

Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

**Bachelor Culturele Antropologie en Ontwikkelingssociologie
(Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology)**

Radboud University

Contents of the report

1. Executive summary	2
2. Assessment process	4
3. Programme administrative information.....	6
4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard	7
4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	7
4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	9
4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment.....	11
4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	13
5. Overview of assessments.....	14
6. Recommendations	15

1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme of Radboud University, 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 (Staatscourant nr. 69458).

The programme objectives are sound. The programme covers subjects in this domain broadly. The panel appreciates the interdisciplinary character of the programme, allowing students to be educated in both the anthropology and development studies disciplines. The panel also welcomes the programme being focused on subjects of cultural diversity and inequality. The panel supports the strong research-orientation of the programme. The programme objectives are up-to-date.

The programme objectives meet the requirements of the Reference Framework for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology in the Netherlands. The panel welcomes the efforts by the joint programmes to draft this framework and regards this to be a sound description of this domain.

The panel welcomes the comparison to other programmes in the Netherlands and regards this programme at the same time to be comparable to these programmes and to have a clearly distinguishing profile.

The panel finds students to be well prepared to enrol in master programmes in this domain or to enter the labour market, acknowledging the latter option to be taken by limited numbers of students.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme correspond to the programme objectives, are well-articulated and conform to the bachelor level.

The admission requirements and procedures are adequate. The panel supports programme's intentions to try and raise the influx numbers. The panel supports the plans to foster student and staff diversity.

The panel is positive about the contents of the curriculum. The curriculum meets the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The courses are up to standard. The panel appreciates the clear organisation of the curriculum and the solid coherence of the curriculum.

The panel regards the lecturers to be both good researchers and skilled teachers. The panel values that the lecturers are strongly education-minded and appreciates that the lecturers introduce their research in the courses. The panel notes that lecturers are very accessible for students. The workload of the lecturers may be demanding, but the Faculty is taking measures to balance the workload.

The panel regards the educational concept and study methods in the curriculum as appropriate, allowing students to complete the curriculum in time. The panel appreciates the small-scale, intensive and student-activating education in the programme. Study guidance is organised well. The study load is balanced and the student success rates are up to standard.

The panel approves of the examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme, these being in line with Faculty policies. The panel is positive about the roles and activities of the Examination Board and the Assessment Committee in assuring the quality of examinations and assessments.

The panel looks favourably upon the examination methods adopted in the programme. These are varied and are consistent with the goals and contents of the courses.

The supervision and assessment processes for the third-year Learning projects and the Bachelor theses have been well-organised. The panel advises to integrate the third Learning project and the Bachelor thesis, in order to promote the integration of theory and methodology, maybe allotting more credits to the combination. In addition, the panel suggests to develop the rubrics in the scoring forms for the Learning projects.

The panel considers the measures ensuring the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments to be satisfactory.

The panel regards the third-year Learning projects and the Bachelor theses to be adequate academic projects. The panel supports the grades given by examiners of the programme, although some of the theses may have been marked slightly too high.

The panel appreciates the measures taken in the programme to promote the labour market orientation of students and to foster the preparation for their future careers. The panel recommends to elaborate on the inter-disciplinary character of the programme in terms of labour market opportunities.

The panel considers the programme graduates to have reached the intended learning outcomes and to be qualified to enrol in master programmes or to enter the labour market.

The panel that conducted the assessment of the Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme of Radboud University 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, 7 March 2019

Prof dr. T. Otto
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren
(panel secretary)

2. Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by Radboud University to manage the limited framework programme assessment process for the Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology of this University. The 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).

Having conferred with management of the Radboud University 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 T. Otto, full professor of Anthropology and Ethnography, University of Aarhus, Denmark, full professor and tropical leader, The Cairns Institute, James Cook University, Australia (panel chair);
- Dr E.D. Rasch, associate professor, Sociology of Development and Change Group, Wageningen University (panel member);
- Dr M.E. Pelkmans, associate professor in Anthropology, London School of Economics and Political Science, United Kingdom (panel member);
- Drs D. Stolk, programme coordinator Cultural Emergency Response, senior member management team, Prins Claus Fonds Amsterdam (panel member);
- C.J. Stam MSc, student Master Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, recently graduated (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-assessment 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 was discussed. In the course of the process preparing for the site visit, programme management and the Certiked 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 the final projects of 15 graduates from the last few years. 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-assessment report of the programme, including appendices. In the self-assessment report, the student chapter was included. In addition, the expert panel members were forwarded a number of theses of the programme graduates, these theses being part of the selection made by the process coordinator.

