activities feed back into the programme and help students to develop academic and personal skills and a sense of civic responsibility as set out in the intended learning outcomes (standard B).

The panel concludes that UCR is a vibrant teaching-learning community with, as they call it at UCR, true 'RASA spirit'. This community feeling is created and upheld by the students, study association RASA, staff and programme management. Class sizes are small, and students play an active role in class. Every week, students have at least 16 face-to-face teaching hours. Together with weekly course assignments, exam preparation and extracurricular activities, this leads to an intensive education. (standard C).

The programme has a thorough admissions procedure in place. According to the panel, UCR succeeds in selecting motivated and talented students. The panel is satisfied with the number of students that UCR admits every year and it is pleased that UCR is trying to increase the diversity of student intake. The admissions procedure generally results in a good match between students and programme (standard D).

The panel verified that UCR's staff is more than qualified to deliver the courses within the 'Small-scale and Intensive Educational Framework'. They hold relevant teaching qualifications and are active researchers in relevant disciplines. Staff members feel very committed to the UCR community and have good opportunities to work on their own teaching and research career while teaching at UCR. These good teaching and research opportunities are reflected in the number of faculty members with a Senior Research Qualification (standard E).

The panel concludes that UCR has a professional, dedicated and supportive staff team, more than capable of delivering the curriculum while maintaining the standards of intensive and small-scale teaching at UCR (standard F).

The panel concludes that UCR's facilities – the class rooms, lecture halls, music rooms, computer facilities, study places, laboratory facilities, common house Elliott – help create a suitable teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities. The panel is convinced that any former concerns regarding UCR's science facilities are adequately addressed (standard G).

Based on the portfolios, graduates' testimonies and the material it studied during the site visit, the panel concludes that students and graduates meet the ambitious intended learning outcomes. Graduation rates are higher than those of other bachelor's programmes at Utrecht University. Theses were generally of a very high level and students show being able to reflect (self)critically on their study path, their civic responsibilities and on personal growth. They convincingly demonstrate that they are familiar with and have embraced the programme's ILOs. UCR graduates enrol in prestigious master's programmes. The fact that the majority has no problems in being admitted into their

master's programme of first choice, and the fact that they perform well in these programmes is taken as evidence that the programme delivers graduates of a high standard. (standard H).

Practice-based assessment
With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that UCR meets all standards. In its assessment under Standards A, G and H, it paid specific attention to the formulation of programme outcomes at track level, the laboratory facilities and the portfolio, as these were identified as 'areas of improvement' in the 2013 assessment.

The panel has established that UCR has shown excellent progress on all points. The programme has rephrased the programme outcomes at track level by, among other things, specifying, for each track, which program outcomes (ILOs) are covered in which courses. UCR has started organising lab courses at a nearby institute, and the programme will soon have state-of-the-art facilities for hands-on laboratory experience within walking distance of UCR. Finally, the programme has added a reflective element to the portfolio, with well-designed questions and helpful instructions. As mentioned several times above, the panel is very enthusiastic about this reflective report and thinks it is a very worthwhile experience for students to consider their learning journey shortly before taking the next step in their career.

The improvement shown, the development plans, and the fact that all criteria meet the standard, result in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature by the panel and a positive advice regarding the practice-based assessment.

Conclusion
The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

This reference framework is intended for the Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) programs in the Netherlands. This includes selective University Colleges as well as non-selective LAS programs situated within a university. These programmes are a constituent part of Dutch "scientific" or "scholarly" education (wetenschappelijk onderwijs). The LAS education framework articulated here distinguishes itself from (emerging) broad programs through its proximity to academic inquiry and research and through its commitment to wide-ranging intellectual formation not chiefly aimed at preparing students for particular professions.

As this accreditation process is reviewing an ever more diverse range of programs, this framework of reference is short rather than extensive. Rather, it is a reference framework that reflects shared educational aims with each of the programs under review.

Liberal arts and Sciences emphasises intellectual growth through both broad and deep learning as the foundation of the curriculum. Standing in the liberal arts tradition that seeks to free the individual through intellectual and ethical engagement, LAS encourages inquiry through profoundly open curricula that allows students to explore a diversity of academic fields from the Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. This enables them to attain depth in disciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary concentration areas of their own choosing. By combining the disciplinary depth and multi- or interdisciplinary learning with undergraduate research and communication skills, students develop their creativity, initiative-taking, skills in working together. Often conducted in a strongly international context, LAS programs regardless of setting promote intercultural understanding abilities and societal engagement.

LAS takes place within distinct learning and social communities. The formal program and extracurricular activities are often linked and in such cases students, faculty and staff participate actively in the governance of the program and the community. Teaching and learning experiences are typically characterized by small-scale and intensive education, with a high level of interaction between students and teachers and among students themselves. Giving this emphasis on active discussion and debate, LAS programs strive for diversity in their student population in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender and cultural and socio-economic backgrounds and offer dynamic environments that invite curricular experimentation and educational innovation and attract academics dedicated to excellence in teaching.

Liberal Arts & Sciences programs have intended learning outcomes that include:
a. multidisciplinary familiarity in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences combined with depth of knowledge in a chosen concentration area;
b. ability to approach complex questions or issues in an inter- or multidisciplinary way;
c. advanced academic skills in communication, quantitative and qualitative methods, critical thinking, research and learning;
d. attitudes and skills for engaged citizenship, including international and intercultural understanding, social skills and a will to contribute to solving societal issues;
e. intellectual curiosity, reflexivity, integrity and an open mind, learning skills necessary for subsequent graduate studies and the workplace.

Approved in Tilburg on October 25, 2017 by
• Dean Amsterdam University College: prof. dr. Murray Pratt
• Dean Erasmus University College: prof. dr. Maarten Frens
• Dean Leiden University College The Hague: prof. dr. Judi Mesman
• Dean University College Groningen: prof. dr. Hans van Ees
• Dean University College Maastricht: prof dr. Matthieu Zegers
• Dean University College Roosevelt: prof. dr. Bert van den Brink
• Dean University College Tilburg: prof dr. Alkeline van Lenning
• Dean University College Twente: prof. dr. Jennifer Herek

- Dean University College Utrecht: prof. dr. James Kennedy
- Director Liberal Arts and Sciences @ Utrecht University: dr. Iris van der Tuin

APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

UCR graduates demonstrate that they master the following:

Demonstrate mastery of disciplinary knowledge	
Definition of the discipline	Distinguish what phenomena are studied and what types of questions scholars hope to answer via what methods. (This includes an awareness of assumptions and limitations, and the understanding that multiple paradigms exist in a single discipline.)
Theories	Demonstrate understanding of the most prominent theories of the discipline.
Methodologies	Apply common analytical methods and tools of the discipline and assess work of others.

Demonstrate mastery of disciplinary skills	
Critical Thinking	Independently formulate and critically review problem formulations, arguments and results (critical thinking, problem solving).
Research	Apply aspects of the main research methodologies of the discipline.
Communication	Communicate effectively (orally and in writing) with both scholarly- and lay- audiences.
Learning	Independently acquire and evaluate relevant academic information, reflect on one's own progress and identify one's knowledge gaps, and master new topics in discipline.

Understand and exercise academic attitudes and values	
Academic and Professional standards	Understand and adopt standards for academic integrity and relevant professional standards.
Discipline's role in the world	Reflect in logical, social and/or ethical terms on interaction between discipline and the natural world, society and/or self.

Understand connections with other disciplines	
Related fields	Transfer knowledge and/or skills from other related disciplines.
Complex problems	Present analysis of (and possibly first steps towards) the solution of complex multifaceted problems requiring knowledge and/or skills from different disciplines.

APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

A UCR student needs to complete 24 courses of 7.5 EC each. For every major[1] – Arts & Humanities, Social Science and Science – the academic rules and procedures specify what courses are required. The diagram below represents per major how the courses are combined in different categories:

• All majors require a number of skills course in the Academic Core (ACC) department. Specific courses and their level are indicated.
• In the major department, the student must include courses in at least two disciplines (tracks) including at least three courses at the highest (300) level.
• A breadth requirement states that students must do at least one course in every academic department.
• In their final year, all students must complete one capstone.
• Finally, students need to complete a number of electives. These electives can be used to do further specialization in the major, but can also be used to form a minor.

Full details on graduation requirements and the list of offered courses are described in the Academic Rules and Procedures.

