

ONDERZOEKERIJ

Research Master Psychology

University of Amsterdam

Report of the limited programme assessment

De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden

Email: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl



Contents

Contents.....	3
Executive summary.....	4
1. Introduction	6
1.1 Administrative data	6
1.1 Introduction	6
1.2 Panel composition	6
1.3 Working method.....	7
2. Review	9
2.1 Intended learning outcomes	9
2.2 Teaching-learning environment	10
2.3 Student assessment.....	14
2.4 Achieved learning outcomes	15
3. Strengths and recommendations.....	17
3.1 Strengths of the programme	17
3.2 Recommendations.....	17
4. Conclusion.....	18
Appendix A – Panel composition and programmes of the cluster.....	19
Appendix B – Schedule of the visit	21
Appendix C – Documents studied	22
Appendix D – Abbreviations	23



Executive summary

The outcome of the external assessment of the research master Psychology of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) by an NVAO approved panel is positive. The two-year full-time programme aims to educate students as critical and analytical professionals who are able to deal with ever-changing knowledge in a scientifically responsible manner, build bridges between the different disciplines within psychology, and contribute to the formation of cutting-edge scientific insights.

The panel is positive about the broad focus of the programme, in which students will acquire general theoretical and methodological knowledge in the field of psychology and more thorough knowledge in their area of specialisation. According to the panel this broad orientation leads to the possibility to build bridges between the various subdisciplines in psychology.

In the programme, students complete advanced courses on research methods and statistics. Furthermore, they are trained in scientific writing and presentation skills, and programming skills. Next to the research-oriented courses, students choose a major (three specialised courses and a thesis) and a minor (two specialised courses) from a different psychological subdiscipline. The panel is enthusiastic about this major-minor structure which gives students the possibility to tailor the programme to their own interests. However, the accumulation of knowledge and skills in the specialised courses is less clear. The panel thinks the programme would benefit from a more explicit build-up of knowledge and skills in the specialised courses in the curriculum, for example by means of a portfolio.

The panel values the research-oriented nature of the programme, evidenced by the two research projects and the academic context with teaching staff that are well-qualified and knowledgeable researchers. The programme focusses mainly on academic research. The panel recommends the programme to further incorporate an applied focus in the curriculum.

The panel is somewhat concerned about the heavy study load and stress that students perceive. Although the programme has already taken some measures, such as a buddy system, the panel encourages the programme to take further steps to change the environment from an environment of performing to a learning environment. More explicit integration of the learning outcome 'self-regulation', which includes self-monitoring and reflection, in the courses might be helpful in this.

The programme has a clear framework for assessment and makes use of an appropriate range of assessment methods. The panel values the use of rubrics in the assessment procedures. It encourages the programme to further improve the rubric system of theses, especially with respect to the thesis process. The Examinations Board (EB) plays an active role in ensuring the quality of assessments. All learning outcomes are assessed in an integrated way in the research project. The panel is pleased with the quality and academic level of the fifteen theses it examined. According to the panel, the students reach a high level of achievement and are very well prepared for a career in psychological research.

The panel is therefore convinced of the quality of the research master's programme Psychology.



The chair and the secretary of the panel hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 10 May, 2021

Janke Cohen-Schotanus
(chair)

Annemarie Venemans
(Secretary)



1. Introduction

1.1 Administrative data

Name of the programme:	Psychology (research)
CROHO number:	60383
Level of the programme:	Master of Science
Orientation of the programme:	Academic
Study load:	120 EC
Tracks:	Brain & Cognition, Clinical Psychology, Developmental Psychology, Psychological Methods, Social Psychology, Work & Organizational Psychology
Location:	Amsterdam
Variant:	Full-time
Expiration of accreditation:	1 November 2021

1.1 Introduction

This report focuses on the assessment of the research master's programme Psychology of the University of Amsterdam (UvA). This assessment forms part of a cluster assessment of thirteen research master's programmes at seven universities. In total, fifteen panel members participated in this cluster assessment. Appendix A provides an overview of the thirteen participating research masters and the composition of the total panel.

The assessment is based on the standards and criteria described in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands 2018 (limited framework). Research master's programmes must meet a number of additional criteria as described by the NVAO (specification of additional criteria for research master's programmes, 2016).

