

Assessment report  
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

**Master International Development Studies**

University of Amsterdam

*Contents of the report*

1. Executive summary .....	2
2. Assessment process .....	5
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 .....	10
4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment.....	13
4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes .....	15
5. Overview of assessments.....	16
6. Recommendations .....	17

## 1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Master International Development Studies programme of University of Amsterdam. The programme was assessed according to the standards of the limited framework, 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 was also assessed on the EADI/IAC criteria in the context of the EADI/IAC accreditation application.

The panel considers the objectives of the programme to be very sound and relevant, the programme being distinctly multidisciplinary, addressing relevant disciplines and introducing students not only to analyses but also to critical evaluation of these analyses. The panel noted the programme to be respected within the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The multidisciplinary dimensions of the programme are supported by the Faculty and the Graduate School of Social Sciences. These are also reflected in the curriculum.

The objectives are firmly positioned within the domain-specific framework of reference, drafted by the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes, and therefore match the international requirements for the development studies domain. The panel suggests however to relate the objectives more clearly to subjects, issues and perspectives from the Global South.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme meet the programme objectives, are well-structured and well-articulated. The panel welcomes that the intended learning outcomes reflect the multidisciplinary focus of the programme objectives, address the different disciplinary perspectives on development studies, include critical reflection on current development issues and contexts, deal with societal relevance and normative and policy concerns, and are directed towards research and communication skills.

The intended learning outcomes conform to the master level. The panel is positive about programme management maintaining the programme intended learning outcomes up to date.

The panel appreciates the programme objectives to prepare students for positions in the development studies professional field. In addition, the contacts of the programme management with professional field representatives are welcomed by the panel.

The comparison by programme management to development studies programmes in the Netherlands and abroad contributes to the understanding of the programme profile.

The panel considers the programme to be managed conscientiously.

The curriculum of the programme complies with the intended learning outcomes and is regarded by the panel to be multidisciplinary and coherent. The design of the curriculum is very clear. In addition, the curriculum is strongly related to current research. The panel is positive about the tables and descriptions linking the intended learning outcomes to the courses.

The panel considers the lecturers to be very dedicated to the programme. The expertise and educational capabilities of the lecturers are very much up to standard. Nearly all staff members have PhDs and are UTQ-certified. Lecturers come from various countries. The guidance and supervision on the part of the lecturers is appreciated by students.

The admission procedures of the programme are up to standard, the entry prerequisites being very strict. The curriculum allows students coming from disciplinary backgrounds to be introduced to this multidisciplinary field. Although students come from various countries, the panel proposes to try and increase student group diversity, particularly from the Global South. The panel also advises programme management to offer scholarships, enabling lower-income students to enrol in the programme.

The programme exemptions policy and regulations are adequate.

The study methods meet the contents of the programme and promote students participating actively in class. The programme is demanding, but programme management succeeds in managing the study load. The panel considers the number of hours of face-to-face education and the students-to-staff ratio to be satisfactory. The panel is positive about the student success rates. Information provision and study guidance during the courses are well-organised. The panel suggests, however, to improve the information about the fieldwork and especially about the costs involved and to improve the organisation of the fieldwork, starting the fieldwork with sound research questions.

The examination and assessment policies for the programme are appropriate, these being in line with the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences and University of Amsterdam rules and regulations. The position and authority of the Examinations Board for this programme are adequate as well. The Board is in control of the examination and assessment processes in the programme.

The panel approves of the examination methods adopted in the programme.

Programme management has taken adequate measures to ensure the validity of examinations and the reliability of assessments. The appointment procedures for examiners, the peer-review procedures for examinations and the assessment days for the lecturers are evidence of this. The fraud and plagiarism formalities are appropriate. The panel considers the supervision and assessment processes of the Research Project to be adequately organised. The panel advises to add detail to the thesis assessment form, as this is rather concise.

The panel assesses the course examinations, these being assignments, to be up to standard.

None of the Research Projects reviewed were assessed by the panel to be unsatisfactory. The grades of these projects were generally found to be consistent with the grades the panel would have given. The projects were strong on data collection and data analysis, but some of the projects could be strengthened in terms of the conceptual framework and the reflection on methodology. In addition, in some cases the panel found the formulation of the research questions to be too broad.

In the panel's opinion, the programme should remain attentive to the preparation of the graduates for positions on the labour market.

