

Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

Bachelor Sociology

University of Amsterdam

Contents of the report

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Executive summary | 2 |
| 2. Assessment process | 4 |
| 3. Programme administrative information..... | 7 |
| 4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard | 8 |
| 4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes | 8 |
| 4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment | 11 |
| 4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment..... | 14 |
| 4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes | 16 |
| 5. Overview of assessments..... | 17 |
| 6. Recommendations | 18 |

1. Executive summary

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

The programme objectives are sound and relevant. The panel welcomes the clear profile of the programme to educate students broadly in the sociology discipline. The panel considers the programme to be strongly research-based. In addition, the panel welcomes the programme training students in personal and academic skills and in analysing and reflecting upon empirical findings. The panel is positive about the themes students may specialise in within the programme. The benchmark of the programme against programmes in the Netherlands and abroad leads to clarification of the programme profile. The panel approves of the students being primarily educated to proceed to master programmes in this domain.

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

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be comprehensive, to match the programme objectives and to meet the bachelor level.

The admission requirements and procedures of the programme are up to standard. The panel appreciates the matching days for applicants.

The curriculum matches the intended learning outcomes. The panel appreciates the programme the strict correspondence of the programme intended learning outcomes, course goals, study methods and examination methods. The panel appreciates the contents of the curriculum and regards the courses to address sociological theory, methodology, empirical findings, and academic skills comprehensively and at appropriate levels. The panel considers the curriculum coherence to be up to standard, and theory and methodology to be well-integrated. The curriculum is strongly research-oriented.

The panel considers the lecturers to be dedicated and motivated, constituting a coherent team. The panel is very positive about the expertise and research track records of the lecturers. PhD candidates and junior lecturers are well-guided by staff members. The panel suggests to monitor the workload of the lecturers, and to take action, if this workload is too demanding.

The educational concept and study methods of the programme are well-thought-through and are aligned to the main features of the programme and the student body. The programme intentions to promote the self-reliance on the part of students is welcomed by the panel. The number of hours of face-to-face education is adequate. The students-to-staff ratio is appropriate. The study guidance is up to standard. The

panel notes international students being welcomed and being well-guided in the programme. The panel encourages the programme to continue to do this. The panel advises to intensify the feedback given to students, both in terms of contents and in terms of time allotted, in preparation of their examination. The drop-out rates and student success rates are satisfactory.

The panel regards the examination and assessment policies to be well-organised. The Examinations Board monitors the examination and assessment processes appropriately.

The panel is positive about the examination methods adopted in the programme, these being consistent with the goals and contents of the courses. The panel welcomes the measures, which have been taken to counter the effects of free-riding.

The supervision and assessment processes for the Bachelor Research Projects are appropriate. Students are provided with well-organised supervision. Although the assessment procedures are adequate, the panel suggests to clarify in the assessment procedures both examiners arriving independently at their assessments. The thesis assessment scoring forms are comprehensive and include relevant criteria. Next to the form, students receive detailed oral feedback during the thesis defence. The panel advises, however, to add more elaborate written comments to substantiate the assessments.

The panel considers the measures ensuring the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments to be up to standard. The scheduling of the yearly assessment days is perceived as positive by the panel.

The Bachelor theses the panel studied, match the intended learning outcomes. The theses are regarded by the panel to be up to standard. The panel fully agrees to the grades given by the programme examiners. The panel suggests to ensure ethical and judicial (legal privacy rules) screening of the Bachelor Research Projects, in case of primary data collection.

The panel considers students completing the programme to have reached the intended learning outcomes and regards the programme to offer suitable preparation for programmes at master level. The range of master programmes graduates are admitted to gives ample evidence of graduates' knowledge and skills.

The panel advises to strengthen the professional components in the programme, and students' reflection upon and preparation for the professional field.

The panel which conducted the assessment of the Bachelor Sociology programme of University of Amsterdam assesses this programme to meet the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, judging the programme to be satisfactory. Therefore, the panel advises NVAO to accredit the programme.