1.2 Panel composition

For every online visit, a (sub)panel was composed, based on the expertise and availability of panel members. Each (sub)panel consisted of five members, including the chair and the student member. The panel that assessed the research master's programme Psychology consisted of the following members:

- Prof. dr. Janke Cohen-Schotanus (chair), Professor emeritus of Research of Education in the Medical Sciences;
- Prof. dr. Caroline Braet, Professor Developmental Psychopathology Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology at Ghent University;
- Prof. dr. Harm Hospers, Professor emeritus of Applied Health Psychology;



- Prof. dr. Guus Smeets, Professor of Education in Psychology, Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences at Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Marie Stadel, MSc (student member), Behavioural and Social Sciences Research Master, University of Groningen (graduated in 2020).

The panel was supported by dr. Annemarie Venemans-Jellema, who acted as secretary.

All panel members and the secretary have signed a declaration of independence and confidentiality. In this declaration they affirm not to have had any business or personal ties with the programme in question for at least five years prior to the review.

The NVAO approved the composition of the panel on 26 November 2020.

1.3 Working method

Preparation

On 14 January, the panel of the entire cluster held a general online kick off meeting. In this meeting, the panel received an introduction to the assessment framework and discussed the working methods in preparation to and during the online visits.

The programme drew up a self-evaluation describing the programme's strengths and weaknesses. This self-evaluation included a chapter in which the students reflected on the programme. The panel members prepared the assessment by analysing the self-evaluation report and the appendices provided by the institution. The panel also evaluated a selection of fifteen master theses and the accompanying assessment forms from the programme. The theses selection was made by the panel's secretary based on a provided list of at least fifty theses from the most recent years. In the selection, consideration was given to a variation in assessments (grades), topics and programme variants.

The panel members individually formulated their preliminary findings and a number of questions they wanted to raise during the online visit. The secretary made an overview of these preliminary findings and questions and sent it to the panel members as a starting point for the preparation of the panel during the online visit.

To further ensure that the different panels used the same working method and approach for all thirteen programmes in the cluster, the two chairs and the two secretaries had two additional meetings: once prior to the first visit and once halfway through all the visits.

Online visit

The online visit took place on 1 March, 2021 (see Appendix B for the schedule). During the preparatory meeting, the panel discussed the preliminary findings and decided which questions to raise in their meetings with the programme representatives. During the visit, the panel spoke with representatives of the management, students, lecturers, alumni and the Examinations Board. Everyone involved in the programme had the opportunity to inform the panel in confidence about matters they consider important to the assessment. No one made use of this opportunity. The panel used the last part of the online visit to evaluate the interviews and had a second meeting with the programme's management to receive answers to any remaining questions. At the end of the visit, the chair presented the panel's preliminary findings and their first impressions of the programme.



Report

The secretary drew up a draft report based on the panel's findings. This draft report was submitted to the members of the panel and adjusted on the basis of their review and feedback. After adoption, the draft report was sent to the institution for verification of factual inaccuracies. The secretary discussed the programme's comments with the chair, after which the secretary drew up the final report and circulated it to the panel for a final round of comments.

The report follows the four standards such as set of in the NVAO's Assessment Framework 2018 (limited framework): 1) the intended learning outcomes, 2) the teaching-learning environment, 3) assessment, and 4) achieved learning outcomes. Regarding each of the standards, the assessment panel gave a substantiated judgement on a three-point scale: meets, does not meet, or partially meets the standard. The panel subsequently gave a substantiated final conclusion regarding the quality of the programme, also on a three-point scale: positive, conditionally positive, or negative.

Development dialogue

Although 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 in light of the outcomes of the assessment report.



2. Review

2.1 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, analysis, and considerations

The mission of the UvA research master's programme Psychology is to educate students as critical and analytical professionals who are able to deal with ever-changing knowledge in a scientifically responsible manner, build bridges between the different disciplines within psychology, and contribute to the formation of cutting-edge scientific insights. This has been formulated in a set of content-focused and skills-based learning objectives.

The content-focused objectives refer to advanced knowledge and comprehension of the major concepts, theories, and empirical findings in the field of specialisations. The programme divides these objectives into specialist knowledge of methods and techniques of psychological research and associated statistics on the one hand, and specialist knowledge of theories and findings on the other hand. The content-focused objectives differ per specialisation and are continuously updated according to the state of the art within the discipline.