The panel that conducted the assessment of the Master International Development Studies 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 recommends NVAO to accredit this programme. In addition, the panel assesses the programme to meet the EADI/IAC criteria and, therefore, advises EADI/IAC to accredit the programme.

Rotterdam, 23 April 2018

Prof. dr. D.A.N.M. Kruijt  
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren  
(panel secretary)

## 2. Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by the University of Amsterdam to support the limited framework programme assessment process for the Master International Development Studies programme 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). In addition, the objective of the programme assessment was to assess whether the programme would meet the EADI/IAC criteria. The joint assessment of NVAO standards and EADI/IAC criteria was conducted following the agreement signed by the NVAO Board and the EADI/IAC Board to that effect.

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

The panel composition was as follows:

- Prof. dr. D.A.N.M. Kruijt, emeritus professor Development Studies, Utrecht University, Netherlands (panel chair);
- Prof. dr. M.J. Spierenburg, professor Development Studies, Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands (panel member);
- Prof. dr. D.C. Mitlin, professor Global Urbanism, Manchester University, United Kingdom (panel member);
- Prof. dr. B. Kebede, professor Behavioural Development Economics, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom (panel member);
- Dr. J.G. Mönks, executive director NORRAG, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Switzerland (panel member; representing EADI/IAC);
- M. Speelberg BA, student Master International Development Studies, Utrecht University, Netherlands (student member).

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

In writing, all panel members and the secretary confirmed being impartial with regard to the programme to be assessed and that they observe the rules of confidentiality.

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 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 thesis research projects of graduates of the programme from the two most recent years. Acting on behalf of the assessment panel, the process coordinator selected 15 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-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 final thesis research projects of the programme graduates, these final thesis research projects being part of the selection made by the process coordinator.

A number of weeks before the site visit date, the assessment panel chair and the process coordinator met to discuss the self-assessment report provided by programme management, the procedures regarding the assessment process and the site visit schedule. 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 thesis research 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 panel met to speak about the preliminary findings on the quality of the programme. During this meeting, the preliminary findings of panel members, including those about the final thesis research 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 10 January 2018, the panel conducted the 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 the Faculty Board representatives, programme management, Examinations Board representatives, lecturers and final thesis research projects examiners, and students and alumni.

In a closed session at the end of the site visit, the panel considered in detail 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 were 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: M International Development Studies  
Orientation, level programme: Academic Master  
Grade: MSc  
Number of credits: 60 EC  
Specialisations: N.A.  
Location: Amsterdam  
Mode of study: Full-time (language of instruction: English)  
Registration in CROHO: 60329

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 Master International Development Studies programme of the University of Amsterdam is meant to introduce students to development studies as a distinctly multi-disciplinary field. The objectives of the programme include educating students in the history and theories of development, familiarising them with different disciplinary perspectives on development, such as those from sociology, anthropology and human geography, acquainting them with the multi-scalar context of development processes, recognising relations between local, regional, national and global levels and teaching them about interaction and unequal power relations between actors within context-specific institutional environments. In addition, the programme objectives are for students to acquire research skills, academic skills and professional skills.

Programme management showed the programme objectives to meet the domain-specific framework of reference, being the international Revised Definition of the field of Development Studies of October 2015 of the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI). This international framework defines development studies as the multi- or interdisciplinary field of study, seeking to understand social, economic, political, technological, ecological, gender and cultural aspects of societal change at local, national, regional and global levels and their interplay, the field being context-sensitive and being characterised by normative and policy concerns.

The objectives have been translated by programme management into a series of intended learning outcomes. These specify, among others, knowledge and understanding of a broad range of theoretical concepts and approaches in the development studies field, drawing on multiple disciplines, understanding of and critical reflection on current development issues and contexts, academic research skills, awareness of societal relevance, ethical research aspects and normative and policy concerns, communication skills and competencies to engage respectfully with groups and individuals with different perspectives and from different parts of the world.

Programme management presented a table to show the intended learning outcomes to correspond to the Dublin descriptors for master level programmes.

The programme has been compared to other well-known development studies programmes at the master level, both in the Netherlands and abroad. This programme may be regarded to be comparable to these programmes, but with an emphasis on inclusive and sustainable development, to be strongly research-oriented, to require students to carry out fieldwork and to educate students to act responsibly, conscientiously and ethically in the development studies field.



