

Assessment report

Master Spatial Engineering

University of Twente



Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation



The European Consortium for
Accreditation in Higher Education

Assessment report

Master Spatial Engineering

Copyright © 2022
ECA OCCASIONAL PAPER

European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education



All rights reserved. This information may be shared, copied and redistributed for non-commercial purposes, provided that the source is duly acknowledged. Derivatives of this material are however not allowed.

Additional copies of this publication are available via www.ecahe.eu.

Cover art: David Goehring (CC. by)





Table of content

| | |
|---|----|
| Glossary | 7 |
| 1. Executive summary | 8 |
| 2. The assessment procedure | 11 |
| 3. Basic information..... | 13 |
| 4. Assessment scale..... | 14 |
| 5. Assessment criteria..... | 15 |
| 6. Overview of assessments | 33 |
| Annex 1. Composition of the panel | 34 |
| Annex 2. Documents reviewed | 37 |
| Annex 3. Site visit programme | 39 |



Glossary

| | |
|--------|---|
| CBL | Challenge-based learning |
| EB | Examination Board |
| ECIU | European Consortium of Innovative Universities |
| EER | Education and Examination Regulations (in Dutch <i>Onderwijs- en Examenregeling</i>) |
| ITC | Faculty of ITC, University of Twente The International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC) was an institute of higher (tertiary) education located in Enschede. As of 1 January 2010 it has been incorporated into the University of Twente as the sixth faculty, while preserving its own unique international character as a faculty sui generis, and is now formally known as University of Twente, Faculty of Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC). |
| iiiLOs | Intended international and Intercultural Learning Outcomes |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance (government aid for developing countries) |
| PDP | Personal Development Plan and Portfolio |
| PILOs | Programme Intended Learning Outcomes |
| PLE | Project-led education |
| TE | Technical Engineering |
| QA | Quality assurance |
| SIS | Spatial Information Science |
| SPG | Spatial Planning for Governance |
| SUTQ | Senior University Teaching Qualification (in Dutch <i>Seniorkwalificatie Onderwijs</i>) |
| UTQ | University Teaching Qualification (in Dutch <i>Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs</i>) |



1. Executive summary

The Master Spatial Engineering was assessed by Certified Evaluation Agency. Certified convened an assessment panel for the audit. The panel studied the self-evaluation report of the programme and undertook a site visit at the University of Twente on 15 and 16 May 2023.

The panel would like to compliment the programme management on their strong commitment to the international and intercultural dimensions of the programme. All elements supporting these dimensions are very well to excellently covered in the programme.

Standard 1 – Intended internationalisation

Becoming an empathic spatial engineer with specific attention for various social and cultural perspectives in the world is the essential nucleus of the programme. The goals that have been formulated to enable this, are widely supported by both internal and external stakeholders. These internationalisation goals are challenging, well thought out, clear, well documented and relevant for an international career, either abroad or at an international organisation in someone's home country.

The panel concludes that the objectives have been formulated clearly, that they are challenging and in line with the internationalisation goals and that they are verifiable and monitorable. Some objectives in the international skills learning line deserve finetuning.

The nature of some objectives makes it difficult to measure quantitative and/or qualitative elements, but the programme applies valid and effective criteria for the learning environment to safeguard the quality of the output.

The internationalisation goals relate to and are firmly embedded in teaching and learning. The wide variety of adequate didactical measures contribute to the quality of teaching and learning. This shines through in the way alumni present themselves.

The panel deems all the underlying criteria of this standard to be more than appropriately met. The panel found the programme to surpass the generic quality (basic quality) for this standard. None of the underlying criteria have any shortcomings.

The panel assesses **Standard 1**, Intended internationalisation, as **good**.

Standard 2 – International and intercultural learning

The panel concludes that the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes (iiiLOs) correspond with the programme's internationalisation goals.

The panel concludes that methods used for the assessment of students are suitable for measuring the achievement of the iiiLOs and that they are particularly suitable for assessing iiiLOs of an upcoming spatial engineer. The panel recommends considering assessing some of the iiiLOs in a more concrete assessment next to the portfolio (assessing next to reflecting).



The panel concludes that the graduates demonstrably achieve the iiiLOs. Both student products and careers after graduation demonstrate this.

The panel deems all the underlying criteria of this standard to be more than appropriately met. The panel found the programme to surpass the generic quality (basic quality) for this standard. None of the underlying criteria have any shortcomings.

The panel assesses Standard 2, International and intercultural learning, as **good**.

Standard 3 – Teaching and learning

The panel concludes that structure, content and teaching methods of the current and the new curriculum are excellent and enable students to achieve the iiiLOs. Student products and the way students and alumni present themselves prove this convincingly.

The panel concludes that the learning environment is perfectly suitable for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes. Students are permanently immersed in an international environment.

The programme excels across the standard's entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary and good practices in all the underlying criteria. The programme can be regarded as an international example for this standard.

The panel assesses Standard 3, Teaching and learning as **excellent**.

Standard 4 - Staff

The panel concludes that the staff is of very high quality and very diverse in the broadest sense of the word (cultural background, international experience, domains of expertise, gender, etc.) Staff members have ample internationalisation experience and are equipped with well-developed intercultural competences and language skills, in line with the international and intercultural dimensions of the programme. Further individual and collaborative development regarding international experiences, intercultural competences and language skills is actively stimulated by the faculty and the programme. With so many different professionalisation trajectories on offer in and outside the faculty and in and outside the Netherlands, tailoring professionalisation to individual needs is always possible.

The panel found that the programme systematically and substantially surpasses the generic quality for this standard. The programme excels across the standard's entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary and good practices in all of the underlying criteria. The programme can be seen as an international example for this standard.

The panel assesses Standard 4, Staff, as **excellent**.



Standard 5 - Students

The panel concludes that the composition of the student group is very diverse and is in line with the programme's internationalisation goals. The programme has valid and effective procedures in place to also guarantee this for the future and to make sure that all students in the programme benefit from it.

The panel concludes that the internationalisation experience gained by the students is in line with the internationalisation goals of the programme. The programme has various effective methods and rules in place to guarantee this for all students.

The panel concludes that students are serviced at an extraordinary level. This applies to services, facilities, and events as well as to personal assistance and guidance. The wide variety of what is on offer enables all students to benefit from it.

The panel found that the programme systematically and substantially surpasses the generic quality for this standard. The programme excels across the standard's entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary and good practices in all of the underlying criteria. The programme can be seen as an international example for this standard.