The skills-based learning objectives refer to critical, scientific thinking skills, that are the same for all students. The programme formulated six skills: paraphrasing, analysing, evaluating, independent thinking, communication and self-regulation.

The panel appreciates the distinction between content and skills objectives. The programme has succeeded in formulating intended learning outcomes that reflect the 'breadth' of the programme. This stimulates students to become interested in cross-disciplinary challenges, which is important for future scientists in psychology. At the same time, the skills and abilities are strongly geared towards research skills and a critical academic attitude. The panel is also positive about the separate learning outcome on the skill 'self-regulation', which includes self-monitoring and reflection. It finds these skills highly relevant for researchers.

The panel is of the opinion that the academic master's level is clear: students will have acquired general theoretical and methodological knowledge in the field of psychology and more thorough knowledge in their area of specialisation. The programme's intended learning outcomes comply with the Dublin-descriptors for a master's level. The panel considers that the research-oriented nature of the programme is very much present in the objectives. Therefore, it is of the opinion that the intended learning outcomes meet the research master's requirements.

The programme has compared itself to other research master's programmes in the field of psychology in the Netherlands. The programme at the UvA distinguishes itself by offering a programme with a broad set-up, a major-minor structure and a possibility for a clinical route. The latter facilitates students to meet the entry-requirements for the postmaster training in Dutch healthcare psychology (*GZ-psycholoog*). According to the panel, a research-oriented programme with this structure is unique in the Netherlands.



Conclusion

In conclusion, the panel appreciates the combination of the academic research master's level with the broad orientation of the programme lined up in the intended learning outcomes. This broad orientation leads to the possibility to build bridges between the various subdisciplines in psychology.

The programme therefore meets standard 1.

2.2 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, analysis, and considerations**Curriculum*

The research master's programme in Psychology is a full-time programme of 120 EC, divided into four semesters, each consisting of three periods (8-8-4 weeks respectively). The curriculum consists of a required core curriculum (21 EC), elective courses in methods and statistics (12 EC), specialised courses (36 EC), research projects (50 EC) and colloquia (1 EC). The specialised courses are offered by the six programme groups: Brain & Cognition, Clinical Psychology, Developmental psychology, Psychological Methods, Social Psychology, and Work & Organizational Psychology.

The panel speaks highly about the major-minor structure of the curriculum. In this structure, students choose a major (three specialised courses and a thesis) and a minor (two specialised courses) from a different psychological subdiscipline. In addition, students have one elective course which they can do in their major, minor, another specialisation from the research master, or outside the research master. According to the panel this structure creates flexibility and allows students to optimally align and customise the programme to their personal preferences and research ambitions.

The number of available specialised courses differs per specialisation and per year. According to the self-evaluation report each programme group organises at least three specialised courses every two years. Students the panel spoke with, are pleased with the range of courses. The panel noted that in some years, two programme groups offered less than three courses over two years. The management confirmed that there have been some difficulties in offering the courses in the smaller disciplines, but that was solved by combining two specialisations in those years. The panel is satisfied with the measures the programme took, but encourages the programme to ensure that each specialisation offers the minimally required courses each year.

The panel noted coherence between the courses of the required core curriculum. Courses in this part of the curriculum are: 'Scientific Writing & Presenting', 'Good Research Practices', 'Programming in Psychological Science', and 'Statistics 1'. The gradual build-up of these courses allows students to develop the knowledge and skills required for their research internship and master thesis. The accumulation of knowledge and skills in the specialised courses is less clear. According to the panel, this can partly be attributed to the mix of first year and second year students in each specialised course. The programme convinced the panel that the mix of students with different major specialisations as well as the mix of first-year and second-year students stimulates collaboration across psychological subdisciplines and is helpful for social cohesion. However, the panel thinks the



programme would benefit from a more explicit build-up of knowledge and skills in the specialised courses within the curriculum, for example by means of a portfolio with personalised learning objectives.

The panel appreciates that the curriculum consists of two research projects. In the first year, students conduct a 'Research Internship' (in the field of their major or minor), and in the second year they conduct their 'Research Thesis' (in the field of their major). The internship is composed of a research proposal and a final report. The master thesis report is written in the form of a publishable journal article. At least one of the projects has to be an empirical study. Students may carry out one of the two research projects abroad. The two projects should focus on different topics. The panel is convinced that with these two projects students acquire fundamental scientific knowledge and skills such as critical evaluation of scientific literature, debating on scientific issues, and presenting research findings in a clear, critical and stimulating manner.