	A&H major (BA)		SSC major (BA)		SCI major (BSc)
6 ACC courses	100 English	6 ACC courses	100 English	5 ACC courses	100 English
	200 English		200 English		200 English
	100 Research Methods		100 Research Methods		100 Research Methods
	100 Rhetoric		200 Research Method		100 Language
	100 Language		100 Language		200 Language
	200 Language		200 Language	12 SCI courses	100 Mathematics
10 A&H courses		10 SSC courses			
	100 Track A		100 Track A		100 Track A
	200 Track A		200 Track A		200 Track A
	300 Track A		300 Track A		300 Track A
	100 Track B		100 Track B		100 Track B
	200 Track B		200 Track B		200 Track B
	300 Track B		300 Track B		300 Track B
	300 Track A/B/C		300 Track A/B/C		300 Track A/B/C
1 SSC course		1 A&H course			
1 SCI course		1 SCI course		1 A&H course	
6 Electives		6 Electives		1 SSC course	
				5 Electives	
	Electives can be from any department		Electives can be from any department		Electives can be from any department
1 Capstone	Final work	1 Capstone	Final work	1 Capstone	Final work

---

[1] For the less-common Interdepartmental major separate rules apply.

APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Monday 24 Sepember 2018 - UCR

8.45 - 9.00	Arrival panel/welcome
9.00 -12.00	Initial panel meeting cluster
12.00 - 13.00	lunch and break
13.00 - 14.00	Initial panel meeting UCR
14.00 - 15.15	Tour + uitleg portfolio
15.15 - 15.30	Break
15.30 - 16.15	Development dialogue
16.15 - 17.00	Programme management
17.00 - 17.30	Alumni

Tuesday 25 September 2018

8.45 - 9.00	Arrival panel
9.00 - 9.30	Internal panel meeting
9.30 - 10.15	Students (including student members of the Programme Committee)*
10.15 - 11.00	Teachers and tutors (including staff members of the Programme Committee)*
11.00 - 11.15	Break
11.15 - 11.45	Boards of Examiners
11.45 - 12.15	Treasure trove
12.15 - 13.15	Lunch
13.15 - 14.15	Internal panel meeting
14.15 - 14.45	Programme management
14.45 - 15.00	Presentation findings
15.00 - 15.15	Goodbye and thank you

APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 capstone projects and portfolios of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences. Information on the selected works 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):
- Self-reflection with appendices
    - Self-reflection
    - 2017-2018 Student Handbook, including the Academic Rules and Procedures (OER)
    - UCR Capstone Guidelines
    - UCR Teaching Handbook (including the assessment policy)
- Additional information regarding capstones
- Educational reports from the last calendar years
- Documents from the Board of Examiners
    - Board of Examiners regulations
    - Rules for Examinations and other assessments
    - Recent annual reports
    - Recent quality control reviews
- Alumni reports
    - UCR Alumni Survey: classes of 2007-2014
    - UCR Master Orientation Tool
- LAS alumni survey factsheet
- Initiatives for Science facilities
- Joint Research Center Information booklet (in Dutch)
- Masterplan Campus Zeeland (in Dutch)
- Business plan Engineering & Innovation initiative
- Other material referred to in self-reflection
    - UCR Strategic Plan 2017-2021
    - Admissions Report
    - External Evaluation Panel Report
    - UCR response to 2012 accreditation
- Curriculum samples
    - Assorted track outlines
    - Course materials from six courses in Research Methods and Statistics, Communication, Art History, Antiquity, Anthropology, Physics
    - Portfolios of six students
- General
    - Minutes from PC
    - Minutes from UCR Council

LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

This report was finalised on 25 March 2019

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AT UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessments as a starting point (September 2016).

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Name of the programme: Liberal Arts and Sciences
CROHO number: 50393
Level of the programme: bachelor's
Orientation of the programme: academic
Number of credits: 180 EC
45 specializations; BA degree unless a Science specialization comprising at least 90 EC is completed (the latter results in a BSc degree)
Location(s):   Utrecht
Mode(s) of study: full time
Language of instruction: Dutch
Submission deadline: 01/05/2019

The visit of the assessment panel Liberal Arts and Sciences to the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University took place on 27 September 2018.

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

Cluster Liberal Arts and Sciences
The assessment of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences at the Faculty of Humanities is part of the assessment of Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Sciences degree. The assessment of Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Sciences degree is part of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences.

From May to December 2018, a panel of expertise members assessed bachelor's programmes Liberal Arts and Sciences at eight universities. A panel of six to nine members was appointed for each site visit, based on the expertise and availability of each panel member and taking into account possible conflicts of interest.

The full panel Liberal Arts and Sciences consisted of eighteen members:
- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of the Radboud University [chair]
- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice chair]

- Prof. S. (Samuel) Abraham, co-founder and managing director of ECOLAS and founder, professor and rector of Bratislava International School of Liberal Education (BISLA, Slovakia)
- Dr. S.I. (Sylvia) Bergh, associate professor in Development Management and Governance at the International Institute of Social Studies in The Hague
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom)
- Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen
- Prof. W.M. (Wayne) Cranton, assistant dean (research) at the Faculty of Arts, Computing, Engineering and Sciences of Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom)
- C. (Carl) Gombrich, MSc programme director of the BASc Art and Sciences at the University College London (United Kingdom)
- Dr. K. (Katherine) Goodman, assistant professor and associate director of Inworks at the University of Colorado Denver (United States)
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany)
- Dr. A. (Alyssa) Schneebaum, lecturer and researcher at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and Universität Wien (Austria)
- Em. prof. A.H.A. (Fred) Soons, emeritus professor in International Public Law at Utrecht University
- Dr. M. (Mark) Sommerville, associate dean of Faculty Affairs and Development and associate professor in Electrical Engineering and Physics at Olin College of Engineering (United States)
- Dr. J.(Jos) Willems, former member of the board of Zuyd University of Applied Sciences and educational advisor for Higher Education
- Drs. S.C. (Sylvia) Witteveen, academic director of the Psychobiology programme at the Faculty of Science of the University of Amsterdam
- I. (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, University College Groningen
- Y. (Yara) van Ingen, bachelor's student Maastricht Science Programme, Maastricht University
- M. (Maya) Ouwehand, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, Utrecht University

The panel was supported by dr. Els Schröder as project coordinator of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences. She also acted as secretary during the visit to Leiden University College, University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme. She was supported by dr. Joke Corporaal at University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme, who also wrote the reports of the first five colleges. Dr. Marianne van der Weiden acted as secretary during the site visits to Groningen University College, University College Tilburg and University College Twente.

Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University
The bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences at the Faculty of Humanities has been assessed as part of a combined site visit to Utrecht University's three Liberal Arts and Science programmes, which form separate 'tracks' within Utrecht University's Liberal Arts and Science degree programme. In this report, these tracks will be referred to as 'programmes'.

The Utrecht University Liberal Arts and Sciences programmes are: Liberal Arts and Sciences at the Faculty of Humanities (hereafter: LAS), Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Utrecht (hereafter: UCU) and Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Roosevelt (hereafter: UCR). The programmes prepared individual self-evaluation reports. The panel visited the programmes at their individual premises in a combined site visit, which took place between 24-27 September in Middelburg and Utrecht. The panel's findings will be presented in three programme-specific reports.

The panel that visited the three Liberal Arts and Sciences-programmes at Utrecht University consisted of six members:

- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of Radboud University [chair];
- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice-chair];
- Prof. mr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen;
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany).;
- I. (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's studente of Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Groningen [student member].

For the assessment of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education at UCU and UCR, Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T. A Brus were trained by the NVAO and appointed to head the assessment of the Distinctive Feature at these programmes.

The panel was supported by dr. J. (Joke) Corporaal, who wrote the report, and dr. E. Schröder, who supervised the site visit and reporting process as project manager and secretary.

The NVAO approved the composition of the panel on 16 April 2018.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

Preparation
The panel chair, secretary and representatives of the three programmes jointly composed a schedule for the site visit. Prior to the site visit, the programmes selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 4 for the definitive schedule.

Before the assessment panel's visit to Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University, the project coordinator received the programmes' self-evaluation reports. She sent these to the panel and secretary, after checking it for completeness of information. Upon reading the self-evaluation reports, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings, which they send to the secretary and project coordinator.

Final projects
The panel also studied a selection of final projects for all three programmes. All selections were made by the panel's chair with the assistance of the project coordinator, and took into account the expertise and interests of the panel members and referees. The panel chair and project coordinator took care that a variety of topics and disciplines were covered. Also, they ascertained that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades over all presented projects. For LAS, a combination of a disciplinary and an interdisciplinary thesis form a student's final work. For this assessment, fifteen students were selected. In total, the panel studied fifteen theses.