Several weeks before the site visit date, the assessment panel chair and the process coordinator discussed the self-assessment 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-assessment 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 meeting, the preliminary findings of the panel members, including those about the theses 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 8 November 2018, the panel conducted the site visit on the Radboud University campus. The site visit schedule was as planned. In a number of separate sessions, the panel was given the opportunity to meet with Faculty Board representatives, programme management, Examination Board members, 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, 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 were given two weeks to respond. Having been corrected for these factual inaccuracies, the Certiked bureau sent the report to the Board of Radboud University, to accompany their request for re-accreditation of this programme.

3. Programme administrative information

Name programme in CROHO: B Culturele Antropologie en Ontwikkelingssociologie (B Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology)
Orientation, level programme: Academic Bachelor
Grade: BSc
Number of credits: 180 EC
Specialisations: None
Location: Nijmegen
Mode of study: Full-time (language of instruction Dutch)
Registration in CROHO: 50035

Name of institution: Radboud University
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 Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme is one of the programmes of the Teaching Institute Social and Cultural Sciences of the Faculty of Social Sciences of Radboud University. The Faculty offers seven Bachelor programmes, seven Master programmes and three Research Master programmes. The dean of the Faculty has the responsibility for all programmes of the Faculty. Programme management is shared by this programme and the Master Anthropology and Development Studies programme. The director of these programmes is responsible for the coordination and organisation of the programme. The director is advised on the quality assurance of the programme by the Programme Committee, being composed of lecturers and students. The Examination Board for both programmes has the authority to monitor the quality of examination and assessment processes and products.

The Bachelor Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology programme of Radboud University is a three-year, broad, research-based, academic bachelor programme in this field. The programme is interdisciplinary, being based upon notions and concepts of both cultural anthropology and development studies. The domain of Cultural Anthropology and Development Studies is, broadly stated, directed towards the study of cultural similarities and differences within and between societies and the study of processes of social and cultural change. These subjects are studied from holistic and comparative perspectives and using qualitative and quantitative research methods, among which ethnographic research methods are predominant. The objectives of the programme at Radboud University are, more specifically, to educate students in the themes of cultural diversity and inequality in multi-cultural societies, and on their impact regarding the development and functioning of markets. Students are educated to address contemporary problems, being trained to transfer classical concepts in this domain to present-day situations. The programme is strongly research-based and the programme objectives meet the research lines of the staff involved. Students are trained to do research under supervision.

The objectives of the programme are conform to the Reference Framework for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology in the Netherlands, which has been drafted by the joint programmes of this assessment cluster in the Netherlands.

Programme management compared the programme to other programmes in this field in the Netherlands. This programme distinguishes itself by focussing on the themes of cultural diversity and inequality and by being strongly directed toward the critical reflection on processes of social and cultural change.

Students are primarily educated to continue their studies, proceeding to master programmes in this field. They may, however, enter the labour market, qualifying for junior positions in this field. The proportion of students entering to the labour market is very small, however. To align the programme to professional field requirements, programme management regularly discusses the programme with professional field representatives.

The programme objectives have been translated into intended learning outcomes, addressing theoretical competences, application of knowledge and insights in themes, methods and techniques and skills and attitude. The intended learning outcomes specify knowledge and understanding of cultural anthropology and development studies to study scientific and societal problems within the domain, specially regarding cultural diversity and inequality, knowledge and skills to design research and address societal problems, knowledge and skills to do supervised research in this field, communication skills and critical reflection competencies.

Programme management presented the comparison of the intended learning outcomes to the Dublin descriptors for the bachelor level.

Considerations

The panel regards the programme objectives to be sound. The programme covers subjects in this domain broadly. The panel appreciates the interdisciplinary character of the programme, allowing students to be educated in both the anthropology and development studies disciplines. The panel welcomes the programme being focused on subjects of cultural diversity and inequality. The panel supports the strong research-orientation of the programme. The programme objectives are up-to-date.

The programme objectives meet the requirements of the Reference Framework for Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology in the Netherlands. The panel welcomes the efforts by the joint programmes to draft this framework and regards this to be a sound description of this domain.

The panel welcomes the comparison to other programmes in the Netherlands and regards this programme at the same time to be comparable to these programmes and to have a clearly distinguishing profile.