The panel assesses Standard 5, Students as **excellent**.

Based on the judgment of the panel per standard (2 times 'good', 3 times 'excellent') and taking the decision rules into account, the panel advises to award the programme with the Certificate for Quality in Internationalisation (CeQuInt).



2. The assessment procedure

The assessment procedure was organised as laid down in the Frameworks for the Assessment of Quality in Internationalisation (Frameworks) published by the European Consortium for Accreditation (ECA).

A panel of experts was convened and consisted of the following members:

- Dr. P.A. (Philipp) Magiera, chair
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH
Head of section departmental coordination for the regional department Europe, Central Asia, Mediterranean
- Prof. dr. K.T. (Karin) Rebel, panel member
Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences & Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development + Center for Academic Teaching and Learning
Professor Sustainability Science & Education + Principle fellow
- A.K. (Anna-Karin) Högfeltdt, panel member
Kungliga Tekniska högskolan (KTH), Sweden
Operations manager of the faculty training and education development support
- Dr. E.A. (Elisabeth) Addink, panel member
Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences
Associate Professor Remote Sensing & Vegetation, Director of Geosciences Honours College
- Prof. dr. D. (Dirk) Kruijt (emeritus professor), panel member (CeQuInt-trained)
Utrecht University, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
Professor of Development Studies
- Mrs. J. (Jessica) Wray, panel member (student)
University of Amsterdam
MSc student Earth Sciences and bat researcher

The composition of the panel reflects the expertise deemed necessary by the Frameworks. The individual panel members' expertise and experience can be found in [Annex 1: Composition of the assessment panel](#). All panel members signed a statement of independence and confidentiality. These signed statements are available from [abbreviation agency] upon simple request. The procedure was coordinated by Barbara Roemers MA at Certiked Evaluation Agency.

The assessment panel studied the self-evaluation report and annexed documentation provided by the programme before the site visit. ([Annex 2: Documents reviewed](#)) The panel organised a preparatory meeting on 8 May 2023. The site visit took place on 15 and 16 May 2023 at the University of Twente. ([Annex 3: Site visit programme](#))



The panel formulated its preliminary assessments per standards immediately after the site visit. These were based on the findings of the site visit which built upon the review of the self-evaluation report and annexed documentation.

The panel finalised the draft report and sent it to the programme management of Spatial Engineering on 12 June 2023 to review the report for factual inaccuracies. The panel amended the report where necessary (minor issues) based on the feedback received from the programme.

The panel approved the final version of the report on 3 July 2023.



3. Basic information

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Qualification: | Master Spatial Engineering |
| Number of credits: | 120 |
| Specialisations (if any): | n/a |
| ISCED field(s) of study: | 05, 06, 07, 08 https://eqe.ge/res/docs/228085e.pdf |
| Institution: | University of Twente |
| Type of institution: | Publicly funded |
| QA / accreditation agency: | Certiked evaluation organisation / NVAO |
| Status period: | 1 November 2023 (deadline for regular NVAO accreditation request) |



4. Assessment scale

The assessment-scale relates to the conclusions of the assessment panel at the level of the standards and is based on the definitions given below. Through the underlying criteria, each of the standards describes the level of quality or attainment required for a satisfactory assessment. The starting point of the assessment scale is however not threshold quality but generic quality. Generic quality is defined as *the quality that can reasonably be expected from an international perspective*.

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Unsatisfactory | <p>The programme does not meet the current generic quality for this standard.</p> <p>The programme does not attain an acceptable level across the standard's entire spectrum. One or more of the underlying criteria shows a meaningful shortcoming.</p> |
| Satisfactory | <p>The programme meets the current generic quality for this standard.</p> <p>The programme shows an acceptable level of attainment across the standard's entire spectrum. If any of the underlying criteria show a shortcoming, that shortcoming is not meaningful.</p> |
| Good | <p>The programme surpasses the current generic quality for this standard.</p> <p>The programme clearly goes beyond the acceptable level of attainment across the standard's entire spectrum. None of the underlying criteria have any shortcomings.</p> |
| Excellent | <p>The programme systematically and substantially surpasses the current generic quality for this standard.</p> <p>The programme excels across the standard's entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary or good practices in all the underlying criteria. The programme can be regarded as an international example for this standard.</p> |



5. Assessment criteria

Standard 1: Intended internationalisation

Criterion 1a: Supported goals

The internationalisation goals for the programme are documented and these are shared and supported by stakeholders within and outside the programme.

Findings and considerations

The Master Spatial Engineering (M-SE) is one of the two programmes of the faculty of Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC)¹ of the University of Twente.

The goals of the M-SE are laid down in 7 'programme intended learning outcomes' (PILOs), 3 of which have an international component. This applies to PILO 3 and 6 and to PILO 7 in particular.

| | |
|---|--|
| | PILO with international orientation |
| 3 | Can design context specific and appropriate interventions for sustainable development. |
| 6 | Is competent in cooperation and communication. |
| 7 | Can work internationally as a global citizen and as an empathic engineer. |

These internationalisation goals are in line with UNESCO's definition of global citizenship² the international profile of the ITC faculty and, especially regarding attention for soft skills development, also in line with the 'High Tech Human Touch' identity of the University of Twente. Furthermore, the internationalisation goals have been formulated against the background of several international frameworks of reference³.

¹ The International Institute for Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC) was an institute of higher (tertiary) education located in Enschede. As of 1 January 2010 it has been incorporated into the University of Twente as the sixth faculty, while preserving its own unique international character as a faculty *sui generis*, and is now formally known as University of Twente, Faculty of Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation (ITC).

² A global citizen has a sense of belonging to a broader community and common humanity. Global citizenship emphasises political, economic, social and cultural interdependency and interconnectedness between the local, national and global.

³ These international frameworks include ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology and is the US engineering accreditation commission), GI-BoK (Geographic information Science and Technology Body of Knowledge, a university consortium for geographical information sciences) and AESOP (Association for European schools of Planning, a network of European universities, their departments and affiliated schools that are engaged in teaching and research in the fields of urban and regional planning).



The programme's internationalisation goals are transparently presented in a matrix. In this matrix, the 7 PILOs are translated into 55 sub-ILOs, 12 of which are directly related to internationalisation goals. These 12 sub-ILOs are the 'intended international and intercultural learning outcomes' (iiiLOs). All sub-ILOs are linked to study units in the matrix.