Site visit
The panel visited the programmes between 24-27 September 2018. It visited UCR on 24-25 September, UCU on 26 September and LAS on 27 September. During these visits, UCR and UCU were also assessed by the panel on the Distinctive Feature of Small-Scale and Intensive Educations.

At the start of the site visit on 24 September, the panel held a preparatory meeting during which it was instructed regarding all assessment frameworks and procedures. After this, the panel discussed

its working method and its preliminary findings for the site visit with respect to the regular assessments of all three programmes and the assessments of the Distinctive Feature (if applicable). It also paid attention to the content and use of the programmes' domain-specific framework of reference, which is included in Appendix 1.

After its initial meetings, the panel focused on its individual assessments of the programmes. At each location, the panel started with a dedicated panel meeting, in which the panel discussed its preliminary findings for each programme followed by a programme-specific development conversation. In it, the panel and representatives of the visited programme discussed various developments routes for the programme. The result of these conversations are summarised in three separate reports, which will be published through the programmes' communication channels. The information received during the development conversations are not part of the conducted assessments.

The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes at their premises visited the available facilities. It also examined materials provided by each programme. An overview of these materials for LAS is given in Appendix 5, and for the other programmes in their own programme-specific report. At all three locations, the panel used the final part of the visit to discuss its programme-specific findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards the panel chair gave an oral presentation, in which he expressed the panel's preliminary impressions and general observations.

Reports
After the site visit, the secretary wrote three draft reports: each programme received its own report. The draft report for LAS focuses on the regular NVAO programme assessment. The draft reports for UCR and UCU include two separate chapters: the first part of these reports focuses on the regular NVAO programme assessment of the bachelor's programme, and the second part of the report specifically addresses the standards related to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education. Subsequently, the secretary sent the reports to the assessment panel and project coordinator for feedback. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project coordinator sent the draft reports to the university in order to have these checked for factual irregularities. The secretary discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and adapted the reports accordingly before its finalisation.

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 both the standards and the programme as a whole.

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

Unsatisfactory
The programme does not meet the generic quality standard and shows shortcomings with respect to multiple aspects of the standard.

Satisfactory
The programme meets the generic quality standard across its entire spectrum.

Good
The programme systematically surpasses the generic quality standard.

Excellent
The programme systematically well surpasses the generic quality standard and is regarded as an international example.

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Standard 1
The panel concludes that LAS has a clear, unique profile. The programme's mission statement and intended learning outcomes evidently correspond to the domain-specific framework of reference and to the international requirements of the discipline, and exceed these in the way in which they are formulated and in the way in which they include reflection as part of the programme's aims. The panel particularly appreciates how the intended learning outcomes clearly describe interdisciplinary and disciplinary skills and how the programme has innovatively translated these into five 'roles for reflection', which is exercised in an excellent way. This helps students to reflect on their learning trajectory from the start of the programme and to understand the intended learning outcomes. The panel was impressed to see how well the programme manages to cooperate with other faculties and disciplines across the university, which also translate in highly ambitious and innovative aims and goals. It considers LAS' grounding in theoretical research in the field of interdisciplinarity state-of-the-art for an LAS undergraduate programme.

Standard 2
The panel considers LAS' teaching-learning environment of a very high standard. LAS has a strong research approach towards - and academic reflection of - interdisciplinary teaching and learning, consequently expressed in intended learning outcomes, course objectives, course design and capstones. The programme has clearly put a lot of work into developing the programme's structures and principles, and making these clear and explicit to students. They now provide an ideal platform for both staff-student discussions and student self-reflection. Offering a wide curriculum with no less than 45 specialisations entails the risk that students drift away from LAS, but the programme has close contacts and clear agreements with the other Utrecht University bachelor's programmes to prevent this from happening.

Regular course and curriculum evaluations, and adjustments made accordingly, give evidence of LAS' committed and development-oriented approach. The integrative core, with a strong focus on reflection, teaches students to think in an integrated way. The panel was struck to see how well the students know what they are learning, utilizing newly acquired knowledge and skills on the way. The design of the programme allows LAS to be truly transformative. LAS benefits from having very active and outward looking staff members, who are constantly trying to improve their courses. The programme yields impressive results with a small number of staff. Staff members share a clear, integrated vision of teaching and are very committed to the programme and to the students. The panel particularly appreciated how the design of the programme is based on evidence from research, including evidence developed by the teaching team itself. Staff members are involved in longitudinal research regarding interdisciplinary learning and liberal education. According to the panel, staff members are clearly highly engaged and committed with expertise in their own discipline as well as being or becoming internationally leading scholars in the field of interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Staff members are on the whole given significant research time, which may be a key factor in supporting their outstanding evidence-based innovations and approaches.

The programme has a good tutorial system in place, with relatively small and well-coordinated tutor groups of 15 first-year students. The fact that second and third students have set up their own tutor system to support first-year students, and the fact that they are closely involved in the matching process for prospective students, is interpreted as evidence of their sense of commitment to the programme.

Standard 3
LAS has an elaborate assessment policy in place, with clear assessment principles and a lot of attention for monitoring the quality of assessment – not only of LAS courses, but also of the general education courses and courses within the specialisation programmes. The programme uses a wide variety of assessment methods, including some innovative ways of assessment such as reflection documents and peer feedback. Assessment itself is well designed, with assignments being oriented

at the appropriate level and showing an increase in complexity. The panel was particularly enthusiastic about the clear grading rubrics, the excellent thesis feedback form and the assessment of important interdisciplinary skills (self-reflection, self-authorship, integration) in the reflective e-portfolio. It also appreciated how assessment criteria, including rubrics, are clearly communicated to the students. The Board of Examiners performs its duties well, it made a proactive and professional impression on the panel. The panel does advice the Board of Examiners to fill in the research ethics crack that it came across in its sample check.

Standard 4
The panel concludes that students easily reach the intended learning outcomes. The programme clearly meets its own, ambitious standards. Theses and capstones are generally of a high level, grading is realistic and the programme provides extensive and constructive feedback throughout. Quality standards are high and comparable with similar programmes. Intake, attainment, and graduate outcomes are being carefully monitored. The programme has successfully dared to formulate a type of student that enters and leaves the LAS programme, and many of the intended learning outcomes have been mentioned in this report in a best practice context. There is still room for improvement. Although the panel is enthusiastic about the clear thesis feedback forms, the pre-given answers seemed to invite rather short individual comments, which limits the students' learning opportunity. Also, success rates are low. The panel is pleased to see that measures to prevent study delay and increase the number of students graduating on time have been taken. The majority of students (80%) find their way into master's programmes, and most of them have no trouble being accepted in highly competitive programmes. The panel interprets this as indication of the level achieved.

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

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	excellent
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	excellent
Standard 3: Student assessment	good
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	good
General conclusion	good

The chair, prof. dr. Theo Engelen, and the secretary of the panel, dr. Els Schröder, 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: 25 March 2019

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

Organisational context

The bachelor programme Liberal Arts and Sciences is one of three LAS programmes offered at Utrecht University, two English-taught honours colleges (University College Utrecht and University College Roosevelt) and this non-selective, university-wide programme, taught in Dutch. All three programmes aim to educate students in the Liberal Arts and Sciences and prepare them for a meaningful career and life. Each programme is run independently under separate management. LAS is offered by Utrecht Universities' School of Liberal Arts, Department of Philosophy and Religious Studies, Faculty of Humanities.

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes
The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.

Findings

The main goal of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences is to train students to become 'disciplined interdisciplinarians' who know what direction they wish to take in their future studies and career. The programme is based on the premise that the world is increasingly complex and fast changing and that this calls for graduates with an attitude of life-long learning who are able to navigate independently between and within disciplines. Students take courses across Utrecht University and they are expected to take responsibility for and regularly reflect on their individual study programme and main goals. The panel considers these aims very apt for a degree in Liberal Arts and Science and is particularly pleased with the emphasis on personal responsibility and reflection.

LAS offers an interdisciplinary part ('integrative core'). The programme is grounded in and inspired by the scholarly field of interdisciplinary research. According to the self-evaluation report, the programme caters to societally engaged students 'whose academic interests span what is taught at more than one Faculty and by more than one bachelor's degree program'. From talking to the students, the panel concludes that this, without doubt, is the kind of students that LAS manages to attract. The panel concludes that LAS has a unique profile, which clearly sets it apart from similar programmes and from other broad bachelor programmes. The programme's statement that it is development-oriented seems justified; the list of changes made after the previous assessment visit is impressive and proof of the programme's constant desire to reflect an adept. This is considered excellent practice by the panel.