The panel finds students to be well prepared to enrol in master programmes in this domain or to enter the labour market, acknowledging the latter option to be taken by limited numbers of students.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme correspond to the programme objectives, are well-articulated and are conform to 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 decreased during the last years, going from 67 students in 2012 to 37 students in 2016. The programme is taking measures to reverse this trend. The programme also strives to increase student diversity. The entry requirements for the programme are the pre-university (vwo) diploma. Applicants having the higher professional education (hbo) propaedeutic diploma without the vwo-diploma are admitted, if they meet specific requirements. Prospective students are informed about the programme and are invited to attend matching days. On these days, lectures and tutorials are scheduled and students meet with lecturers and the study advisor. This way, students may make informed choices for the programme.

The programme curriculum takes three years, the total study load being 180 EC. For the programme, the programme assessment plan has been drafted, specifying the relations between the intended learning outcomes, the course goals and the examination methods. The curriculum has been organised in four teaching-learning trajectories, matching the intended learning outcomes. These trajectories are the theoretical, thematic, methodological and skills and attitude trajectories. They span the three years of the curriculum. Within the trajectories, courses build upon each other. In the theoretical trajectory, courses in the first year are introductory, whereas courses in the third year address contemporary debates. The thematic trajectory addresses themes, inherent to the focus of the programme. In the methodological trajectory, students study quantitative and qualitative research methods, the focus being on the latter. In the skills and attitude trajectory, courses in academic skills, literature reviews, labour market orientation and academic writing are scheduled. At the conclusion of each of the years, Learning projects have been scheduled to integrate the trajectories. In these projects, students do fieldwork research in groups in the first two years and individually, be it under supervision, in the third year. The curriculum consists for the most part of compulsory courses. In the minor (30 EC) in the first semester of the third year, students may select electives. They have also the research internship option (12 EC) as part of the minor. At completion of the curriculum, students draft the Bachelor Thesis. In the curriculum, internationalisation is promoted. In the third year, students may take minor courses at foreign institutes and may do their learning project abroad. Most students go abroad. The curriculum coherence has been assured in the design of the curriculum. At the beginning of each of the semesters, coordinators of the years explain the composition of the curriculum and the relations of courses within and across years to students. Course coordinators meet to align courses. The curriculum is being renewed to align with the new research lines adopted by the staff, being focused on the relations of cultural diversity and inequality. The process of renewal started in 2016 and will be completed in 2018.

The lecturing team is composed of 14 permanent staff members and 4 temporary staff members. Staff members are employed at the Teaching Institute Social and Cultural Sciences. All lecturers are engaged in both education and research, being members of the Research Institute Social and Cultural Research. All staff members have PhDs, about 78 % of them are BKO-certified and another two of them are in the process of acquiring the certificate. About 44 % of them have SKO-certificates as well. Staff members have additionally been trained in interactive teaching and in assessments. Lecturers experience their workload to be demanding. The Faculty is taking measures to alleviate lecturers' workload by curtailing administrative duties. The programme strives to increase the staff diversity. Students appreciate the lecturers, including their accessibility.

The educational concept of the programme is research-based, small-scale and interactive learning. The number of hours of face-to-face education are at least 15 hours per week. The study methods adopted in the programme are lectures, tutorials or working groups. Study methods adopted depend on the teaching-learning trajectory and the year in the curriculum. In the thematic or methodological trajectories, lectures and tutorials are offered in combination. In the skills and attitude trajectory, mostly small-scale working groups are scheduled. From the first to the second and third years, study methods shift from lectures to working groups and individual supervision. In all years of the curriculum, students are guided during mentoring meetings. They reflect, among others, on study progress and scientific integrity. Individual coaching may be part of these meetings. Study guidance is offered by the programme study advisor. Students may contact the study advisor in case of questions or problems. The student-to-staff ratio is about 20/1. In the first year and in line with the Binding Study Advice, students must obtain 42 EC. The study load of the curriculum is experienced by students to be manageable. About 20 % to 30 % of the students drop out, mainly in the first year. This proportion decreased to about 5 % in the last year and the programme wants to maintain this figure. The student success rates are about 33 % after three years and about 88 % after four years (last four to five cohorts; proportion students re-entering in second year).

Considerations

The admission requirements and procedures are adequate. The panel supports programme's intentions to try and raise the influx numbers. The panel supports the plans to foster student and staff diversity.