The internationalisation goals (PILO 3, 6 and 7), including the translation into iiiLOs, (see criterion 2a) are frequently evaluated among and widely supported by work field representatives (including the Professional Advisory Board and internship host organisations), the management team, the teaching staff, and the appointed international skills learning line coordinator. Students and alumni also play a role in evaluations, and they expressed their specific appreciation of the international orientation. For many of them, this focus on internationalisation was the main reason for choosing M-SE. They particularly valued becoming aware of personal bias, strengths and weaknesses in multicultural settings, linked to PILO 7.

Conclusion and recommendations

Becoming an empathic spatial engineer with specific attention for various social and cultural perspectives in the world is the essential nucleus of the programme. The goals that have been formulated to enable this, are widely supported by both internal and external stakeholders. These internationalisation goals are challenging, well thought out, clear, well documented and relevant for an international career, either abroad or at an international organisation in someone's home country.

Criterion 1b: Verifiable objectives

Verifiable objectives have been formulated that allow monitoring the achievement of the programme's internationalisation goals.

Findings and considerations

Objectives are directly derived from the programme's internationalisation goals and transparently presented in a matrix linking the 7 PILOs to 55 sub-ILOs (objectives) and sub-ILOs to study units (see also criterion 2a). Assessment rubrics contain criteria and indicators for measuring the output. Six out of seven study units include objectives explicitly linked to internationalisation goals. The programme calls these 'intended international and intercultural learning outcomes (iiiLOs). The iiiLOs are especially dominant in the international module and in the international skills learning line. The panel notes that some goals in the skill learning line could be formulated more concrete and more specific.

Regarding the setting of the learning environment, the programme also formulated verifiable criteria, including equal rights for all students, extensive international experience for staff members, an international classroom, international and multicultural groups working on real-life wicked problems, international experience required to graduate, etc.



Some objectives, for instance inclusiveness, are not directly “identifiable” in education and have no link with an intended learning outcome. But the requirements for the international learning community of teachers and students⁴ guarantee achieving such objectives.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the objectives have been formulated clearly, that they are challenging and in line with the internationalisation goals and that they are verifiable and monitorable. Some objectives in the international skills learning line deserve finetuning to make them more concrete and specific.

Some objectives might be less suitable for measuring quantitative and/or qualitative elements (like inclusiveness), but the programme applies valid and effective criteria for the learning environment to safeguard the quality of the output.

Criterion 1c: Impact on education

The internationalisation goals explicitly include measures that contribute to the overall quality of teaching and learning.

Findings and considerations

The programme describes a spatial engineer as “someone who uses spatial data, technology, and planning to address stakeholder needs that result from the big problems that society is facing. They work on things like natural disasters, climate change, and poverty. And they help make our communities and the world a better place to live in”. Internationalisation, interdisciplinarity, integration and social-cultural awareness and skills are key in the programme: spatial engineers approach wicked real-world problems in an international context, combining different fields of expertise, including Spatial Information Science (SIS), TE (Technical Engineering) and Spatial planning for Governance (SPG), using intercultural communication skills. This makes spatial engineers “empathic engineers”.

Students and teachers with various cultural backgrounds form an inclusive, international learning community. This community in itself plays an important role in M-SE education. In the team-based case study projects, students learn in groups, together, from their teachers and from each other, thereby working on their cultural sensitivity and empathy. The integrated approach, challenge-based learning and project-led education (see criterion 3b for more information) in these case study projects, contribute to the overall quality of education because students are being trained in working on wicked problems in an authentic way, preparing them very well for their future jobs.

After the case study projects, students follow the International module which further prepares them for making well-informed choices regarding electives, research projects and internships to further shape their international profile.

⁴ More than 50% of the students and almost 40% of the teaching staff is non-Dutch.



An important “tool” in M-SE education is the Personal Development Plan and Portfolio. In this portfolio students reflect on the development of their international and intercultural skills, and during oral assessments they elaborate on this. The panel was enthusiastic of this way of teaching international and intercultural skills.

The didactical measures described above, add to the value of international education and to the value of education in general (scope-broadening). They also serve the main aim of bringing forward empathic spatial engineers. The panel interviewed a few alumni and found them not “just” empathic spatial engineers, but enthusiastic, powerful, confident empathic spatial engineers with a true pioneer’s mentality. In other words, they exceeded the programme’s expectations.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the internationalisation goals relate to and are embedded in teaching and learning. The wide variety of didactical measures (international learning community, team-based case study projects, integrated approach, challenge-based learning, project-led education, the International module and the Personal Development Plan and Portfolio) contribute to the quality of teaching and learning. This clearly shines through in the way alumni present themselves.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 1 - Intended internationalisation

Becoming an empathic spatial engineer with specific attention for various social and cultural perspectives in the world is the essential nucleus of the programme. The goals that have been formulated to enable this, are widely supported by both internal and external stakeholders. These internationalisation goals are challenging, well thought out, clear, well documented and relevant for an international career, either abroad or at an international organisation in someone’s home country.

The panel concludes that the objectives (iiiLOs) have been formulated clearly, that they are challenging and in line with the internationalisation goals (PILOs) and that they are verifiable and monitorable. Some objectives in the international skills learning line deserve finetuning. The nature of some objectives makes it difficult to measure quantitative and/or qualitative elements, but the programme applies valid and effective criteria for the learning environment to safeguard the quality of the output.

The internationalisation goals relate to and are firmly embedded in teaching and learning. The wide variety of adequate didactical measures contribute to the quality of teaching and learning. This shines through in the way alumni present themselves. The panel advises to pay more attention to preparing international students for the Dutch labour market.

The panel deems all the underlying criteria of this standard to be more than appropriately met. The panel found the programme to surpass the generic quality (basic quality) for this standard. None of the underlying criteria have any shortcomings.

Considering all the above, the panel assesses Standard 1, Intended internationalisation, as **good**.



Standard 2: International and intercultural learning

Criterion 2a: Intended learning outcomes

The intended international and intercultural learning outcomes defined by the programme are a clear reflection of its internationalisation goals.