The programme has formulated 11 intended learning outcomes that students are expected to have obtained upon graduation. The ILOs incorporate both disciplinary and interdisciplinary skills, as well as the 'ability to socially and ethically reflect on his/her own place in society and a chosen profession' (ILO4) and communication skills, as well as skills for lifelong learning. For reflection purposes, the programme has translated the intended learning outcomes in 'five roles for reflection', differentiating between the role of the researcher, disciplinarian, interdisciplinarian, professional and citizen. This translation into clear roles, or profiles, is articulated in a very clear way, also for students. The panel considers this approach very attractive and highly informative.

The panel finds the intended learning outcomes ambitious and clearly articulated. The ILOs correspond to the idea of interdisciplinarity by combining a disciplinary and interdisciplinary approach. They tie in well with the level and orientation of the programme, convincingly correspond to the domain-specific framework and are closely mapped to the programme's innovative 'five roles for reflection'. In the panel's opinion, this framework makes it very clear to students how their teaching and learning activities and assessments allow them to develop these specific skills and

empowers them to adopt these roles from the start of their studies. It is truly state-of-the-art and could be considered as an example of international best practice. The panel was impressed that students are well aware of the intended learning outcomes and the five reflection roles. These roles prompt students to reflect in a natural way on what the programme sets out to do and on the student's individual role and learning trajectory. The panel was also enthusiastic about the notion of producing a cohort of students who are 'disciplined interdisciplinarians' and 'self-authored persons' with a broad range of specialisations and skills. This emphasis on personal development corresponds to the broader aims of a degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences to educate responsible, flexible and creative citizens, who are able to combine specialist knowledge with new, innovative approaches to contribute to society.

Considerations
The panel concludes that LAS has a clear, unique profile. The programme is very development-oriented, and its mission statement and intended learning outcomes evidently correspond to the domain-specific framework of reference and to the international requirements of the discipline and exceed these in the way in which they incorporate reflection as part of the programme's aims. The intended learning outcomes are formulated in a clear, comprehensive and measurable way and they really drive the students' learning trajectory. The panel particularly appreciates how the ILOs clearly describe interdisciplinary and disciplinary skills and how the programme has innovatively translated these into five 'roles for reflection'. This helps students to reflect on their learning trajectory from the start of the programme and to understand the intended learning objectives. Students also demonstrated to have fully embraced these objectives as part of their study. This is considered further evidence of the excellent way in which the programme formulated its goals, ambitions and ILOs. Additionally, the panel was impressed to see how well the programme manages to cooperate with other faculties and disciplines across the university, which benefits the programme's profile and helps to make its aims achievable. The panel considers LAS' grounding in theoretical research in the field of interdisciplinarity state-of-the art for an LAS undergraduate programme.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'excellent'.

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
LAS is a three-year bachelor's programme, evenly divided over six semester of two blocks each. All courses account for 7.5 EC Students take approximately eight courses per year and 24 courses in total. The integrative core consists of four LAS core courses; two courses in the first year, one in the second year and one in the third year. In addition, students complete a specialisation in one of three fields: the humanities, natural sciences or social sciences (9-14 courses, with at least three courses at an advanced level) and they take four 'general education' courses outside the domain of their specialisation. The remaining room (15 - 52.5 EC) allows students to follow a minor, study abroad and/or do a practical training. At LAS, students write two theses: a disciplinary thesis (which is part of the specialisation) and an interdisciplinary capstone (part of the integrative core). They also compile an e-portfolio, a digital document in which they reflect on curricular and extracurricular activities by using the five roles for reflection. Students do not receive credits for the e-portfolio; the tutors assess it with a pass or fail. Even though the programme itself is taught in Dutch, students often also take courses in English.

The UU educational model divides courses into three levels of study: introductory, intermediate and advanced. Standardised timetabling and course registration enable LAS students to take courses at

multiple faculties and across the university. The programme distinguishes between six learning trajectories (methodology, specialisation, interdisciplinarity, communication skills, information processing and management), which gradually increase in complexity. The four LAS core courses familiarize students with connective thinking, thinking about disciplines-as-disciplines, conducting a small interdisciplinary research project in a multidisciplinary team and writing an interdisciplinary capstone.

In the first year, students are made familiar with the concept of liberal arts and science and interdisciplinarity. Towards the end of this first year, they choose in which of circa 45 specialisations they want to major. Specialisation advisors help students to choose a set of courses that allows them to gain sufficient adequacy in the chosen field of studies, whereas tutors help reflect on the interdisciplinary part of the programme (also see section 'study guidance'). The second year is centered around the specialisation and the third LAS course (The Thinking Academy), and the last year is for completing the specialisation, writing the two theses and finalising the e-portfolio.

Didactic concept
The LAS programme has shaped its education following the liberal educational model; students combine broad and deep learning with integrative and self-directed learning. In the integrative core, there is an emphasis on group work and peer feedback. Teachers are seen as 'facilitators of learning' rather than traditional teachers, so they can help students to learn in a self-directed way. Students perform both individual and group assignments and, to facilitate progress, there is a balance between formative and summative assessment. As mentioned above, teaching at LAS is research-driven. Staff members are involved in researching 'interdisciplinary learning environments' such as LAS itself. They participate in and benchmark the programme against various international research networks such as the Association for Interdisciplinary Studies and the Global Academy of the Liberal Arts. As the self-evaluation report states, 'research informs education and education informs research'.

The panel has looked at the didactical approach, degree requirements, and four cores courses in more detail. According to the panel, the programme benefits from groundbreaking curriculum design. The panel considers the programme to be extremely well designed by complying with the principles of constructive alignment. During the site visit, the panel saw striking examples of how the curriculum and didactical concept come to fruition. Having followed the integrative core and the specialisation, interdisciplinary, and management trajectories, students not only clearly develop the intended learning outcomes throughout the programme, but learn to reflect critically on the process. With 45 specialisms, the curriculum is very wide and includes many UU wide courses. This gives students ample opportunity to choose courses that fit their personal interests and talents. The panel also values the new, combined Humanities/LAS honours programme for students who want to specialise further within their specialisation. Finally, the panel considered the treasure trove as proof of how the curriculum encourages student initiatives and challenges students to participate in exciting, interdisciplinary and creative projects.

According to the panel, final integrative reflection is central to the programme, with a focus on complex problem solving. The way the ILOs relate to the four educational principles; five roles for reflection; and six learning trajectories is truly innovative and other programmes with an interdisciplinary curriculum design would do well to take this as an example of best practice. The four core courses manage to bring all these complex lines together and pay a lot of attention to process-guidance. According to the panel, there has evidently been a lot of work put into developing the programme's structures and principles, and making these clear and explicit to students. They now provide an ideal platform for both staff-student discussions and student self-reflection. The structures and principles are clear without being reductive and offer multiple empowering ways for students to think their way through their studies. This design is especially beneficial when the programme faces the challenge of creating coherence when much of the teaching is delivered outside LAS. The panel especially values how the design of the programme is based on evidence from research, including evidence developed by the teaching team itself, and on student input via curriculum evaluations.

Admission
The intake at LAS has doubled in the assessment period. In 2012/2013, 116 students started the programme, and in 2017/2018 there were 248 new students. In the self-evaluation report, the programme mentions two possible reasons for the strong growth; the success of the University Colleges and the fact that LAS is a good alternative for students with a wide interest who do not wish to attend (or are not admitted to) a residential college. The programme stresses that LAS 'is not a Dutch-language model of the UC model'. The distinctive features of LAS are explained to students during the matching process.

Because the percentage of students dropping out in the first year exceeded the UU parameter of 15% considerably, with approximately one third of students stopping or switching during the first year in 2014/2015 and 2015/2016, the programme has adjusted this matching process. Current students are closely involved in the new set-up, which consists of open days and a 'Student-for-a-Day' programme, for which prospective students prepare a homework assignment, and during which they are informed about the programme and its pitfalls. Students at risk (high school students with a grade lower than 7 out of 10 for Dutch or an average score of 7 or lower for Dutch, English and Mathematics) and students with a weak motivation letter meet with a study advisor, other prospective students meet up with LAS students. This way, the programme combines evidence-based selection with self-selection after enrolment. According to the programme, the dropout and switch rates have decreased considerably. When asked if the programme could accommodate more students, the programme management explained that 300 students would be the absolute maximum because of the current team size. Due to a general rise of LAS programmes, the programme is currently able to find the right students for the programme and to redirect others.