The programme is distinctly meant to be academic, but programme curricula intends to equip students with knowledge and skills to obtain positions in the professional field. Students are educated as academic professionals, being students who have the knowledge, analytical skills, critical thinking, research skills and professional skills to be competitive in the professional field of development studies. Students are not primarily trained to pursue PhD trajectories. Students who want to continue as PhD students, are referred to the Research Master International Development Studies programme of University of Amsterdam. Programme management confers with representatives from organisations and businesses about the prospects for graduates in the professional field.

#### *Considerations*

The panel considers the objectives of the programme to be very sound and relevant, the programme being distinctly multidisciplinary, addressing relevant disciplines and introducing students not only to analyses but also to critical evaluation of these analyses. The panel noted the programme to be respected within the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The multidisciplinary dimensions of the programme are supported by the Faculty and the Graduate School of Social Sciences. These are also reflected in the curriculum. The panel suggests to relate the objectives more clearly to subjects, issues and perspectives from the Global South.

The programme objectives are firmly positioned within the domain-specific framework of reference, drafted by the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI), and therefore match the international requirements for the development studies domain.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme meet the programme objectives, are well-structured and well-articulated. The panel welcomes that the intended learning outcomes reflect the multidisciplinary focus of the programme objectives, address the different disciplinary perspectives on development studies, include critical reflection on current development issues and contexts, deal with societal relevance and normative and policy concerns, and are directed towards research and communication skills. The panel is positive about programme management maintaining the programme intended learning outcomes up to date.

The intended learning outcomes conform to the master level, as exemplified by the Dublin descriptors.

The panel appreciates the programme objectives to prepare students for positions in the development studies professional field. In addition, the contacts of the programme management with professional field representatives are welcomed by the panel.

The panel welcomes the comparison by programme management to development studies programmes in the Netherlands and abroad. This comparison contributes to the understanding of the programme profile.

#### *Assessment of this standard*

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

## 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 Master International Development Studies programme is a programme of the Graduate School of Social Sciences of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of the University of Amsterdam. The director of the School is in charge of the educational and financial policies for this and the other programmes of the School. The programme director of this Master programme is responsible for the day-to-day management of the programme, being assisted by the programme coordinator/study advisor. Most of the lecturers teaching in the programme are employed at the Department of Human Geography, Planning and International Development Studies of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. The Programme Committee, being composed of two staff members and three students (one from this Master and two from the Research Master International Development Studies) reviews student survey results and advises the programme director on the quality of the programme. The Examinations Board has been given the authority to monitor the quality of the examinations and assessments and the examination processes of this and three other programmes of the Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Programme management presented detailed descriptions and tables to demonstrate how the curriculum meets the intended learning outcomes of the programme. In these descriptions and tables, the intended learning outcomes have been related to the curriculum components, the teaching methods in the courses and the course assessments. The curriculum has a total study load of 60 EC and takes ten to twelve months to complete. The curriculum is scheduled in six periods or blocks of either eight or four weeks, the first two blocks in the semester being eight weeks and the third block being four weeks. The structure of the curriculum was changed in 2017/2018, following discussions among staff and students. In the first block, the students are taught theoretical and foundational knowledge in the development studies field, being introduced to theories, concepts and discourses and being offered a conceptual model to link multiple disciplines and multiple methodologies (9 EC). In the second block, students select two electives (two times 6 EC). The electives offered by the programme address, among other topics, economics, social justice, gender and urban dimensions of development. Students may choose electives that are not pre-approved, but need approval by the Examinations Board. Parallel to the courses mentioned, the *Research Training and Fieldwork Preparation* course (9 EC) is scheduled in the first two blocks and the first half of the third block. In this course, students are introduced to social science research methods and are taught to collect and analyse data from field research. Both qualitative and quantitative research methods and techniques are addressed. The course includes support as students draft the research proposal for their *Research Project*. In the curriculum, three intercultural communication training workshops are scheduled, two of which are part of this course. In the second half of the third block and the fourth block, students conduct the fieldwork for their Research Project. For this project, students may choose topics related to ongoing research by staff members. The Research Project has a study load of 24 EC with fieldwork and writing extending from the fourth to the sixth block. Most students do their fieldwork in the Global South. The fieldwork is greatly appreciated by students. Having completed the fieldwork, students take the course *Thesis Seminar* (3 EC). In this course, they are taught how to structure their analyses and how to write the thesis. The reflection on research ethics is part of this course. In addition, students take the *Policy and Practice Seminar* (3 EC), introducing them to the professional field and training them in a number of transferable skills.