Rotterdam, 12 April 2019

Prof. dr. A. Need
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercooteren
(panel secretary)

2. Assessment process

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

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

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

- Prof. dr. A. Need, professor Sociology and Public Policy, School of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences, University of Twente (panel chair);
- Prof. dr. I. Glorieux, professor, Department Sociology, Research Group TOR, Vrije Universiteit Brussel (panel member);
- Prof. dr. P. Dekker, professor Civil Society, Department Sociology, Tilburg University, programme leader Waarden en Zingeving, Netherlands Institute for Social Research, SCP (panel member);
- K. Wilts, student Bachelor Sociology, University of Groningen (student member).

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

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

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

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

The panel chair and the panel members were sent the self-evaluation report of the programme, including appendices. In the self-evaluation report, the student chapter was included. In addition, the expert panel members were forwarded a number of final projects of the programme graduates, these final projects being part of the selection made by the process coordinator. Two weeks prior to the site visit, panel members received access to the digital learning environment of the programme and a selection of detailed course dossiers.

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

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

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

On 25 January 2019, the panel conducted a site visit on the University of Amsterdam campus. The site visit schedule was in accordance with the schedule as planned. In a number of separate sessions, panel members were given the opportunity to meet with Faculty representatives, programme management, Examinations Board representatives, lecturers and final projects examiners, and students and alumni.

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

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

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

3. Programme administrative information

Name programme in CROHO: B Sociology (B Sociologie)
Orientation, level programme: Academic Bachelor
Grade: BSc
Number of credits: 180 EC
Specialisations: None
Location: Amsterdam
Mode of study: Full-time (instruction language Dutch; Dutch/English from 2018/2019)
Registration in CROHO: 56601

Name of institution: University of Amsterdam
Status of institution: Government-funded University
Institution's quality assurance: Approved

4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard

4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

The Bachelor Sociology programme is one of the programmes of the College of Social Sciences of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of University of Amsterdam. This College is the home of the Bachelor programmes Sociology, Anthropology, Political Science, Human Geography and Planning and Interdisciplinary Social Sciences. The Dean of the Faculty has the responsibility for all programmes of the Faculty. Assisted by the programme coordinator, the director of the programme is responsible for the delivery and quality of this programme. The Programme Committee for both the Bachelor Sociology and Master Sociology programmes, being composed of equal numbers of lecturers and students, advises programme management on quality issues regarding these programmes. The Examinations Board for both the Bachelor Sociology and Master Sociology programmes has the authority to monitor the quality of examinations and assessments of these programmes.

The objectives of the programme are to educate students broadly in the sociology discipline and not to limit the discipline to specific paradigms or perspectives, and to offer research-based education. Students are educated in both classical and contemporary sociological theories. They are also taught qualitative, quantitative and mixed research methods and techniques. In addition, students are trained in sociological craftsmanship, meaning the acquisition of personal and academic skills pertaining to the sociological profession. Students are taught to collect, analyse and weigh empirical findings to apply these to societal problems or in policy-related settings.

To cover the theoretical and methodological breadth of sociology, students are introduced to six sociological themes or domains. These are Intersectionalities: Class, Race, Gender, and Sexuality; Urban Places and Social Problems; Migration and Citizenship; Life Courses, Family and Health; Education and Work; Globalising Cultures. These themes are aligned to programme staff expertise and research interests.

The programme decided to change the language of instruction from Dutch to Dutch and English from the academic year 2018/2019 onwards. The goal of this change has been to offer students an international programme, at the same time not abandoning education in Dutch or losing the Dutch sociological perspective. From 2018/2019 onwards, lectures are English-taught, but students are free to choose either Dutch- or English-taught tutorials and are free to write assignments and do the examinations in either Dutch or English.

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

Students are primarily prepared to continue their studies in master programmes in sociology or in related social sciences. They may, however also enter the labour market.

The programme was benchmarked against programmes in the Netherlands and abroad. Compared to programmes in the Netherlands, this programme distinguishes itself through its breadth. The programme may be said to have considerable similarities to programmes of reputed universities abroad, but also to be broader than these programmes.