Findings and considerations

The 7 PILOs of the programme are translated into 55 “sub-ILOs”, including 12 sub-ILOs directly related to internationalisation goals. These are called intended international and intercultural learning outcomes (iiiLOs):

| | iiiLO |
|----|--|
| 1 | Reflect on own role as team member and professional |
| 2 | Reflect on how cultural differences between stakeholders may affect the acceptance of the proposed intervention |
| 3 | Communicate the results of the research project using visual, written and oral means |
| 4 | Define a personal Development Portfolio aimed at building up knowledge and skills during the case study project |
| 5 | Identify the relationship between culture (underlying values and assumptions of a society) and the specific behaviours that derive from these |
| 6 | Define clear operationalised fact-finding questions on stakes and interests for the host organisation and interact effectively and respectfully with host organisations to obtain information for analyses |
| 7 | Reflect on own professional behaviour in the interaction with the host organisation |
| 8 | Participate effectively and share knowledge within the project team, describe role as team member, reflect on own strengths and weaknesses in working in a team |
| 9 | Reflect on differences experienced during the excursions, comparing organisations and projects presented during the excursion and videoconferences |
| 10 | Describe own professional skills and awareness of ethical values needed for working in international and multicultural teams and environments and as an empathic engineer who aspires to social justice |
| 11 | Draw viable conclusions and generate a good synthesis, and where possible, give recommendations that recognise the needs and wishes of stakeholder groups involved |
| 12 | Reflect on professional skills, own role in a team, ethical values needed for working in international and multicultural teams and environments |

The 55 sub-ILOs are linked to study units in the programme. This translation from PILOs into sub-ILOs including the iiiLOs, and the link with study units is laid down in a comprehensive matrix, thereby transparently demonstrating the explicit coherence and correspondence between the iiiLOs and the programme.



Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes (iiiLOs) correspond with the programme's internationalisation goals.

Criterion 2b: Student assessment

The methods used for the assessment of students are suitable for measuring the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

Findings and considerations

The programme uses a variety of assessment methods, including inception reports, project reports, written tests and oral tests. Some learning goals are assessed in group work (for instance collaboration skills), some in individual assessments. Furthermore, the student's portfolio plays an important role in personal development. The panel was particularly enthusiastic about the combination of the portfolio and oral assessment during which the student elaborates on his/her portfolio.

According to the panel, the assessment methods are adequate. At the same time, the panel thinks that some of the learning outcomes should not only be "reflected upon" (in the portfolio) but should also be assessed in a more concrete assessment.

A description of the assessment of each study unit can be found in the Education and Examination Regulations (EER) and in the study guide. The assessment approach is, in correspondence with the educational approach, quite holistic and integrated. The iiiLOs are assessed within the assessment context of case study projects, the internationalisation module, internships etc. and translated into criteria and indicators in the rubrics of the assessment forms.

According to the panel, this assessment approach is a valid assessment style for assessing international and intercultural learning outcomes in general and even more so for assessing the iiiLOs of M-SE, since M-SE is particularly focused on delivering alumni that will demonstrate a holistic and integrated approach in their future jobs.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that methods used for the assessment of students are suitable for measuring the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes and that they are particularly focused on assessing iiiLOs within the context of a spatial engineer. The panel recommends considering assessing some of the iiiLOs in a more concrete assessment next to the portfolio assessment (assessing next to reflecting).



Criterion 2c: Graduate achievement

The achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes by the programme's graduates can be demonstrated.

Findings and considerations

Internationalisation achievements are directly demonstrated in student products: essays, poster presentations etc. compiled by students for their case study projects, the international module etc. demonstrate the achieved iiiLOs. This also applies to the graduation products of the programme: all theses and internship reports reviewed by the panel explicitly contained an international and intercultural perspective.

Furthermore, international achievements are demonstrated by the careers of alumni. Alumni move into an array of international careers as defined by the programme. About 50% of the alumni works in an international environment, meaning in a country other than the graduate's home country or in an organisation with a strong international profile.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the graduates demonstrably achieve the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes (iiiLOs). Both student products and careers after graduation demonstrate this.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 2 - International and intercultural learning

The panel concludes that the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes (iiiLOs) correspond with the programme's internationalisation goals.

The panel concludes that methods used for the assessment of students are suitable for measuring the achievement of the iiiLOs and that they are particularly suitable for assessing iiiLOs of an upcoming spatial engineer. The panel recommends considering assessing some of the iiiLOs in a more concrete assessment next to the portfolio (assessing next to reflecting). The panel concludes that the graduates demonstrably achieve the iiiLOs. Both student products and careers after graduation demonstrate this.

The panel deems all the underlying criteria of this standard to be more than appropriately met. The panel found the programme to surpass the generic quality (basic quality) for this standard. None of the underlying criteria have any shortcomings.

Considering all the above, the panel assesses Standard 2, International and intercultural learning, as **good**.



Standard 3: Teaching and Learning

Criterion 3a: Curriculum

The content and structure of the curriculum provide the necessary means for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

Findings and considerations

The curriculum is described in the EER and in the study guide.
 Since the start of the programme (2018), students follow this curriculum:

| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |
|--------|--|---|--|---|
| Year 1 | Case study project 15 EC: <i>Climate-Resilient Cities</i> | Case study project 15 EC: <i>Food and Water Security</i> | Case study project 15 EC: <i>Human-induced Earth Movement - Energy Transition</i> | Electives 14 EC <i>(Focus on methods for MSc Research)</i> |
| | | | | Academic skills (justification MSc Research) 1 EC |
| Year 2 | <i>International Module</i> ⁴ 7.5 EC | Academic & Research Phase 37.5 EC | | Internship 15 EC |

Students starting in September 2023 will follow this curriculum:

| | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | |
|--------|---|--------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Year 1 | Case study project 15 EC: <i>Sustainability & Resilience</i> | Data mastery 10 EC | Case study project 15 EC: <i>Adaptation & Transitions</i> | International Module 7.5 EC | Proposal writing 5 EC |
| | | Elective 5 EC | | | Elective 2.5 EC |
| Year 2 | Electives 10 EC | | | | |
| | Academic & Research Phase 35 EC | | | | |
| | Internship 15 EC | | | | |

One of the changes concerned the position of the international module. This module has been transferred from year 2 to year 1 (and the electives from year 1 to year 2). With this switch students are better prepared for making informed choices regarding the (internationally oriented) electives on offer. The panel welcomes this change.

Both versions of the curriculum enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes, including the iiiLOs (see also criterion 2a). On study unit level, this applies in particular to the case study projects, the internationalisation module, the internship and the thesis. Students demonstrate the achieved level in their intermediate products (products from case study projects and the internationalisation module) and final products (thesis and internship report).



See also criterion 2c. The panel was impressed by the level of these products and the panel is convinced that both programme versions enable students to achieve all iiiLOs.