According to the panel, the programme is also research-driven because of its academic context. It is clear to the panel that students are part of a high-quality, driven and committed research environment. In 2017, the research institute was assessed in the research review Psychology. The institute received an excellent score on quality, relevance and viability. This reputation of the institute is endorsed by the panel.

Students and alumni the panel met were very satisfied with the research-oriented nature of the programme. Although a broad research focus is covered in the intended learning outcomes, both students and alumni feel that the programme is predominantly academically oriented and prepares students for a position as a PhD candidate. They somewhat miss(ed) the preparation for a career outside of academia in courses and research projects. The previous accreditation panel already recommended to strengthen the orientation towards a career outside academia. According to the panel, the programme mainly responded to this recommendation by improving career guidance towards a career outside academia (for example by career talks with alumni and career markets). The panel suggests to take this a step further and to structurally incorporate an applied focus in the curriculum, for example by offering (more) research projects with an applied focus.

The programme offers students who meet the applicable entry requirements (such as proficiency in Dutch) the possibility to obtain the '*Basisaantekening Psychodiagnostiek*' (BAPD) and meet the requirements for the postmaster training '*GZ-psycholoog*' within the research master. This clinical route deviates from the standard programme in two ways. Students follow courses on diagnostics and interventions instead of two specialised courses and students follow a clinical internship instead of a research internship. The panel is convinced about the added value of this clinical route, because of the shortage of researchers in a clinical psychology setting. Also, the panel agrees with the programme that the quality of mental health care can benefit from this clinical track. It was pleased to note that during the clinical internship there is still a strong link between science and practice. Therefore, the panel is of the opinion that the programme found a good way to implement the clinical route in the programme.

The educational concepts of the programme are student-centred education and research-oriented education. The programme provides an international learning environment. The panel recognises these concepts in the curriculum. Students value the small-scale education and the interactions with students and teachers. The panel is convinced that the variety of teaching methods such as practicals and discussion meetings, exercises, assignments, working groups, and lectures, provides students enough opportunities to master the intended learning outcomes.

The language of instruction is English. The programme management substantiates its choice by arguing that the educational profile of the programme, the international background of the academic



staff, and the internationally diverse influx of students who participate in the globalised research community, necessitate an English-taught programme. The panel supports this choice.

The assimilation of the intended learning outcomes in the programme

One of the appendices of the self-evaluation report showed the relationship between the learning outcomes and the courses. The intended learning outcomes of the programme are translated into specific learning objectives for each course outlined in the course catalogue. The panel noted that the entire programme covers all learning outcomes. However, the panel believes that the skills learning objective 'self-regulation' could be better integrated in the curriculum. This objective refers to the self-regulating cognitive activities in terms of managing a research project, self-monitoring, reflecting on own role, behaviour, inferential judgements, and applying ethical/scientific codes of conduct. The management mentioned that this learning outcome is already implemented in the research projects and it aims to also integrate this outcome in the courses. The panel encourages this.

Admission

Admission procedures and criteria are clearly presented in the self-evaluation report. The programme is a selective master's programme with a yearly intake between 38 and 50 students. Strict criteria are in place, such as study records and academic achievements, scientific writing skills, motivation, research experience, and English language proficiency. The number of international students increased in the past years to about 70% in the current student cohort. The panel learned that the programme does not have a clear vision on the optimal percentage of international students for this programme. The panel encourages the programme to develop a vision on this and use it in the strategy for recruiting future students.

Staff

One of the appendices to the self-evaluation report contains a list of all academic staff members participating in the programme. The panel recognises the staff's scientific quality and international academic reputation. The panel is not only impressed with the scientific quality of the teaching staff but also with their involvement in the programme. During the visit the panel noticed a large enthusiasm of the staff. In addition, students were very pleased about the involvement of staff members. According to the students, there is always a lot of interaction between the teaching staff and the students. In their opinion the staff is very supportive. The panel highly appreciates this commitment and the availability of staff members.

Of the total number of lecturers about 65% obtained the *Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs* (BKO) certificate and another 8% of them is expected to become BKO-certified soon. The panel is of the opinion that here is room for improvement. It advises making sure that all staff members do obtain the qualification.