The objectives of the programme have been translated into the programme intended learning outcomes. These intended learning outcomes specify, as the main points, broad knowledge of sociological theory; broad overview of sociological methodology; basic sociological research skills, including analysis of research findings; basic level of analysis of and critical reflection upon societal problems; understanding to weigh ethical dilemmas; oral and written communication skills; and critical reflection on the position and responsibilities as sociologists.

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

Considerations

The panel regards the programme objectives to be sound and relevant. The panel welcomes the clear profile of the programme to educate students broadly in the sociology discipline. The breadth of the programme becomes evident from the range of theories and methodologies studied. The panel considers the programme to be strongly research-based. In addition, the panel welcomes the programme training students in personal and academic skills and in analysing and reflecting upon empirical findings. The panel is positive about the themes students may specialise in within the programme.

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

The panel welcomes the benchmark of the programme against programmes both in the Netherlands and abroad, as the benchmark leads to further clarification of the programme profile.

The panel approves of the students being primarily educated to proceed to master programmes in this domain.

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be comprehensive and to match the programme objectives. The panel regards the intended learning outcomes to meet the bachelor level.

Assessment of this standard

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

4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings

The student influx between 2013 and 2017 decreased from about 100 incoming students in 2013 and 2014 to about 60 to 70 students in the years after. In 2018, the inflow of students rose to about 140 students. This rise was mainly due to the influx of about 50 international students. The admission criteria for the programme are either the Dutch pre-university diploma (vwo) or equivalent prior education from abroad or the completed first year of higher professional education (hbo). The programme schedules matching days for applicants, including lectures, tutorials, literature study and assignments. Matching days are meant to inform prospective students and to allow them to assess the choice for the programme. Foreign students attend matching days online. Matching days are much appreciated by the incoming students.

The programme takes three years to complete and carries 180 EC of study load. For the programme, the intended learning outcomes have been mapped to the curriculum components to show the curriculum meeting the programme intended learning outcomes. The curriculum and courses have been designed in line with the constructive alignment principle, meaning correspondence of programme intended learning outcomes, course goals, study methods and examination methods. All courses in the curriculum mirror one or more of the programme objectives, being theory, methodology, empirical findings and sociological craftsmanship. These may be regarded as learning pathways. The first year of the curriculum consists of mandatory, introductory courses within all four learning pathways. In the *Amsterdam Research Project* course at the end of this first year, students integrate knowledge and skills acquired and conduct a limited scope sociological research project in small groups. In the second year, more advanced courses within each of the learning pathways are scheduled. In addition, domain courses are offered. These cover all six domains or themes in the programme. In these domain courses, theory is addressed, but methodology and academic skills are also included. Students study literature, make research assignments and report on findings in these domain courses. In the first semester of the third year, students opt for either minor courses, internships or courses abroad. In the second semester of the third year, students take methodology and empirical findings courses and complete individually the Bachelor Research Project (18 EC). The subjects addressed in the courses in the curriculum are research-led. Lecturers being researchers in the programme domain lecture in these courses and relate subjects taught to current research.

A total number of 30 staff members lecture in the programme, 5 of whom are full professors. In addition, about 23 PhD candidates and junior lecturers are involved in the programme. Many lecturers come from abroad. All staff members are employed at the Department of Sociology of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. They are all researchers in research groups of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research. The lecturers' research is highly valued. All staff members have PhD degrees. Of the total number of staff about 83 % are BKO-certified and another 13 % are in the process of acquiring the certificate. PhD candidates and junior lecturers teach in the tutorials, being guided and supported by the lecturers in the courses. Lecturers meet regularly in staff meetings to discuss the programme. They

experience their workload to be quite demanding. The Faculty is taking measures to alleviate the workload.