Conclusion and recommendations

According to the panel, content and structure of the programme excellently prepare students to achieve the iiiLOs. The panel is convinced that the M-SE curriculum with its strong focus on internationalisation in almost all of the study units, enables all students to achieve the required level of all iiiLOs. The M-SE curriculum could serve as an example for other programmes with comparable internationalisation ambitions and deserves the predicate 'state of the art' according to the panel.

The panel concludes that both structure and content of the current and the new curriculum provide excellent means for achieving the iiiLOs.

Criterion 3b: Teaching methods

The teaching methods are suitable for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

Findings and considerations

The faculty of ITC has a strong focus on internationalisation, which trickles down into the ITC programmes. ITC has a vision on education in place, focusing on capacity-development⁵. Each M-SE study unit description includes information on the teaching method, falling under the umbrella of the educational vision of ITC. The teaching methods that are used in the programme and that are particularly prominent in the case study projects, are Challenge-Based Learning (CBL) and Project-Led Education (PLE). Students learn by executing challenging wicked-problems-projects together with other students. The core values of M-SE (stimulating curiosity, using activating methods, working on real world problems in a multicultural learning environment etc.) are clearly visible in the presentations of the case study projects, provided by the students. Moreover, case study projects are strongly student-centred and stimulate students to take responsibility for their own learning path. Teachers know very well how to stimulate the right attitude.

Students themselves point out that working in a diverse group of students with multiple nationalities and becoming aware of personal biases, strengths and weaknesses in the group context, is one of the most valuable learning outcomes for their future careers. During their studies, they reflect on this in their Personal Development Plan and Portfolio (PDP). PDP-reflections concern visible and hidden cultural aspects, links between values and behaviour, universal, cultural and personal aspects, risk perception and framing etc.

⁵ Capacity-development refers to the process of developing and strengthening the skills, instincts, abilities, processes and resources that organisations and communities need to survive, adapt, and thrive in a fast-changing world.



Next to the teaching methods in the case study projects (CBL, PLE, PDP), the teaching methods in the international module, are also specifically tailored to iiiLOs. During the international module students make assignments (for instance an essay on geo-ethics) regarding the excursions that they make to several European institutes and companies and regarding videoconferences with organisations outside Europe that they attend. These organisations are carefully picked, based on the need for covering various perspectives and various knowledge fields of relevance for a spatial engineer.

Last but not least, the personal and small-scale teaching and the high number of contact hours ensures that everyone is actively participating in projects.

Students demonstrate the achieved level of iiiLOs in their intermediate products (products from case study projects, the international module, PDPs etc.) and in their final products (theses and internship reports). See also criterion 2c and 3a. According to the panel, these products clearly reflect the achieved level of the iiiLOs.

Furthermore, students and alumni interviewed by the panel, presented themselves convincingly as global citizens and empathic spatial engineers, thereby demonstrating the effectiveness of the teaching methods.

Conclusion and recommendations

According to the panel, the teaching methods (CBL, PLE, PDP, (virtual) excursions, small-scale education, high number of contact hours) excellently prepare students to achieve the iiiLOs. The panel is convinced that the teaching methods of the M-SE enable all students to achieve the required level of all iiiLOs. The panel considers the teaching methods to be truly activating and inspiring, especially regarding achieving the iiiLOs. The panel sees this reflected in a vibrant learning community of students and teachers alike. The M-SE teaching methods could serve as an example for other programmes with comparable internationalisation ambitions and deserve the predicate 'state of the art' according to the panel.

The panel concludes that the programme uses excellent teaching methods enabling the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes. Student products and the way students and alumni present themselves prove this convincingly.

Criterion 3c: Learning environment

The learning environment is suitable for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

Findings and considerations

The learning environment has been described in the self-evaluation report and the panel took a guided tour during the site visit.

The learning environment has been described in the self-evaluation report.



The faculty of ITC has a strong focus on internationalisation (see footnote 1) and attracts many non-Dutch students and teachers (see criterion 4a and 5a), bringing a vigorous international and intercultural vibe to the location of the ITC faculty and classrooms. A striking diverse international community of students and teachers provides the perfect surroundings for working on and achieving the iiiLOs.

In the first part of the programme the international learning environment is created in the case study projects. The programme has procedures in place to make sure that all students work in diverse and international groups on these case study projects (see mixing procedure, criterion 5a). In the international module the international learning environment is created by excursions to European institutes and by videoconferences with organisations outside Europe (see for more information on the International module criterion 3b). Furthermore, studying abroad (electives) is successfully stimulated and internships and research projects are executed in an international setting, provided either by a host organisation in another country or at an international organisation in someone's home country (see also criterion 2c and 5b).

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the learning environment is perfectly suitable for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes. Students are permanently immersed in an international environment.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 3 - Teaching and Learning

The panel concludes that structure, content and teaching methods of the current and the new curriculum are excellent and enable students to achieve the iiiLOs. Student products and the way students and alumni present themselves prove this convincingly.

The panel concludes that the learning environment is perfectly suitable for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes. Students are permanently immersed in an international environment.

The programme excels across the standard's entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary and good practices in all the underlying criteria. The programme can be regarded as an international example for this standard.

Considering all the above, the panel assesses Standard 3, Teaching and learning as **excellent**.



Standard 4: Staff

Criterion 4a: Composition

The composition of the staff (in quality and quantity) facilitates the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

Findings and considerations

The teaching, guiding and supervising staff (mentors, tutors, supervisors and study unit coordinators) counts 70 staff members (part-timers included). The programme calculated the student-staff ratio for each study unit. This ratio is exceptionally good for all parts of the curriculum. Students can always study in small to very small guided groups:

Calculation student-staff ratio current curriculum⁶

| Student / staff ratio per study unit | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | | average |
| Year 1 | Climate-Resilient Cities(15EC) | 6.28 |
| | Food and Water Security (15EC) | 5.38 |
| | Human-Induced Earth Movement (15 EC) | 5.78 |
| | Academic skills (1 EC) | 7.86 |
| Year 2 | International Module (7,5 EC) | 13.74 |
| | Academic & Research Phase (37,5 EC) | 12.64 |
| | Internship (15 EC) | 19.77 |
| | Total programme | 9.35 |

Full professors (13) and associate professors (11) make up for about one third of the teaching staff. All staff members have their UTQ or are currently following a UTQ training. Some have more advanced teaching qualifications (SUTQ).