The panel is positive about the contents of the curriculum. The curriculum meets the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The courses are up to standard. The panel appreciates the clear organisation of the curriculum and greets the solid coherence of the curriculum.

The panel regards the lecturers to be both good researchers and skilled teachers. The panel values that the lecturers are strongly education-minded and appreciates that the lecturers introduce their research in the courses. The panel notes that the lecturers are very accessible to students. The workload of the lecturers may be demanding, but the Faculty is taking measures to balance the workload.

The panel regards the educational concept and study methods in the curriculum as appropriate, allowing students to complete the curriculum in time. The panel appreciates the small-scale, intensive and student-activating education in the programme. Study guidance is organised well. The study load is balanced and the student success rates are up to standard.

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 correspond to the Faculty of Social Sciences guidelines. As has been indicated, the Examination Board has the authority to monitor the quality of programme examination and assessment processes and products. On behalf of the Examination Board, the Assessment Committee monitors examinations and assessments.

The examination methods for the courses are selected in line with the courses' goals and contents. In the courses, a wide variety of examination methods has been adopted, including written examinations, individual and group written assignments, essays, take-home examinations, presentations, in-class participation and portfolios. In case of group examinations, individual performances by students are closely monitored and assessed.

The final projects of the programme are the third Learning project and the Bachelor thesis. The Learning project is meant to conduct on-site research under supervision. The Bachelor thesis does not include empirical research. In the third year course Contemporary Debates, students draft the research questions and do the literature review to prepare the Learning project and the Bachelor thesis. The Learning project and the Bachelor theses are separate activities, although students are encouraged to bring these two together. In the Academic Writing course, students are guided in drafting the thesis. Bachelor theses are assessed by two examiners independently, using rubrics scoring forms. In case of differences in judgments of more than 1.5 points or in case one examiner assesses the thesis to be unsatisfactory, a third examiner will assess the thesis. The Examination Board will thereupon determine the final grade.

Programme management and the Board of Examiners have taken measures to promote the quality of examinations and assessments. The assessment plan for the programme outlines the relations of the intended learning outcomes, courses' goals and examination methods adopted. For each of the courses, course dossiers have been compiled. These include the course learning goals, examination methods, assessment criteria and the specifications of relations between course goals, programme intended learning outcomes and the examinations. Examinations including answer models or assessment scoring forms are peer-reviewed. Examinations with deviant grade distributions are inspected by the Examination Board. The Board inspects third-year Learning projects and Bachelor theses on a regular basis. The Assessment Committee reviews, among others, the matching of examinations and the course learning goals.

Considerations

The panel approves of the examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme, these being in line with Faculty policies. The panel is positive about the roles and activities of the Examination Board and the Assessment Committee in assuring the quality of examinations and assessments.

The panel looks favourably upon the examination methods adopted in the programme. These are varied and are consistent with the goals and contents of the courses.

The supervision and assessment processes for the third-year Learning projects and the Bachelor theses have been well-organised. The panel advises to integrate the third Learning project and the Bachelor thesis, in order to promote the integration of theory and methodology, maybe allotting more credits to the combination. In addition, the panel suggests to develop the rubrics in the scoring forms for the Learning projects.

The panel considers the measures ensuring the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments to be satisfactory.

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

The panel reviewed 15 Bachelor theses of programme graduates of the last two years. The average grade for these projects is about 7.1 for the last six years. In 2017, the average grade was somewhat lower, being 6.9.

To prepare for their future careers, students are offered the labour market orientation course and are invited to meet with representatives of the professional field. Programme management regularly discusses the alignment of the programme with trends in the professional field with professional field representatives and programme alumni.

Considerations

The panel regards the third-year Learning projects and the Bachelor theses to be adequate academic projects. The panel supports the grades given by examiners of the programme, although some of the theses may have been marked slightly too high.

The panel appreciates the measures taken in the programme to promote the labour market orientation of students and to foster the preparation for their future careers. The panel recommends to elaborate on the inter-disciplinary character of the programme in terms of labour market opportunities.

The panel considers the programme graduates to have reached the intended learning outcomes and to be qualified to enrol in master programmes or to enter the labour market.

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 integrate the third-year Learning project and the Bachelor thesis, in order to promote the integration of theory and methodology, maybe allotting more credits to the combination.
- To develop the rubrics in the scoring forms for the third-year Learning projects.
- To elaborate on the inter-disciplinary character of the programme in terms of labour market opportunities.