The staff lecturing in the programme are in total 25 lecturers, three of whom are full professors. Staff members have backgrounds in economics, anthropology, sociology, law, human geography, political science, international law or international relations. Most lecturers in the programme are participating in the Governance and Inclusive Development research programme, which is part of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research. About 80 % of the lecturers have a PhD (94 % counting in FTE) and 72 % of the lecturers (89 % counting in FTE) are UTQ-certified (UTQ means Dutch University Teaching Qualification). Lecturers come from various countries, such as India, United States and United Kingdom. In the Policy and Practice Seminar, professionals coming from NGOs, the Dutch government and research institutions lecture about the professional field and about requirements for programme graduates in this field. Lecturers meet regularly. Four education meetings for the Department of Human Geography, Planning and International Development Studies department and four staff meetings for the International Development Studies teaching staff are scheduled per year. Lecturers collaborated in redesigning the curriculum. The results of surveys show students having very favourable views on the lecturers' teaching capabilities.

Every year, about 250 students apply to enter the programme. About 50 % of them are admitted and about 60 to 65 students are actually enrolled. Incoming students are from the Netherlands (25 % to 30 %), from other European countries (50 % to 60 %) or from other continents (10 % to 20 %). About 20 % of the students are male, whereas 80 % are female. To be admitted to the programme, applicants should have a Bachelor degree in Development Studies or in one of the other social sciences with 30 EC of development studies courses, at least 20 EC of social sciences quantitative and qualitative research methods courses and an overall grade of at least 7.0 (Dutch grading system) in their prior education. Applicants are to submit an academic text in English, two names of two possible references and a letter of motivation. Students being suitable to enrol, but having deficiencies, are offered preparatory courses. The maximum number of applicants allowed to enrol is about 75. When there are more eligible candidates than places, the admissions committee will rank the candidates following pre-formulated criteria.

Students may apply for exemptions. Requests for exemptions are handled by the Examinations Board.

Programme management intends to promote the active participation by students in the classroom. The study methods adopted in the programme include plenary lectures, student-led seminar sessions, class discussions, student presentations and class assignments. The average number of hours of face-to-face education is about 9 hours per week in the first semester and about 3 hours per week in the second semester, excluding individual supervision. The student-to-staff ratio is 26 : 1. Students report studying about 36 hours per week and regard the study load to be fair. Programme management adopted measures to improve the study load, as this was previously perceived by students as being too high. The student success rates are about 75 % for students completing the programme in one year, that is in nominal time, and about 91 % for students completing the programme after two years (average figures for cohorts 2013 to 2016).

Students regard the information about the programme to be adequate. The programme coordinator/study advisor meets with all students two times per year and maintains contact with every one of the students about the study progress, with regard to selecting the thesis supervisor and about study problems. In the fieldwork market in October, students meet potential supervisors who will guide them through the Research Project. For the fieldwork, students are guided by local supervisors, who are approached by programme supervisors or by students themselves.

### *Considerations*

The panel considers the programme to be managed conscientiously.

The curriculum of the programme complies with the intended learning outcomes and is regarded by the panel to be multidisciplinary and coherent. The design of the curriculum is very clear. In addition, the curriculum is strongly related to current research. The panel is positive about the tables and descriptions linking the intended learning outcomes to the courses.

The panel considers the lecturers to be very dedicated to the programme. Nearly all staff members have PhDs and are UTQ-certified. Lecturers come from various countries. The guidance and supervision on the part of the lecturers is appreciated by students.

The admission procedures of the programme are regarded by the panel to be up to standard. The entry prerequisites are very strict, allowing only the most talented and motivated students in. The curriculum allows students coming from disciplinary backgrounds to be introduced to this multidisciplinary field. Although students come from various countries, the panel proposes to try and increase the student group diversity, particularly from the Global South. The panel also advises programme management to offer scholarships, enabling lower-income students to enrol in the programme.

The programme exemptions policy and regulations are adequate.

The panel regards the study methods to meet the contents of the programme and to promote students participating actively in class, as may be deduced from student-led seminar sessions. The programme is demanding, but programme management succeeds in managing the study load. The panel considers the number of hours of face-to-face education and the students-to-staff ratio to be satisfactory. The panel is positive about the student success rates. Information provision and study guidance during the courses are well-organised. The panel suggests, however, to improve the information about the fieldwork and especially about the costs involved and to improve the organisation of the fieldwork, starting the fieldwork with sound research questions.