The educational concept of the programme consists of three components, being student-activating teaching, research-led education and the international classroom. The programme trains students to become more self-reliant throughout the curriculum, as the programme wants to prevent students becoming too dependent upon guidance and support. The programme makes efforts to integrate international and Dutch students. The students-to-staff ratio for the programme is 28/1. The number of hours of face-to-face education is 12 hours per week in the first year, 10 hours in the second year, and 8 hours in the third year. The study methods adopted in the courses mainly are lectures, tutorials and seminars. International students are welcomed and assisted upon their arrival. In the first year, all students are guided by junior lecturers acting as mentors. Students are guided in the *Sociological Craftsmanship* classes as well as individually. In all three years, students may contact the study advisor. The study advisor invites all students for a personal meeting in the second year to inform them about, among others, the third year options in the programme. Once per year, all lecturers come together to discuss study progress of all students in the programme. Students experience the study load to be challenging. On the other hand, the average number of study hours spent by students are about 25 hours per week. Factors outside of the programme may contribute to the perceived study load. The programme drop-out rates are rather stable over the years and amount to about 20 % in the first year. In the years thereafter, about 6 % of the students additionally drop out. The student success rates of the programme are on average 25 % after three years. The success rates after four years rose from about 50 % for cohort 2008 to about 73 % for cohorts 2013 and 2014 (proportions of students re-entering in the second year).

Considerations

The panel considers the admission requirements and admission procedures of the programme to be up to standard. The panel appreciates the matching days for applicants.

The curriculum matches the intended learning outcomes. The panel appreciates the programme having adopted the constructive alignment principle, leading to the strict correspondence of the programme intended learning outcomes, the course goals, and the study methods and examination methods in the courses. The panel appreciates the contents of the curriculum and regards the courses to address sociological theory, methodology, empirical findings, and academic skills comprehensively and at appropriate levels. The panel considers the curriculum coherence to be up to standard, and theory and methodology to be well-integrated. The curriculum is strongly research-oriented.

The panel considers the lecturers to be dedicated and motivated, constituting a coherent team. The panel is very positive about the expertise and research track records of the lecturers in the programme. PhD candidates and junior lecturers are well-guided by staff members. The panel suggests to monitor the workload of the lecturers, and to take action, if this workload is too demanding.

The panel regards the educational concept and the study methods of the programme to be well-thought-through and to be aligned to the main features of the programme and the student body. The programme intentions to promote the self-reliance on the part of students in the course of the programme is welcomed by the panel. The number of hours of face-to-face education is adequate. The students-to-staff ratio is appropriate. The study guidance is up to standard. The panel notes international students being welcomed and being well-guided in the programme. The panel encourages the programme to continue to do this. The panel advises to intensify the feedback given to students, both in terms of contents and in terms of time allotted, in preparation of their examination. The drop-out rates and student success rates are satisfactory.

Assessment of this standard

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

4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

The programme examination and assessment rules and regulations are in line with the University of Amsterdam and the Social Sciences assessment policies. As has been said, the Examinations Board has the authority to monitor the quality of examination and assessment processes and products of both the Bachelor Sociology and the Master Sociology programmes.

The examination methods for the courses are selected to conform to the courses' contents, in line with the constructive alignment principle. In nearly all courses, multiple examinations are scheduled. The examination methods in the programme include written examinations, written assignments, take-home assignments, papers or essays, and oral presentations. To ensure the assessment of students' individual performances, group assignments carry limited weight within the total of the course examinations.

The rules and regulations for the Bachelor Research Project are laid down in the project manual. The projects are individual research projects. Students prepare their projects in small groups, being supervised by lecturers in the programme. Groups may be divided in qualitative research or quantitative research groups. Early in the process, the research proposals are assessed by both the supervisor and the second reader. The Bachelor Research Projects themselves are also assessed by the supervisor and the second reader independently who in mutual consultation arrive at the common assessment. Part of the assessment is the oral defence by students. For the assessment, assessment scoring forms are adopted. These scoring forms include relevant assessment criteria. The examiners give oral feedback to the students on the written report and the oral defence. In case the examiners do not succeed in reaching consensus on the grade, the Examinations Board invites a third examiner to grade the project.