The cultural background and the international experience of the teachers is very diverse. A little bit more than 60% of the staff is Dutch, including non-native Dutch speakers who obtained their Dutch citizenship. The rest of the staff comes from other countries, mostly countries outside Europe.

The domain expertise within the teaching team is also very diverse, varying from technical engineering expertise to spatial information science to spatial planning for governance to soft skills in the field of communication.

Students are very positive about the quality and the approachability of the teachers. The panel was also impressed by the teachers and consider them to be significantly valuable for the execution of the programme. They were enthusiastic and engaged and they demonstrably formed a team. To preserve the coherence in the team and in the programme, they often organise 'transfer meetings' where they, among other things, discuss their didactical approaches.

⁶ The student-staff ratio for the new curriculum has not been calculated yet but will be in line with the current situation.



Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the staff is of very high quality and that the diversity of the staff members, regarding cultural background, their international experience and their specific domains of expertise, is essential for enabling students to achieve the iiiLOs. As mentioned under criterion 3c, a striking diverse international community of students and teachers provides the perfect surroundings for achieving the iiiLOs.

The panel concludes that the staff is both in terms of quantity and quality very well equipped for guiding students in their learning path to achieve the iiiLOs.

Criterion 4b: Experience

Staff members have sufficient internationalisation experience, intercultural competences and language skills.

Findings and considerations

At least 40% of the teachers comes from abroad (teachers who have an international background but obtained Dutch citizenship are not included in this percentage but “counted as” Dutch). Many teachers in the programme are involved in projects around the globe (mostly in ODA-countries) and are constantly extending their experience by working in various international and multicultural environments. They use this first-hand experience in examples in teaching, in cases for the project-led education and when guiding students who reflect on their intercultural competences in their Personal Development Plan and Portfolio.

Every ITC staff member (except native speakers of English) has to prove his/her achieved level of English with a certificate. The level of English of the teachers is at least C1⁷, but is in practice often C2. This corresponds with the UT’s language policy: English is the primary formal language of communication.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that staff members have ample internationalisation experience and are equipped with well-developed intercultural competences and language skills. They use these competencies, skills, knowledge and experience in their teaching.

⁷ This level refers to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages.



Criterion 4c: Services

The services provided to the staff (e.g. training, facilities, staff exchanges) are consistent with the staff composition and facilitate international experiences, intercultural competences and language skills.

Findings and considerations

The ITC faculty offers a wide variety of professionalisation trajectories, varying from general teaching professionalisation (UTQ, SUTQ etc.) to courses with a specific focus on teaching and guiding roles in M-SE (mentor, tutor, supervisor, study unit coordinator). During the site visit it became clear that the faculty cares about acknowledging and appreciating talents (in Dutch *erkennen en waarderen van talent*) but that in practice the younger generation benefits more from this (in terms of career opportunities) than the older staff members.

Expanding teachers' international and intercultural experience is facilitated through exchanges (EU grants), through possibilities to participate in projects of the European Consortium of Innovative Universities (ECIU) and in ITC projects around the world. Moreover, teachers can build on their intercultural competences through courses offered by UT's Centre for Training and Development, including UT languages courses (Dutch, English, German, Spanish and Chinese), UT cultural courses, international conferences, other language courses, short-term internships abroad, etc.

Teachers receive 40 hours per year to work on their professionalisation. Teacher's professionalisation is actively stimulated by the faculty and the programme and is a standard item in the annual review cycle with teachers.

During the site visit, teachers themselves pointed out that a large part of their professionalisation actually takes place 'on the job'. Explicitly during transfer meetings in the teaching team of a study unit and implicitly by being part of an inspiring and diverse international and intercultural learning community.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the services provided to the staff are consistent with the staff composition. These services facilitate extending international experiences and working on intercultural competences and language skills quite well. The panel notes that with so many different professionalisation trajectories on offer in and outside the faculty and in and outside the Netherlands, tailoring professionalisation to individual needs is always possible. The panel advises to pay more attention to equal career opportunities for staff members.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 4 - Staff

The panel concludes that the staff is of very high quality and very diverse in the broadest sense of the word (cultural background, international experience, domains of expertise,



gender, etc.) Staff members have ample internationalisation experience and are equipped with well-developed intercultural competences and language skills, in line with the international and intercultural dimensions of the programme. Further individual and collaborative development regarding international experiences, intercultural competences and language skills is actively stimulated by the faculty and the programme. With so many different professionalisation trajectories on offer in and outside the faculty and in and outside the Netherlands, tailoring professionalisation to individual needs is always possible.

The panel found that the programme systematically and substantially surpasses the generic quality for this standard. The programme excels across the standard's entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary and good practices in all of the underlying criteria. The programme can be seen as an international example for this standard.

Considering all the above, the panel assesses Standard 4, Staff, as **excellent**.



Standard 5: Students

Criterion 5a: Composition

The composition of the student group (national and cultural backgrounds) is in line with the programme's internationalisation goals.

Findings and considerations

The incoming students form a mix from the 'Global South', with many students originating from countries that receive Official Development Assistance (ODA), such as Ethiopia, Kenya, Ghana, and India, as well as students from Europe and some from the Americas and Asia. The 84 currently enrolled students come from 26 different countries.

The academic level of the students applying to M-SE is assessed in the admission procedure. Students need to be fluent in English and they need to be educated at bachelor level in at least three domains relevant for M-SE, being hydrology/meteorology, earth sciences, civil engineering, SPG, remote sensing and software engineering. The motivation of incoming students is also assessed. This carefully designed admission procedure leads to a highly diverse student population.

During their studies, students work in small groups on projects. To prevent them from "involuntarily" forming a group with like-minded students with the same background, the programme has procedures in place to stimulate (and if necessary, force) mixing.

This mixing procedure combined with the admission procedure and the international reputation of the programme guarantees a diverse student population beneficial for all M-SE students in line with the programme's internationalisation goals.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the current composition of the student group in terms of national, cultural and domain specific backgrounds is very diverse and is in line with the programme's internationalisation goals. The programme has valid and effective procedures in place to guarantee this for the future as well and to make sure that all students in the programme benefit from it.

Criterion 5b: Experience

The internationalisation experience gained by students is adequate and corresponds to the programme's internationalisation goals.