A subject that was discussed in more detail during the site visit was the diversity of students entering the programme. According to the programme, many students come from the Utrecht region, from similar demographical backgrounds. Regardless of the discipline they specialise in, students are often interested in similar topics such as sustainability. As a result, many students choose similar topics for their capstone projects. Like other LAS programmes, the programme does not attract many students from migrant and/or lower socioeconomic backgrounds. The panel agrees that diversity in the classroom is needed to tackle complex problems from different perspectives. The LAS programme has taken a few steps to increase diversity and strengthen the community spirit. There is a UU diversity panel that tries to increase diversity in all of UU's programmes. In addition, a group of teachers regularly visits elementary schools with a rich diversity of pupils. Finally, the programme has made an effort to foster community building within LAS by creating a dedicated space for students and staff where they can meet up outside classes. The panel appreciates these initiatives.

The panel concludes that LAS clearly provides an educational offer distinct from the experience at the university colleges and caters for a somewhat different intake. The admission procedure of the programme is well thought-through and shows a good understanding of the types of students the programme attracts. With a non-selective intake, the programme has had some challenges with retention rates, which are being addressed in the new matching procedure.

Curriculum development
During the site visit, the panel asked the programme management how the quality of courses outside LAS is monitored. The programme management explained that, as a result of signed agreements with the other Faculties' Deans, the programme has good access to university-wide course evaluations. In general, the programme trusts and verifies that other programmes at Utrecht University deliver courses of good quality. However, when many LAS students fail a particular course, the programme is able to check if, for instance, the entry requirements are clear.

During the site visit, the panel met with the Programme Committee, which consists of four staff members and four elected students. The Programme Committee sees all course evaluations for the integrative core. The core courses are assessed twice: at the end and halfway through. This allows the programme to see if there are any points for improvement during the course. In addition to

discussing course evaluations, the Programme Committee organises general sessions and regular meetings to discuss the contents and quantity of the general education courses. Outside the meetings, the Committee communicates with the students on particular topics on Facebook. From talking to staff and student members of the Programme Committee, the panel concludes that the programme has a good system of quality control and that the student and staff' view is taken very seriously at LAS. While keeping up high standards is of course important, the panel does warn the programme to take into account that, according to the self-evaluation report, students perceive an "over-evaluation". They rightly point out that this might result in low response rates and 'blurring' of feedback aimed at the LAS core curriculum and at the LAS specialisation.

Staff
Since the previous assessment visit, the number of teachers at LAS has grown considerably. In 2018/2019, alongside the programme coordinator/director of education (a full professor with 50% research time), there were five assistant professors (four of them had 30% research time), two PhD candidates with 50% teaching responsibilities, and five junior lecturers without research time. In addition, the LAS team consisted of an educational coordinator (0.3 fte) and three study advisors (1.7 fte in total). The self-evaluation report states that interdisciplinary studies are more and more becoming specialised. The programme is actively involved in this trend. Staff members are involved in longitudinal research regarding the interdisciplinary learning environment that LAS provides and its liberal education elements. New lecturers already know or have been made familiar with the facilitation model of teaching and learning.

All lecturers hold a PhD in a relevant discipline, ensuring that they are skilled researchers and experts in their field. They have either already obtained their BKO or are in the process of obtaining this university teaching qualification. The quality of teaching staff outside the School of Liberal Arts is university policy, with its own rules and regulations for career advancement. The programme does profit from more generous contact hours for tutoring and for one writing-intensive core course than other programmes in the Faculty of Humanities because the university provides the beta-financing for teaching to the Faculty for LAS. The panel notes that LAS benefits from a strong core teaching community. The students spoke highly of their teachers. They see them as very supportive and helpful when students experience difficulties or feel overwhelmed by curricular decisions. According to the students, teachers have a can-do attitude and approach a problem as 'something that can be fixed'.

When asked which changes they would make to the programme, the staff mentioned that, for instance, the supervision of and student preparation for the capstone project could always be improved further. In this project, three students with a different specialisation work together on an interdisciplinary project. They are supervised by an LAS advisor and three specialisation advisors (one for each student). Even though there are clear deadlines along the way to prevent the capstone turning into three separate works, the students sometimes find it hard to the integrate the different perspectives. Therefore the integration part of the capstone often costs most of the supervision time. Nonetheless, the staff members feel that this problem can be solved within the existing classes.

In addition, they added that one can always think of other important subjects to be covered in the core courses such as the history of interdisciplinarity and philosophy of science. But the staff members want to avoid having too much overlap with other programmes. According to them, humanities courses for instance already have their own 'research skills' course that deals with some of these topics. The staff stressed that they consider it important that students need the room to follow many classes outside the LAS core curriculum to become an interdisciplinary disciplinarian. Reflecting on their own role in the programme, staff members said they enjoyed being in touch and learning from teachers within different disciplines. When comparing students to peers, they noted that LAS students are very driven and proactive because the programme is tapping into their intrinsic motivation. In the teachers' opinion, LAS students also tend to bring different topics to the discussions.

According to the panel, staff members are clearly highly engaged and committed with expertise in their own discipline as well as being or becoming internationally leading scholars in the field of interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Staff members are on the whole given significant research time, which may be a key factor in supporting their outstanding evidence-based innovations and approaches. The panel was also impressed with the teacher training and research meetings where staff members can discuss their own research and the theoretical grounding in interdisciplinary research. The panel thinks that the programme should be commended for its development-oriented culture. This includes not only internal enhancements (shown in the SWOT analysis and detailed response to previous reviews which show comprehensively how previous feedback has been acted on) but impressive engagement with and contributions to international best-practice-sharing and scholarly discourse on interdisciplinary teaching and learning. The programme clearly benefits from a highly active, outward-looking team. Members of the teaching team are not just evaluating and enhancing their teaching, but engaging in action research.

Study guidance
LAS has a tutorial system; all first-year students are assigned a tutor. Fifteen first-year students share a tutor and a tutor coordinator plans and prepares all meetings. The coordinator also adjusts the tutorial system if this is needed to fit the aims of the programme. To make sure that the integrative core and the tutorial system strengthen each other, every tutor is also a member of the LAS teaching staff. The programme benefits from UU's beta-financing of teaching. As a result, LAS has more tutoring hours (1,5 times the amount of other humanities programmes) and it has a writing-intensive course with more contact/teaching hours per group (66 hours instead of 44 hours). Tutors meet with their tutees both collectively and one-on-one to discuss study related issues. In their second and third year, all students share approximately three tutors, two of whom are responsible for assessing and archiving the students' reflection documents, the e-portfolio. In addition to tutor meetings, students can participate in self-steering tutor groups. Finally, students have started organizing mentor groups themselves, tutor meetings held by second or third year students who voluntarily support first-year students. In the self-evaluation report, the students remark that this has increased the community feeling, and has provided an informal platform across LAS cohorts.

Three study advisors help LAS student with personal challenges. They also organise meetings to inform students about the decisions they have to make and the options open to them, and they prepare cohort analyses and monitor study progress. LAS also works with specialisation advisors; teachers or study advisors in UU bachelor's programmes that offer one or more LAS specialisations. As mentioned above, specialisation advisors help students choose a coherent set of courses that fits the LAS programme's aims. This is to ensure both the feasibility of the specialisation within the time given, and to guarantee access to similar master's programmes. Finally, the LAS programme has an active study association, Atlas, which organises regular extracurricular activities and also provides informal support to students.

Approximately 75% of first-year students obtain enough credits to receive a positive binding advice to continue their studies. (Previously, this was 65-70%.) On average and according to the most recent numbers provided in the self-evaluation report, students take between 3.04 and 4.1 year to complete the programme. A minority of students graduates within three years. The programme has started to investigate which factors have had a negative impact on study success. One of these factors seems to be that many students concentrate on their specialisation in the second year, and postpone the second-year LAS core course to the third year. As a result, they might lose track of their academic and professional orientation. In 2018/2019, study advisors have invited all third-year students to discuss study progress and planning. The panel appreciates this and other initiatives taken, and considers it important that the programme is trying to increase the number of students graduating on time.