Programme management and the Examinations Board have taken a number of measures to promote the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments. The Examinations Board appoints examiners, being permanent BKO-certified staff members or staff members in the process of acquiring the BKO-certificate. For all courses, course dossiers have been compiled. These include, among others, course goals, examination methods adopted, assessment criteria and grading rules. Examinations, assignments and answer models are drafted by teams of examiners. On the yearly assessment day, examiners and the Examinations Board meet to discuss and calibrate assessments of examinations and theses. On behalf of the Examinations Board, the Assessment Committee on a regular basis reviews samples of Bachelor Research Projects. Rules and regulations to prevent fraud and plagiarism are in force. Students and examiners are informed. The Board of Examiners handles cases of suspected plagiarism. Only few cases are reported. The programme feels fraud and plagiarism are effectively prevented.

Considerations

The panel approves of the examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme, these being in line with University of Amsterdam and Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences assessment policies. The Examinations Board monitors the examination and assessment processes appropriately. The panel regards the examination and assessment policies to be well-organised.

The panel is positive about the examination methods adopted in the programme, these being consistent with the goals and contents of the courses. The panel welcomes the measures, which have been taken to counter the effects of free-riding.

The supervision and assessment processes for the Bachelor Research Projects are appropriate. Students are provided with well-organised supervision. The first provisional thesis assessment at the end of the project is done independently by the supervisor and the second reader. Those are compared and discussed before the final meeting with the student, resulting in a consensual grade after the thesis defence. Although the assessment procedures are adequate, the panel suggests to clarify in the assessment procedures both examiners arriving independently at their assessments. The thesis assessment scoring forms are comprehensive and include relevant criteria. Next to the form, students receive detailed oral feedback during the thesis defence. The panel advises, however, to add more elaborate written comments to substantiate the assessments.

The panel considers the measures ensuring the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments to be up to standard. The scheduling of the yearly assessment days is perceived as positive by the panel.

Assessment of this standard

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

4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Bachelor Research Projects are individual research projects on the basis of either qualitative or quantitative data analyses.

The panel studied fifteen Bachelor theses of programme graduates of the most recent years. The average grades for the Bachelor Research Projects were 7.0 for 2015/2016 and 7.3 for 2016/2017.

The programme surveyed the graduates' master studies or careers. The vast majority of the programme graduates continue their studies at master level. They are admitted to master programmes of University of Amsterdam or other universities. About 30 % of the graduates proceed to the Master Sociology programme of University of Amsterdam and about 5 % of them succeed in being admitted to the Research Master Social Sciences of this university. Other graduates either go to other universities or to other master programmes of University of Amsterdam. The range of programmes is wide. About 20 % of the graduates either go abroad or enter the labour market.

The Social Sciences Advisory Board, consisting of professional field representatives, regards the programme to be aligned with professional field requirements. Programme graduates whom the panel met, were more critical.

Considerations

The Bachelor theses the panel studied, match the intended learning outcomes. The theses are regarded by the panel to be up to standard. The panel fully agrees to the grades given by the programme examiners. The panel suggests to ensure ethical and judicial (legal privacy rules) screening of the Bachelor Research Projects, in case of primary data collection.

The panel considers students completing the programme to have reached the intended learning outcomes and regards the programme to offer suitable preparation for programmes at master level. The range of master programmes graduates are admitted to gives ample evidence of graduates' knowledge and skills.

The panel advises to strengthen the professional components in the programme, and students' reflection upon and preparation for the professional field, for instance by presentations by alumni, be it they will enter the labour market after master programmes of their choice.

Assessment of this standard

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

5. Overview of assessments

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

6. Recommendations

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

- To continue welcoming and guiding international students.
- To monitor the workload of the lecturers, and to take action, if this workload is too demanding.
- To intensify the feedback given to students, both in terms of contents and in terms of time allotted, in preparation of their examination.
- To clarify in the assessment procedures of the Bachelor Research Projects both examiners arriving independently at their assessments.
- To add more elaborate written comments on the assessment forms to substantiate the assessments of the Bachelor Research Projects.
- To ensure ethical and judicial (legal privacy rules) screening of the Bachelor Research Projects, in case of primary data collection.
- To strengthen the professional components in the programme, and students' reflection upon and preparation for the professional field, for instance by presentations by alumni, be it they will enter the labour market after master programmes of their choice.