Findings and considerations

Students interact with students with other nationalities and other cultural backgrounds all the time: they work frequently and intensively together in groups (for instance during the case study projects) and these groups are always internationally and intercultural diverse (see criterion 5a). Students themselves point out that the essay assignments in the case study projects are particularly effective regarding observing and analysing various behaviours from different perspectives. The focus on collaboration in international and intercultural groups, combined with the structure, content and teaching methods of the curriculum (see criterion 3a and b), ensures that students gain substantial internationalisation experience during their studies. All of the learning activities necessary to achieve the iiiLOs are mandatory for all students.

Furthermore, Dutch students (outnumbered by international students anyway) are not allowed to speak Dutch with fellow students. Using English as lingua franca is compulsory for all students.

The internationalisation climax is reached during internships and thesis research projects. All of the internship reports and theses reviewed by the panel, contained an international component, in line with the iiiLOs. This was also true for reports and theses written during the corona pandemic. Students managed to find creative solutions to achieve the internationalisation goals, thereby proving that adaptations and exemptions during the pandemic did not affect the achieved learning outcomes.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that the internationalisation experience gained by the students during their studies is in line with the internationalisation goals of the programme. The programme has various effective methods and rules in place to guarantee this for all students.

Criterion 5c: Services

The services provided to the students (e.g. information provision, counselling, guidance, accommodation, Diploma Supplement) are adequate and correspond to the composition of the student group.

Findings and considerations

The faculty of ITC proactively provides an extensive range of services (extracurricular services) to students that arrive in the Netherlands. This service includes assistance with the application procedure, airport pick-up, *guaranteed* housing, an extra introduction week for the faculty after the university's introduction week, the faculty's Student Affairs Office for personal, social, cultural and medical issues, a very active Student Association Board that organises all sorts of activities (excursions, sports days, food festivals etc.), etc.



Furthermore, the programme proactively provides curricular services, mostly focused on personal assistance and guidance, provided by study career counsellors and a high number of mentors, tutors, supervisors etc. (see criterion 4a), ensuring that every student is seen, heard, and kept on board.

The programme recently moved to a brand-new building. The bright and inviting building offers outstanding lab facilities, quiet study rooms, a large study centre, lovely green patios with ponds and, at the heart of the building, an attractive food-work restaurant offering international dishes (vegetarian, halal etc). Moreover, this new on-campus location enables more international collaboration with staff and students from other UT-faculties. Students obviously are very pleased with their “new home”.

Besides these on-site facilities, students have access to an outstanding international digital library and canvas provides equal access to all students and is always available. Some students mention that information on canvas is not always clearly presented.

Lastly, International Diploma Supplements with the name, academic nature, level, contents and study load of the programme are provided to graduates.

Conclusion and recommendations

The panel concludes that services and facilities for students are exceptionally good. This also applies to (actively promoted) events as well as to the easily accessible personal assistance and guidance. As one of the panel members stated, “it is impossible to get lost here”.

The wide variety of services and facilities is based on the diversity of the student population. Every single student will be able to benefit from what is on offer, tailored to personal needs.

The panel advises to evaluate and revise the information on canvas where necessary, with help from with students to make it more user-friendly and easily accessible.

Overall conclusion regarding Standard 5 - Students

The panel concludes that the composition of the student group is very diverse and in line with the programme’s internationalisation goals. The programme has valid and effective procedures in place to also guarantee this for the future and to make sure that all students in the programme benefit from it.

The panel concludes that the internationalisation experience gained by the students is in line with the internationalisation goals of the programme. The programme has various effective methods and rules in place to guarantee this for all students.

The panel concludes that students are serviced at an extraordinary level. This applies to services, facilities, and events as well as to personal assistance and guidance. The wide variety of what is on offer enables all students to benefit from it.

The panel found that the programme systematically and substantially surpasses the generic quality for this standard. The programme excels across the standard’s entire spectrum. This extraordinary level of attainment is explicitly demonstrated through exemplary and good practices in all of the underlying criteria. The programme can be seen as an international example for this standard.

Considering all the above, the panel assesses Standard 5, Students as **excellent**.



6. Overview of assessments

| Standard | Criterion | Level of fulfilment for each standard unsatisfactory/satisfactory/good/excellent (see descriptions in chapter 4) |
|---|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Intended internationalisation | 1a. Supported goals | good |
| | 1b. Verifiable objectives | |
| | 1c. Impact on education | |
| 2. International and intercultural learning | 2a. Intended learning outcomes | good |
| | 2b. Student assessment | |
| | 2c. Graduate achievement | |
| 3. Teaching and learning | 3a. Curriculum | excellent |
| | 3b. Teaching methods | |
| | 3c. Learning environment | |
| 4. Staff | 4a. Composition | excellent |
| | 4b. Experience | |
| | 4c. Services | |
| 5. Students | 5a. Composition | excellent |
| | 5b. Experience | |
| | 5c. Services | |



Annex 1. Composition of the panel

Overview panel requirements

| <i>Panel member</i> | <i>Subject</i> | <i>Internat.</i> | <i>Educat.</i> | <i>QA</i> | <i>Student</i> |
|------------------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1. Dr. Philipp Magiera | X | X | | | |
| 2. Prof. dr. Karin Rebel | X | | X | | |
| 3. Anna-Karin Högfeldt MSc | | | X | X | |
| 4. Dr. Elisabeth Addink | X | | X | | |
| 5. Em. prof. dr. Dirk Kruijt | | X | | X | |
| 6. Jessica Wray BSc | | | | | X |

Subject: Subject- or discipline-specific expertise;
Internat.: International expertise, preferably expertise in internationalisation;
Educat.: Relevant experience in teaching or educational development;
QA: Relevant experience in quality assurance or auditing; or experience as student auditor;
Student: Student with international or internationalisation experience;

1

Name: Dr. P.A. (Philipp) Magiera, chair

Institution: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Position: Head of section departmental coordination for the regional department Europe, Central Asia, Mediterranean

Philipp Magiera received his PhD in hydrology in 2001 and is an expert in transboundary water management, integrated water resource management, water resources/ groundwater protection, adaptation to climate change in the water sector, sector reform, water master planning, Information and knowledge management, and Geo Information Systems. Furthermore, he has ample experience in international leadership positions in Germany, Laos and Jordan.

2

Name: Prof. dr. K.T. (Karin) Rebel, panel member

Institution: Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences & Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development + Center for Academic Teaching and Learning

Position: Professor Sustainability Science & Education + Principle fellow

Karin Rebel is a Professor Sustainability Science & Education at the Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development at the Faculty of Geosciences, and a Principle Fellow at the Center for Academic Teaching and Learning, both at Utrecht University, The Netherlands. She holds a PhD on Environmental Information Science from Cornell University (USA), and is currently combining research on global change and natural ecosystems with innovative sustainability education. She is an expert in interdisciplinary and inter-university education, and in enhancing digital education.