### *Assessment of this standard*

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

### 4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

#### *Findings*

The programme examinations and assessments are in line with the Social Sciences Assessment Policy and the University of Amsterdam Assessment Policy Framework. For this and three other programmes of the Graduate School of Social Sciences, one Examinations Board has been installed, having the authority to ensure and monitor the quality of examinations and assessments and the corresponding processes of these programmes. An external member sits on the Examinations Board.

Examination methods in the programme are diverse and include class assignments, group presentations, homework assignments, individual papers and individual essays. There are no sit-in written examinations. In all courses, multiple examinations to arrive at the final grade are adopted. Examination methods are related to the course goals.

For the programme, measures have been adopted to ensure the validity and reliability of examinations and assessments. Examiners are appointed by the Examinations Board. Examiners are to have a PhD and are to be UTQ-certified. Examinations, drafted by examiners are peer-reviewed by other examiners. For the assessments, assessment keys are used. Programme management schedules assessment days for lecturers and examiners to review and discuss the quality of examinations and assessments. The Examinations Board is present and participates in the review of the examinations.

Assignments, essays, papers and theses are checked for plagiarism. The Examinations Board handles cases of plagiarism or fraud.

As has been indicated, in the *Research Training and Fieldwork Preparation* course, students draft the research proposal. They are guided by their supervisor and by the local supervisor during the fieldwork phase. Upon returning from the fieldwork, students write their thesis. Students submit their thesis and defend their work before the supervisor and the second reader, who has not been involved in the thesis process. The supervisor and the second reader assess and grade the thesis, including the oral defence. They make use of the thesis assessment form. If they do not agree or if the grade is between 5 and 6, or a 9 or higher, a third examiner is called in.

#### *Considerations*

The panel considers the examination and assessment policies for the programme to be appropriate, these being in line with the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences and University of Amsterdam rules and regulations. The position and authority of the Examinations Board for this programme are appropriate. The Board is in control of the examination and assessment processes in the programme.

The panel approves of the examination methods adopted in the programme.

The measures taken by programme management to ensure the validity of examinations and the reliability of assessments are adequate. The appointment procedures for examiners, the peer-review procedures for examinations and the assessment days for the lecturers are evidence. The fraud and plagiarism formalities are up to standard.

The supervision and assessment processes of the Research Project are adequately organised. The assessment processes are up to standard, involving two examiners. The panel advises to add detail to the thesis assessment form, as this is rather concise.

*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 studied the examinations of a number of courses of the programme.

The panel reviewed a total number of fifteen Research Projects of graduates of the programme, these projects exhibiting a variety of grades, ranging from satisfactory to very good. The average grade of the Research Projects over the last two years was 7.6 (Dutch scale, going from 1.0 to 10.0). About 15 % of the students graduate *cum laude* (average grade of 8.0 or more for courses and thesis).

Programme management assists students in preparing for the labour market by offering them the Policy and Practice Seminar at the end of the curriculum. Graduates tend to find paid work within 4 to 6 months after graduation positions. The proportion of graduates having obtained paid work differs, being 95 % for the 2011 – 2012 cohort and being 82 % for the 2014 – 2015 cohort. Graduates of previous cohorts are not very satisfied with the extent to which the programme has prepared them for the labour market. Programme management has taken steps to rectify this with revisions to the Policy and Practice course.

Many of the graduates work in NGOs (27 %) or in private companies (22 %).

##### *Considerations*

Having studied the examinations, these being assignments, of a number of courses of the programme, the panel assesses these examinations to be up to standard.

None of the Research Projects reviewed were assessed by the panel to be unsatisfactory. The grades of these projects were generally found to be consistent with the grades the panel would have given. The projects were strong on data collection and data analysis, but some of the projects could be strengthened in terms of the conceptual framework and the reflection on methodology. In addition, in some cases the panel found the formulation of the research questions to be too broad.

In the panel's opinion, the programme should remain attentive to the preparation of the graduates for positions on 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	Good
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	Good
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 relate the programme objectives more clearly to subjects, issues and perspectives from the Global South.
- To try and increase the student group diversity, particularly fostering the influx of students from the Global South.
- To offer scholarships, enabling lower-income students to enrol in the programme.
- To improve the information about the fieldwork and especially about the costs involved.
- To improve the organisation of the fieldwork, starting the fieldwork with sound research questions.
- To add further details and specifications to the thesis assessment form, as this is rather concise.
- To strengthen the Research Projects in terms of the conceptual framework and the reflection on methodology and to narrow the formulation of research questions.
- To remain attentive to the preparation of the graduates for positions on the labour market.