Before the site visit, the panel was concerned that the programme relies on UU-wide support networks which may not always fit the LAS interest of the student. It therefore asked the students

how they experience the study guidance and support system. The students said that, even though the support system might look complex, with different formal and informal bodies, in practice it works very well. The panel concludes that the responsibility is distributed onto many shoulders around the university; this means that at least some staff members of Utrecht University come to be involved in, to learn about and to commit to LAS. That way, many actors benefit from the introduction of an innovation in teaching. The panel thinks that the student-led peer support and mentoring schemes are a credit to the programme. Students clearly feel inspired to support one another.

During the site visit, it became clear to the panel that the programme has made significant efforts to help students being accepted in the master's programmes after graduation. According to programme management, students are being trained to pitch themselves in the right way (what is the story of your education and what is your dream job?). This has proven to help with admittance into particular master's programmes. Secondly, most bachelor education is given by teachers who also participate in master's programme, and who are also able to make the link to the master's programme. Thirdly, the programme now offers a workshop on master application as part of the tutorial system. This prompts students to think about possible additional requirements in time.

Considerations
The panel concludes that LAS' teaching-learning environment is of a very high standard. LAS has a strong research approach towards – and academic reflection of – interdisciplinary teaching and learning, consequently expressed in intended learning outcomes, course objectives, course design and capstones. The curriculum is extremely well designed and teaches students to take responsibility for their own learning trajectory. According to the panel, the way the ILOs relate to the four educational principles; five roles for reflection; and six learning trajectories is truly innovative and can be seen as an example of best practice. The programme has clearly put a lot of work into developing the programme's structures and principles, and making these clear and explicit to students. They now provide an ideal platform for both staff-student discussions and student self-reflection. The panel was impressed to see how well the programme keeps a close track of what is done outside the core curriculum of LAS. Offering a wide curriculum with no less than 45 specialisations entails the risk that students drift away from LAS, but the programme has close contacts and clear agreements with the other Utrecht University bachelor's programmes to prevent this from happening. By having tutors, study advisors and specialisation advisors cooperate, the responsibility for academic advising and individual study guidance is distributed onto many shoulders around the university. The programme considers this beneficial for all the programmes involved.

Regular course and curriculum evaluations, and adjustments made accordingly, give evidence of LAS' committed and development-oriented approach. This includes not only internal enhancements but impressive engagement with and contributions to international best-practice-sharing and scholarly discourse on interdisciplinary teaching and learning. The integrative core, with a strong focus on reflection, teaches students to think in an integrated way. The panel was struck to see how well the students know what they are learning, utilizing newly acquired knowledge and skills on the way. The design of the programme allows LAS to be truly transformative. Therefore the panel also advises LAS to be vigilant when it comes to the integrative part, because this clearly sets LAS apart from similar programmes, both on a national and international scale.

LAS benefits from having very active and outward looking staff members, who are constantly trying to improve their courses. The programme yields impressive results with a small number of staff. Staff members have a clear, integrated vision of teaching and are very committed to the programme and to the students. The panel particularly appreciated how the design of the programme is based on evidence from research, including evidence developed by the teaching team itself. Staff members are involved in longitudinal research regarding interdisciplinary learning and liberal education. According to the panel, staff members are clearly highly engaged and committed with expertise in their own discipline as well as being or becoming internationally leading scholars in the field of interdisciplinary teaching and learning. Staff members are on the whole given significant research

time, which may be a key factor in supporting their outstanding evidence-based innovations and approaches.

The programme has a good tutorial system in place, with relatively small and well-coordinated tutor groups of 15 first-year students. The fact that second and third year students have set up their own mentor system to support first-year students, and the fact that they are closely involved in the matching process for prospective students, is interpreted as evidence of their commitment to the programme.

The panel considers LAS leading in the Netherlands and Europe in many areas of cutting-edge practice. It therefore assesses the teaching-learning environment as 'excellent'.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'excellent'.

Standard 3: Student assessment
The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Findings

Assessment policy
LAS' assessment policy is described in the School of Liberal Arts' 'Toetsbeleid' document. This assessment policy document sets out assessment criteria and quality standards of assessment, as well as the actual assessment of the programme's core courses, capstone and e-portfolio. It also includes an assessment matrix, which links the intended learning outcomes to the six learning trajectories and to the LAS courses. The programme follows UU's assessment criteria. These require that course assessment comprises at least two assignments (including at least one formative assignment), that assessment is developed by teams of teachers who respect the ILOs and (in the case of LAS) interdisciplinary liberal learning principles, that assessment is evaluated in the light of the ILOs, and that both students and the Board of Examiners evaluate the assessment as adequate. In order to ensure that assessment yields comparable results, the programme uses uniform grading rubrics, which are also published in the course manuals. That way, students are also made aware of the assessment criteria. Assessment of the core courses is furthermore based on the Scholarship of Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning (SoITL) in which many lecturers are involved as researchers, and on the programme's liberal arts elements. Assessment forms should, among other things, stimulate students to compare and integrate insights from different disciplines. Rather than using the term 'feed*back*', the programme prefers using the term 'feed*forward*' to describe the kind of formative assessment it provides. Feedforward is not primarily aimed at justifying the grade given, but at offering guidance to students on how they can improve during a course.

The quality of assessment is monitored in a number of ways. For courses outside the School of Liberal Arts, LAS relies on quality control mechanisms at Utrecht University. The self-evaluation report explains that this situation of 'trust and verify' is possible because of the ways that quality assurance is organised at university and Faculty level. First of all, assessment in all corners of the university is part of the Institutional Quality Assurance accreditation ('Instellingstoets Kwaliteitszorg', ITK) that UU has successfully passed. Secondly, the LAS specialisations are all part of accredited bachelor's degree programmes; their assessment policies are part of regular programme assessments. And thirdly, LAS is able to verify quality assurance in other programmes as a result of the 'covenants between Faculties'. Together with the Board of Examiners and LAS Programme Committee, the programme keeps a close eye on partaking bachelor's programmes assessment matrixes, and it regularly inquires if specialisations are feasible and live up to their academic expectations. To identify best practices and discuss new. assessment related policies and problems, the chairs and examiners of the Board of Examiners and Programme Committee meet twice a year with the School of Liberal Arts' programme coordinators and director of education.

The panel concludes that the programme follows clear assessment principles as set out in the assessment policy document. The assessment matrix aims to ensure a close link between courses, learning trajectories and intended learning outcomes. Quality assurance processes are robust, involving the ITK, BoE, and PC. There are inevitable challenges when much of a programme's assessment is undertaken outside the department, but the panel believes that the programme has tackled these well by introducing covenants between Faculties and by using a system of 'trust of verify' (rather than a system of delegated trust). The panel believes that the SoITL provides a good structure for revising assessment.

Assessment
LAS courses are assessed with various assignments, such as essays, research reports, interview reports, academic articles, oral presentations, poster presentations, and reflection documents. The programme sees to it that these assessment forms are constructively aligned and in keeping with the learning trajectories and intended learning outcomes. The panel has studied a number of assignments, including their grading rubrics. It concludes that the programme uses a diverse and innovative range of assessments, each having a clear rubric to show candidates how they have performed in each area.

Capstone assessment consists of three components; students receive an individual grade for the disciplinary chapter (30%, mark given by the specialisation advisor) and a collective grade for 'comprehensive integration' (60%) and oral presentation of the results (10%, integration and presentation are graded by the LAS advisor). The panel thought that the theses feedback sheets show good practice in assessment feedback; for each aspect of the final grade, there are rubrics.

Students write their disciplinary thesis within their specialisation; the assessment of these theses is part of the system of quality assurance outlined above. However, to assess the performance level upon graduation, the Examination Board does study a sample check of disciplinary theses every three years. Finally, two tutors/staff members assess the portfolio. It consists of four reflection documents, which are coupled to the core courses, and (regarding on the students' individual curriculum) reports pertaining to study abroad, academic skills training and/or practical training.

Board of Examiners
The Board of Examiners is responsible for safeguarding the quality of assessments and making sure that the programme's intended learning outcomes are met. The Board consists of six members who meet four times a year. To guarantee continuity, members are assigned for three years. The Board of Examiners works with a yearly calendar, allowing them to see which topics are discussed at what time. In addition, the Board meets with the LAS Programme Committee twice a year to discuss current affairs. It also regularly contacts the programme coordinator. During the site visit, the panel asked the representatives of the Board of Examiners about pressing and recurring issues. They explained that the Board tries to address recurring issues as much as possible in the programme's Examination and Education Regulations and course descriptions. In addition, it deals with many individual requests, for instance from students who are planning to study abroad and who need forms to prove which courses they have taken. The Board seizes this as an opportunity for advice: does the course that students want to follow fit well within their curriculum? Upon return, students need forms to see if they have met the requirements. This causes a lot of paperwork, the Board representatives explained. However, they stressed that registering the level of courses abroad is a university-wide problem, and that a digital system to assist the Board of Examiners is in development.