3

Name: A.K. (Anna-Karin) Högfeltdt, panel member

Institution: Kungliga Tekniska högskolan (KTH), Sweden

Position: Operations manager of the faculty training and education development support
Anna-Karin Högfeltdt is head of the unit of Learning in (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) at KTH. Through the last 10 years, she focused on establishing democratic and inclusive academic community arenas and networks for training, inspiration, exchange and influence on current issues in technical higher education. She was panel member in the accreditation trajectory of the initial accreditation of the master Spatial Engineering in 2018.

4

Name: Dr. E.A. (Elisabeth) Addink

Institution: Utrecht University, Faculty of Geosciences

Position: Associate Professor Remote Sensing & Vegetation, Director of Geosciences Honours College

Elisabeth Addink holds the position of associate professor Physical Geography at the Department of Physical Geography at the Faculty Geosciences of Utrecht University. Her research is focused on the spatial analysis of (satellite) imagery to determine properties of landscapes and landscape objects. She has broad teaching experience in terrestrial systems and their spatial patterns, remote sensing and data-analysis, natural hazards and risk assessment, and she was the supervisor of many bachelor and master theses. She is a holder of educational certificates of the basic and advanced (senior) university teaching qualification and the Educational Leadership Programme and she is involved in several projects regarding educational innovation.

5

Name: Em. prof. dr. D. (Dirk) Kruijt

Institution: Utrecht University, Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences

Position: Professor of Development Studies
CeQuInt-trained

Dirk Kruijt conducted an extensive number of international, scientific projects, especially projects in countries in Latin America. He worked abroad as an advisor for the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Through working for advisory bodies and (audit) committees, and through his many visiting fellowships, he acquired in-depth knowledge on academic education across the world, especially in ODA-countries. Furthermore, he has broad experience as panel member (both for quality assurance agencies (QANU and Certiked) and for the NVAO) with a specific focus on the 'special feature of internationalisation'.

6

Name: J. (Jessica) Wray BSc

Institution: University of Amsterdam

Position: MSc student Earth Sciences and bat researcher

Jessica Wray has a bachelor's in biology and is now studying Earth Science (Environmental Management) at the University of Amsterdam. She is also working as a bat researcher.



7

Name: B.E. (Barbara) Roemers MA

QA Agency: Certiked-VBI

Position: process coordinator and secretary

Barbara Roemers is certified NVAO secretary. Throughout the trajectory, she supported the panel as process coordinator and secretary.



Annex 2. Documents reviewed

- Self-evaluation report (CeQuInt format)
- Annexes (PDF files):
 - o Vision on goals for internationalisation
 - o Curriculum overview
 - o Study guides 2019-2023
 - o Curricular and extracurricular activities, Education at ITC, ECIU network, student well-being, international classroom, International module, the empathic engineer
 - o Student assessment, information on alumni (careers and surveys), NSE results, study unit descriptions
 - o Minutes and annual reports Programme Committee
 - o Annual reports Board of Examination
 - o Diploma Supplement
 - o Overview of all enrolled students since the start of the programme in 2018, including their national and educational background
 - o Student chapter
 - o Overview of participating staff, including department, profile, position
 - o Overview of international projects in which representatives of the programme are involved
- References (links) to education and examinations regulations, vision on education and educational model, vision on assessment, admission procedures, etc.
- Theses and internship reports of 15 alumni, graduated in the last two years

Annex 3. Site visit programme

Overview

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Date: | 15 and 16 May 2023 |
| Institution: | University of Twente (<i>Universiteit Twente</i>) |
| Programme: | Master Spatial Engineering |
| Address institution: | Drienerloaan 5, 7522 NB Enschede |
| Address site visit: | Langezijds Building, Hallenweg 8, 7522 NH Enschede |

Programme

Monday 15 May

Location: ITC Building, UT Campus panel room LA - 1208

| Time | Room | Activity |
|---------------|--|--|
| 13:15 - 13:30 | LA - 1208 | <i>Arrival of the panel at ITC building</i> |
| 13:30 - 13:45 | LA - 1212 | Welcome by Students + Faculty Board |
| 13:45 - 14:30 | LA - 1212 | Showcase |
| 14:30 - 14:45 | <i>Break/internal panel discussion</i> | |
| 14:45 - 15:30 | LA - 1208 | Meeting with programme management and internationalisation staff |
| 15:30 - 15:45 | <i>Break/internal panel discussion</i> | |
| 15:45 - 16:30 | LA - 1208 | Meeting with students (incl. PC member) |
| 16:30 - 16:45 | <i>Break/internal panel discussion</i> | |
| 16:45 - 17:30 | Hybrid LA - 1212 | Meeting Alumni (some will attend online) |

Tuesday 16 May

Location: ITC Building, UT Campus panel room LA 1208

| Time | Room | Activity |
|---------------|--|--|
| 9:00 - 9:30 | LA - 1208 | <i>Arrival of the panel/internal discussion</i> |
| 9:30 - 10:15 | LA - 1208 | Meeting with teaching staff (incl. PC member) |
| 10:15 - 10:30 | <i>Break/internal panel discussion</i> | |
| 10:30 - 11:15 | walk | Site visit tour |
| 11:15 - 11:30 | <i>Break/internal panel discussion</i> | |
| 11:30 - 12:15 | LA - 1208 | Meeting with Examination Board |
| 12:15 - 12:25 | <i>Break/internal panel discussion</i> | |
| 12:25 - 13:05 | Hybrid LA - 1212 | Meeting Professional Field |
| 13:05 - 14:00 | <i>Lunch & internal panel discussion (including "inloopspreekuur"/consultation time)</i> | |
| 14:00 - 14:45 | LA - 1208 | <i>internal panel discussion – programme management available for questions ("pending issues") continued with Final interview with Programme Management/Education Management</i> |
| 14:45 - 15:45 | <i>Break/internal panel discussion; Deliberations panel (formulating preliminary findings and conclusions)</i> | |
| 15:45 - 16:15 | LA - 2405 | Initial feedback to the management and stakeholders, closing of formal visitation |
| 16:15 - 17:15 | LA - 1208 | Development Dialogue (agenda distributed in advance by programme management) |
| 17:30 | | Departure |



The European Consortium for
Accreditation in Higher Education

www.ecahe.eu