Study load and mentoring

The panel established that the study load is quite demanding. Almost half of the students experience study delay. This delay is partly due to the student's choice to extend their study for CV building. The panel spoke with ambitious students who set high standards for themselves. Both teachers and



students mentioned that the student's passion and perfectionism sometimes led to mental health problems or even a burnout.

The panel noted that the programme is well aware of this culture of perfectionism and competition and takes several measures to reduce the perceived study load. There is for example a very active study advisor who helps students with a large range of problems. Students spoke very highly about her. In addition, the programme has a buddy system in which second-year students pair with first year students to enhance academic and social integration. The panel is pleased that the programme takes this issue seriously and has a system in place to guide students. However, it recommends the programme to take further steps in reducing stress and competition. One of the alumni nicely phrased that it would be good to make the programme more an environment for learning rather than an environment of performing. The panel is of the opinion that better integration of the learning outcome 'self-regulation' in the courses, as stated before, would help to achieve this learning environment.

In addition, more guidance of international students at the start of the programme would be helpful. Although there is an introduction programme, the panel noted that some international students had a hard time to get used to the Dutch educational system.

COVID-19

Due to COVID-19 almost all education of the programme switched to online teaching and assessment in the past year. The panel asked students and teachers about their experience with online teaching. Whilst COVID-19 evidently had an impact on the interaction between students and teachers, both are positively surprised about the online possibilities. For example, the study adviser and the track ambassador started online coffee meetings with the first and second-year students. In addition, the study adviser has set up a 'telephone tree' for first-year students, in which students are assigned to one other. Every two weeks they call someone and check in to hear how the other student is doing. During the online visit, students mentioned that there was still a lot of social interaction and discussion possible. They valued new components that were implemented in the courses, for example the online guest lecture of an Israeli stakeholder. Teachers experienced a high workload, but learned about new online teaching methods. They felt really supported by the UvA Teaching and Learning Centre that provided tools and information. The panel concluded that although the COVID-19 situation is not an optimal teaching and learning situation, the pandemic has also brought some positive developments. It suggests the programme to explore what measures might be kept after COVID-19.

Conclusion

In sum, the panel is convinced that the programme offers a suitable teaching-learning environment with strong elements such as the major-minor structure of the curriculum and the dedicated staff members. The programme therefore meets standard 2.



2.3 Student assessment

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

Findings, analysis, and considerations

Assessment policy and methods

The panel notes that the programme follows the UvA assessment policy framework and the Department of Psychology assessment policy, which are thorough and well-considered. The Psychology assessment policy provides guidelines on testing and assessments. Teachers are taught how to apply the policy in their courses.

To measure the intended learning outcomes, the programme uses a variety of assessment methods such as written exams, open-book exams, papers, programming assignments, research proposals, group reports, and presentations. According to the self-evaluation report, the assessment procedures of individual courses are formulated in the course descriptions that are provided in the course catalogue each year. The panel verified that students are well-informed about the type of assessment and grading criteria before the start of each course.

The panel is pleased that the intended learning outcomes are measured with a variety of assessment methods. It is also positive about the implementation of formative tests and assessments.

Grading of the theses

The grading of theses is based on the use of standardised assessment forms and rubrics. Two staff members, a supervisor and an independent second assessor, always grade the thesis independently. Theses are graded on product (graded by the supervisor and second assessor) and process (only graded by the supervisor). Regarding the process, the supervisor provides feedback on effort, scientific input, handling of feedback, planning, and ethical behaviour and scientific integrity, as well as the oral presentation. The final grade is the average of the process grade and the two product grades. The management and lecturers explained during the interviews that they deem the grade for the process very important, because it is part of the learning outcome 'self-regulation'. The panel agrees with this consideration.

After studying the procedures for the master thesis, the panel is of the opinion that the current procedure allows assessors to address all necessary competences and go into all aspects of the thesis. The panel established from the completed assessment forms it studied, that the forms include extensive written feedback of the supervisor and second assessor.

One point of attention is the high average thesis grade, varying between 8.20 and 8.58 over the last seven years. In several theses the panel studied, the process part of the assessment was graded with a maximum score of 10. The panel extensively discussed whether these high grades are legitimate. It came to the conclusion that based on the criteria used in the rubric, the grades are indeed fair. However, the panel is of the opinion that the grading procedure with regard to the process can be further developed, so that also the process rubric better represent the grades for the different skills students should acquire during the process.