Every three years, the Examination Board checks a sample of disciplinary theses and capstone projects. At the time of the site visit, it had just completed such a check and it was satisfied with the quality of the capstone, the assessment procedure, and the feedback forms. To make sure that the specialisations tie in well with LAS' intended learning outcomes, the Board also looks at course descriptions and, if necessary, asks specialisation advisors to explain, for instance, the learning

trajectories and the place of selected courses in these trajectories. The Board is able to ask for other programmes' assessment matrixes, but had not done so yet at the time of the site visit. According to the Board, making sure that the ILOs are properly represented in the programmes has been a complicated process.

Based on the information provided beforehand and based on its meeting with the Board members, the panel concludes that the Examination Board is working in an efficient manner while taking its legal duties seriously. The panel commends the Board on its proactive approach, which is for instance evidenced in the Board's efforts to align the ILOs of the specialisations with those of the LAS programme. However, in its own sample check, the panel came across a disciplinary thesis that involved research with underage participants. Here, to the panel's concern, consent forms and clarity on how data were stored and processed was lacking. Admitting that this was an isolated case, the panel stresses that it considers ethics an important part of LAS' intended learning outcomes. It therefore advises the Board of Examiners to guard the responsibility for research ethics, and to not delegate this responsibility to other disciplines.

Considerations
The panel concludes that LAS has an elaborate assessment policy in place, with clear assessment principles and a lot of attention for monitoring the quality of assessment – not only of LAS courses, but also of the general education courses and courses within the specialisation programmes. The programme uses a wide variety of assessment methods, including some innovative ways of assessment such as reflection documents and peer feedback. Assessment itself is well designed, with assignments being oriented at the appropriate level and showing an increase in complexity. The panel was in particular enthusiastic about the clear grading rubrics, the good thesis feedback form and the assessment of important interdisciplinary skills (self-reflection, self-authorship, integration) in the reflective e-portfolio. It also appreciated how assessment criteria, including rubrics, are clearly communicated to the students. The Board of Examiners performs its duties well, it made a proactive and professional impression on the panel. The panel does advice the Board of Examiners to fill in the research ethics crack that it came across in its sample check.

Conclusion
Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'good'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes
The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Final achievement level
As mentioned above, the LAS programme pays considerable attention to making sure that, regardless of their chosen specialisation, all students have obtained the intended learning outcomes upon graduation. The programme carefully monitors the alignment of the integrative core courses with the intended learning outcomes, and also enquires if the ILOs are sufficiently covered in the general education courses and specialisations. Disciplinary knowledge culminates in the disciplinary thesis, and interdisciplinary knowledge in the capstone project. Final integration of knowledge and skills takes place in the e-portfolio, in which students reflect on curricular as well as extracurricular activities from the perspective of a 'disciplined interdisciplinarian'. The panel concludes that the reflective e-portfolio, as the culmination of a student's skills in self-direction, self-authorship, and integration, is an excellent innovation and an example for other LAS programmes of how disparate multidisciplinary studies can be made to cohere.

Prior to the site visit, the panel read a selection of fifteen theses and capstone projects and their assessment forms. It concluded that the general level of the theses was good and in line with academic bachelor's level. In some cases, the theses surpassed this level. The panel compliments

the programme on the concept of a collaborative capstone. It found the sections comparing and integrating disciplinary research fascinating to read. The panel concludes that LAS students seem to choose important current social issues for their capstones and theses. According to the panel, this reflects positively on the particular character of an LAS graduate. Some of the theses and capstones had impressive interdisciplinary elements. This shows that these students were not only able to make connections between disciplines, but that they clearly had obtained the programme's intended learning outcomes. The panel considered the assessments as adequate and, in general, it agreed with the grades given. According to the panel, most assessment forms contained detailed and helpful feedback, providing a clear indication of why a particular grade was given and providing productive suggestions for further improvement. However, some assessment forms only included written feedback from one supervisor, making it hard to see how the final grade had been decided on. The panel also wondered if the pre-given answers could motivate supervisors to write very short individual statements, in order to enhance standardisation and numerical comparability. Short feedback does not seem to do justice to the students' work and efforts. Having less qualitative comments also makes communication about grading between supervisors less insightful, the panel thinks.

The panel met with a number of LAS graduates, all of whom had continued to study in disciplinary (research) master's programmes. When asked to compare themselves to peers, they mentioned being open minded and able to approach people from different disciplines, being proactive and having good collaborative skills as features that set LAS graduates students apart from their peers. According to the graduates, the 'power of LAS' is that students learn to think about how disciplines connect and can strengthen each other. They all felt that having been forced to make choices and having organised their individual curriculum, even though they had sometimes chosen the wrong courses, was a helpful experience in their current study and in life in general. The graduates had not experienced problems being accepted into master's programmes, and sensed they could soon catch up with disciplinary students.

Performance of graduates
In the fall of 2017, an independent research center conducted the national Liberal Arts and Sciences alumni survey, which included alumni from the LAS programme and from the Dutch University Colleges. Prior to that, in 2015, LAS' alumni association Aflas had also conducted a survey. Based on its meeting with graduates and based on the (general) information regarding these two surveys provided in the self-evaluation report, the panel concludes that LAS students do well in master's programmes and on the job market. Approximately 80% of LAS graduates continue to study in a master's programme, which is in line with the national average of all LAS programmes (89%). The panel finds it impressive that LAS has fewer students rejected from master's programmes than university colleges and matches their performance in other areas, such as graduates being accepted into PhD programmes or having a permanent job. The panel sees this as an indication of the high quality of the education and good support students are receiving. LAS is clearly competitive on these grounds with a non-selective intake, smaller staff, and fewer dedicated resources. There are also differences. As mentioned under Standard 2, having a non-selective intake impacts attainment figures. Though numbers are improving, LAS' success rates are relatively low, with a minority of students graduating on time. If refused for a master's programme, for LAS alumni this is more often because of a lower GPA when compared to College graduates. LAS graduates are also more often asked to comply with additional requirements. The programme is currently investigating ways to remediate this, such as making sure that students are aware of particular programme's requirements well in advance (see Standard 2). According to the programme, LAS graduates more often have an educational or artistic occupation, and more LAS alumni work in the public sector.

Considerations

The panel concludes that students achieve the intended learning outcomes. The programme clearly meets its own, ambitious standards. Theses and capstones are generally of a high level, grading is realistic and the programme provides extensive and constructive feedback throughout. Quality standards are high and comparable with similar, selective programmes. Intake, attainment, and graduate outcomes are being carefully monitored. The programme has successfully dared to formulate a type of student that enters and leaves the LAS programme, and many of the intended learning outcomes have been mentioned in the standards above in a best practice context. There is still room for improvement. Although the panel is enthusiastic about the clear thesis feedback forms, the pre-given answers seemed to invite rather short individual comments, which limits the students' learning opportunity. Also, success rates are relatively low. The panel is pleased to see that measures to prevent study delay and increase the number of students graduating on time have been taken. The majority of students (80%) finds their way into master's programmes, and most of them have no trouble being accepted in highly competitive programmes. The panel interprets this as indication of the level achieved.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'good'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel concludes that LAS has a clear, unique profile. The programme's mission statement and intended learning outcomes evidently correspond to the domain-specific framework of reference and to the international requirements of the discipline, and exceed these in the way in which they are formulated and in the way in which they include reflection as part of the programme's aims.. The panel particularly appreciates how the ILOs clearly describe interdisciplinary and disciplinary skills and how the programme has innovatively translated these into five 'roles for reflection', which is exercised in an excellent way. This helps students to reflect on their learning trajectory from the start of the programme and to understand the intended learning It considers LAS' grounding in theoretical research in the field of interdisciplinarity state-of-the-art for an LAS undergraduate programme (Standard 1).

LAS has a strong research approach towards - and academic reflection of - interdisciplinary teaching and learning, consequently expressed in intended learning outcomes, course objectives, course design and capstones. Offering a wide curriculum with no less than 45 specialisations entails the risk that students drift away from LAS, but the programme has close contacts and clear agreements with the other Utrecht University bachelor's programmes to prevent this from happening. Regular course and curriculum evaluations, and adjustments made accordingly, give evidence of LAS' committed and development-oriented approach. The integrative core, with a strong focus on reflection, teaches students to think in an integrated way. Staff members are involved in longitudinal research regarding interdisciplinary learning and liberal education. On the whole, they are given significant research time, which may be a key factor in supporting their outstanding evidence-based innovations and approaches. The panel considers LAS leading in the Netherlands and Europe in many areas of cutting-edge practice (Standard 2).