Examinations Board

The Examinations Board (EB) monitors the general quality of the examinations, taking into account student evaluations and signals from students and staff, and undertakes action if necessary. The Board consists of six members representing the six programme groups and an external member. The panel reviewed the activities of the EB in monitoring the quality of examinations. It established that the EB has adequate procedures that safeguard the quality of testing. Based on the self-evaluation report and conversations the panel had with the EB, the panel established that the EB monitors the alignment between intended learning outcomes and assessment. The panel noticed that none of the members of the board is a full professor. The panel advises to empower the Board with members who are full professor.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the measures ensuring the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments to be adequate. The programme therefore meets standard 3.

2.4 Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings, analysis, and considerations

As described under Standard 2, students finish the programme with a final research project. Being the final element of the programme and covering all learning outcomes, this reflects the level achieved by students. In order to assess whether the intended learning outcomes are achieved the panel has studied a sample of recent theses as an internal indicator, and has examined the graduates' success in a research career as an external indicator.

The panel is pleased with the quality and academic level of the fifteen theses it examined. The panel would have given the same grade or a slightly lower grade than the two original assessors based on the assessment criteria. Most of the theses studied were of high quality including advanced measurement and analyses methods. The panel appreciates the interdisciplinary character of several theses it studied. More than 50% of students publish their thesis work in scientific journals which is indicative of high-quality scientific work.

The quality of the programme is clearly expressed by the achievements of the students, who are doing well according to the self-evaluation report. During the site visit, the panel talked to alumni, who reported that they were very satisfied with their education, and felt well-prepared for a job as a researcher. They pointed out that they had benefited from the large variety of courses and good research skills. According to the self-evaluation report and the interview with the alumni, the preparation for a career outside academia could be improved. The panel advises to pay more attention to career paths outside academia.

The self-evaluation report gave further evidence of the final level of graduates. Information from an alumni survey shows that there is a time window of two months between graduation and the first job. According to the panel, the fact that 51% of the students have a PhD position and 22% another type of research position shows the programme's good performance in terms of achieved learning outcomes.



Conclusion

Summing up, due to the good overall level of the theses and the fact that alumni continue on easily to an academic career, the panel is convinced that the learning outcomes are achieved upon graduation. The programme therefore meets standard 4.



3. Strengths and recommendations

3.1 Strengths of the programme

The panel is impressed by the following features:

- Interdisciplinarity – Students are challenged to build bridges between the different disciplines;
- Programme structure – The programme has a major – minor structure as well as one additional elective course which gives students ample opportunity to tailor the programme to their own interests;
- Teaching team – The teaching staff is enthusiastic, well-qualified and knowledgeable in their respective areas. They are active researchers and able to bring in the latest developments in their field;
- Assessment system – The assessments are valid, reliable and transparent.

3.2 Recommendations

For further improvement of the programme, the panel makes the following recommendations:

- Career – Better prepare students for a possible career outside academia. The programme is too much focused on forming a solid basis for a PhD position;
- Coherence of the programme – Make accumulation of knowledge and skills more explicit in the specialised courses;
- Study load – Pay more attention to the perceived study load and mental health of students by creating a learning environment as opposed to a performing environment;
- Assimilation of learning outcomes in the programme – Make sure to integrate the intended learning outcome 'self-regulation' more explicitly in the course programme;
- Thesis assessment – Continue to improve the rubric system of theses, especially with respect to the thesis process.



4. Conclusion

The panel concludes that the objectives and intended learning outcomes of the research master's programme in Psychology of the UvA meet the standards required for an academic programme. It is of the opinion that the content and structure of the curriculum and the available staff constitute an attractive teaching-learning environment for the students. The programme has an adequate assessment system and demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved. The quality of the theses is good.