LAS has clear assessment principles and a lot of attention for monitoring the quality of assessment. The programme uses a wide variety of assessment methods, including some innovative ways of assessment such as reflection documents and peer feedback. Assessment itself is well designed and constructively aligned. The Board of Examiners performs its duties well, it made a proactive and professional impression (Standard 3).

The programme clearly meets its own, ambitious standards. Quality standards are high and comparable with similar programmes. Intake, attainment, and graduate outcomes are being carefully monitored. However, the pre-given answers on the feedback forms seemed to invite rather short

individual comments, limiting the students' learning opportunity. Also, success rates are relatively low. Measurements to prevent study delay and increase the number of students graduating on time are deemed necessary. The majority of students (80%) finds their way into master's programmes, and most of them have no trouble being accepted in highly competitive programmes (Standard 4).

The panel assessed standard 1 and 2 as 'excellent' and standard 3 and 4 as 'good'. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, the panel therefore assesses the programme as 'good'.

Conclusion
The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences* as 'good'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

This reference framework is intended for the Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) programs in the Netherlands. This includes selective University Colleges as well as non-selective LAS programs situated within a university. These programmes are a constituent part of Dutch "scientific" or "scholarly" education (wetenschappelijk onderwijs). The LAS education framework articulated here distinguishes itself from (emerging) broad programs through its proximity to academic inquiry and research and through its commitment to wide-ranging intellectual formation not chiefly aimed at preparing students for particular professions.

As this accreditation process is reviewing an ever more diverse range of programs, this framework of reference is short rather than extensive. Rather, it is a reference framework that reflects shared educational aims with each of the programs under review.

Liberal arts and Sciences emphasises intellectual growth through both broad and deep learning as the foundation of the curriculum. Standing in the liberal arts tradition that seeks to free the individual through intellectual and ethical engagement, LAS encourages inquiry through profoundly open curricula that allows students to explore a diversity of academic fields from the Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. This enables them to attain depth in disciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary concentration areas of their own choosing. By combining the disciplinary depth and multi- or interdisciplinary learning with undergraduate research and communication skills, students develop their creativity, initiative-taking, skills in working together. Often conducted in a strongly international context, LAS programs regardless of setting promote intercultural understanding abilities and societal engagement.

LAS takes place within distinct learning and social communities. The formal program and extracurricular activities are often linked and in such cases students, faculty and staff participate actively in the governance of the program and the community. Teaching and learning experiences are typically characterized by small-scale and intensive education, with a high level of interaction between students and teachers and among students themselves. Giving this emphasis on active discussion and debate, LAS programs strive for diversity in their student population in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender and cultural and socio-economic backgrounds and offer dynamic environments that invite curricular experimentation and educational innovation and attract academics dedicated to excellence in teaching.

Liberal Arts & Sciences programs have intended learning outcomes that include:
a. multidisciplinary familiarity in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences combined with depth of knowledge in a chosen concentration area;
b. ability to approach complex questions or issues in an inter- or multidisciplinary way;
c. advanced academic skills in communication, quantitative and qualitative methods, critical thinking, research and learning;
d. attitudes and skills for engaged citizenship, including international and intercultural understanding, social skills and a will to contribute to solving societal issues;
e. intellectual curiosity, reflexivity, integrity and an open mind, learning skills necessary for subsequent graduate studies and the workplace.

Approved in Tilburg on October 25, 2017 by
• Dean Amsterdam University College: prof. dr. Murray Pratt
• Dean Erasmus University College: prof. dr. Maarten Frens
• Dean Leiden University College The Hague: prof. dr. Judi Mesman
• Dean University College Groningen: prof. dr. Hans van Ees
• Dean University College Maastricht: prof dr. Matthieu Zegers
• Dean University College Roosevelt: prof. dr. Bert van den Brink
• Dean University College Tilburg: prof dr. Alkeline van Lenning
• Dean University College Twente: prof. dr. Jennifer Herek

- Dean University College Utrecht: prof. dr. James Kennedy
- Director Liberal Arts and Sciences @ Utrecht University: dr. Iris van der Tuin

APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Graduates can be expected to:
1. Demonstrate interdisciplinary research skills;
2. Have knowledge of and insight into the most prominent theories and methodological foundations of his/her chosen specialization;
3. Have knowledge of the scholarly approaches used in completed courses;
4. Demonstrate the ability to socially and ethically reflect on his/her own place in society and a chosen profession;
5. Be capable of quickly adopting the vocabulary of a new field of study;
6. Be able to assess relevant disciplines from a meta-perspective;
7. Have basic experience with the methodology of researchers in his/her chosen specialization;
8. Be able to clearly report research findings, both orally and in writing;
9. Possess the thinking and reasoning skills necessary for adequate practice and application of science and scholarship;
10. Work in an independent and goal-oriented manner, reflect on his/her own performance, set goals, and make choices;
11. Design and deliver projects systematically, work in a team, and possess the social and communicative skills to do so.

APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Year 1

In semester one of year one the students take three *GenEd* courses alongside the LAS core course *The Writing Academy*.

In semester two, three additional courses are chosen alongside the LAS core course *Multidisciplinary Project: Globalization* (block 3) or *Multidisciplinary Project: The Brain* (block 4— LAS core 2 in the scheme above).

Oftentimes, students choose a specialization based on a course or course element encountered during General Education and/or optional course work outside the specialization and interdisciplinary core. This course or course element will retrospectively have been part of the selected specialization and/or it will guide further choices for specialization preparation or fulfillment.

Year 2

Year two is centered around the specialization and culminates in the LAS core course *Introduction to Interdisciplinary Research I: The Thinking Academy*.

Year 3

Year three is for completing the specialization, for writing the disciplinary thesis and the capstone, and for finalizing the e-portfolio. *Capstone: Interdisciplinary Research II* is the interdisciplinary thesis that forms the final text for examination of the students' interdisciplinary profile.

Students fill up their study path by adding optional components either isolated in time (doing a minor, an internship, or studying abroad) or gradually (following extra courses criss-crossing throughout the program).

The LAS curriculum according to the educational principles adhered to – As a first part of the LAS curriculum, our students must fulfill the breadth requirement by making a selection of four *GenEd* courses. Students are required to choose four courses from two scholarly domains outside of the domain of their specialization. The students freely choose upon entering the program and reconstruct this 'breadth' element after having chosen a specialization. Suitable *GenEd* courses provide an overview of the attitudes and approaches of the relevant discipline, deal with the research methods of the relevant discipline, are multidisciplinary, address current social issue and prepare for a specialization.

The depth requirement is fulfilled by completing a specialization. The compulsory specialization (67,5 – 105 EC or 9 – 14 courses) has been developed by, or together with, a specialization advisor and is aimed at gaining adequacy in a field of studies as well as successful thesis writing and master admission. The thesis and at least three level-3 courses are a required part of the specialization. LAS offers ca. 45 specializations in co-operation with other bachelor's degree programs at UU. The specializations are updated annually by specialization advisors, approved by Directors of Education and published with or without fixed tracks on the LAS website. (A 'free' specialization is possible but it has proven administratively difficult and time-consuming to organize a thesis in such cases. Such independently formed specializations are only allowed when the program management can guarantee its quality and coherence, and with the approval of the BoE.)

APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Thursday 27 September 2018 - LAS

8.30 - 8.45	Arrival panel
8.45 - 9.30	Initial panel meeting LAS
9.30 - 10.15	Development dialogue
10.15 - 11.00	Programme management
11.00 - 11.15	Coffee break
11.15 - 12.00	Board of Examiners/ Curriculum Committee ('OC'; students and staff)
12.00 - 12.45	Lunch
12.45 - 13.30	Treasure Trove
13.30 - 14.15	Students
14.15 - 15.15	Teachers, tutors, study advisors
15.00 - 15.15	Break
15.15 - 15.45	Alumni
15.45 - 16.45	Internal panel meeting
16.45 - 17.15	Programme management
17.15 - 17.30	Presentation findings
17.30 - 17.45	Goodbye and thank you

APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied fifteen theses of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences. 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):
- Annual report Opleidingscommissie;
- Annual report Examencommissie;
- Onderwijs- en Examenregeling (OER).