Standard	Judgement
Standard 1	Meets the standard
Standard 2	Meets the standard
Standard 3	Meets the standard
Standard 4	Meets the standard
Final conclusion	Positive



Appendix A – Panel composition and programmes of the cluster

Panel composition of the cluster:

- Prof. dr. Janke Cohen-Schotanus (chair) Professor emeritus of Research of Education in the Medical Sciences;
- Prof. dr. Rob Ruiters (chair), Professor of Health and Social Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience at Maastricht University;
- Prof. dr. Lidia Arends, Professor of Statistics and Research Methodology, Department of Psychology, Education & Child Studies at Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Prof. dr. Caroline Braet, Professor of Developmental Psychopathology, Department of Developmental, Personality and Social Psychology at Ghent University;
- Prof. dr. Rachel Gibson, Professor of Politics, Department of Politics, University of Manchester;
- Prof. dr. Harm Hospers, Professor emeritus of Applied Health Psychology;
- Prof. dr. Detlev Leutner, Professor of Instructional Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Duisburg-Essen;
- Prof. dr. Maike Luhmann, Professor of Psychological Methods, Department of psychology, Ruhr University Bochum;
- Hanne Oberman, MSc (student member). Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural, Biomedical, and Social Sciences, Utrecht University (graduated in 2020);
- Prof. dr. Arne Roets, Professor of Social Psychology, Faculty of psychology and educational sciences, Department of Developmental, Personality, and Social Psychology, Ghent University;
- Prof. dr. Guus Smeets, Professor of Education in Psychology, Erasmus School of Social and Behavioural Sciences at Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Yvonne Schittenhelm, BSc, (student member), Master Individual Differences and Assessment, Tilburg University;
- Marie Stadel, MSc (student member), Behavioural and Social Sciences Research Master, University of Groningen (graduated in 2020);
- Prof. dr. Lieven Verschaffel, Professor of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven;
- Prof. dr. Karine Verschueren, Professor School and Developmental Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven.

The cluster is composed of thirteen programmes:

- M Individual Differences and Assessment (research), Tilburg University;
- M Behavioural Science (research), Radboud University;
- M Clinical and Developmental Psychopathology (research), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam;
- M Social Psychology: Regulation of Social Behaviour (research), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam;
- M Psychology (research), University of Amsterdam;
- M Communication Science (research), University of Amsterdam;
- M Educational Sciences: Learning in Interaction (research), Utrecht University;



- M Methodology and Statistics for the Behavioural, Biomedical and Social Sciences (research), Utrecht University;
- M Development and Socialisation in Childhood and Adolescence (research), Utrecht University;
- M Social & Health Psychology (research), Utrecht University;
- M Behavioural and Social Sciences (research), University of Groningen;
- M Psychology (research), Leiden University;
- M Developmental Psychopathology in Education and Child Studies (research), Leiden University.



Appendix B – Schedule of the visit

1 March, 2021

Time	Session
08.30 – 10.00	Preparation panel
10.00 – 10.45	Management
10.45 – 11.00	Evaluation
11.00 – 11.45	Students
11.00 – 12.00	Evaluation
12.45 – 13.30	Lecturers
13.30 – 13.45	Evaluation
13.45 – 14.15	Alumni
14.15 – 14.30	Evaluation
14.30 – 15.00	Examinations Board
15.00 – 15.30	evaluation and preparing questions for management
15.30 -16.00	Second meeting management
16.00 – 17.30	Evaluation
17.30 – 17.45	Presentation of first findings



Appendix C – Documents studied

- Self-evaluation report with appendices
 - Appendix 1: Assessment report of the previous accreditation
 - Appendix 2: Recommendations from the previous accreditation and the follow up of these recommendations
 - Appendix 3: Overview of all research master's courses
 - Appendix 4: Admission, course, and exam regulations
 - Appendix 5: Overview of staff involved in the research master's programme
 - Appendix 6: Relationship between the exit qualifications of the programme and the Dublin descriptors
 - Appendix 7: Teaching and testing during the COVID-19 crisis
 - Appendix 8: Research internship and thesis procedures
 - Appendix 9: Overview of identified strengths and weaknesses
- 15 theses with assessment forms
- Example of semester report
- Guidelines assessment and testing
- Matrix UvA Research master Psychology learning trajectories – programme components – assessment
- Overview of other facilities and services
- Overview of publications based on internships and theses
- Student manual research master internship 2020-2021
- Student manual research master thesis 2020-2021
- Teaching and exam regulations (OER) 2020-2021
- *UvA Kader Toetsbeleid 2019*



Appendix D – Abbreviations

BAPD	<i>Basisaantekening Psychodiagnostiek</i>
BKO	<i>Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs</i>
EB	Examinations Board
EC	European Credit
GZ-psycholoog	<i>Gezondheidszorg psycholoog</i>
NVAO	<i>Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie</i>
OER	<i>Onderwijs- en Examenreglement</i>
UvA	University of Amsterdam

