

**LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES**

AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

**UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM**

**VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT AMSTERDAM**

QANU  
Catharijnesingel 56  
PO Box 8035  
3503 RA Utrecht  
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100  
E-mail: [support@qanu.nl](mailto:support@qanu.nl)  
Internet: [www.qanu.nl](http://www.qanu.nl)

Project number: Q0696.AUC

© 2019 QANU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.



# CONTENTS

<b>REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY COLLEGE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME .....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	7
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	11
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	15
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF SMALL-SCALE AND INTENSIVE EDUCATION .....	29
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>39</b>
APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE.....	41
APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	43
APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM .....	45
APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT .....	49
APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL.....	51

This report was finalised on 27/03/2019





# REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF AMSTERDAM UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessments (September 2016) and the Assessment Framework for the Distinctive feature of small-scale and intensive education (4 November 2011) as a starting point.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

### Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences

Name of the programme:	Liberal Arts and Sciences
CROHO number:	55002
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Location(s):	Amsterdam
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Joint programme:	
partner institutions involved:	University of Amsterdam Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
type of degree awarded:	BSc or BA
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline:	01/05/2019

The visit of the assessment panel Liberal Arts and Sciences to Amsterdam University College of the University of Amsterdam and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam took place on 28 September 2018.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	University of Amsterdam
Status of the institution:	publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	positive

Name of the institution:	Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam
Status of the institution:	publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	positive

## COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

### *Cluster Liberal Arts and Sciences*

The assessment of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences at Amsterdam University College, during which also the assessment of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education took place, is part of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences.

From May to December 2018, a panel assessed bachelor's programmes Liberal Arts and Sciences at eight universities. A panel of six to nine members was appointed for each site visit, based on the expertise and availability of each panel member and taking into account possible conflicts of interest.

The full panel Liberal Arts and Sciences consisted of eighteen members:

- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of the Radboud University [chair]



- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice chair]
- Prof. S. (Samuel) Abraham, co-founder and managing director of ECOLAS and founder, professor and rector of Bratislava International School of Liberal Education (BISLA, Slovakia)
- Dr. S.I. (Sylvia) Bergh, associate professor in Development Management and Governance at the International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Hague
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom)
- Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen
- Prof. W.M. (Wayne) Cranton, assistant dean (research) at the Faculty of Science, Technology and Arts of Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom)
- C. (Carl) Gombrich, MSc programme director of the BASc Art and Sciences at the University College London (United Kingdom)
- Dr. K. (Katherine) Goodman, assistant professor and associate director of Inworks at the University of Colorado Denver (United States)
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany)
- Dr. A. (Alyssa) Schneebaum, lecturer and researcher at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and Universität Wien (Austria)
- Em. prof. A.H.A. (Fred) Soons, emeritus professor in International Public Law at Utrecht University
- Dr. M. (Mark) Sommerville, associate dean of Faculty Affairs and Development and associate professor in Electrical Engineering and Physics at Olin College of Engineering (United States)
- Dr. J.(Jos) Willems, former member of the board of Zuyd University of Applied Sciences and educational advisor for Higher Education
- Drs. S.C. (Sylvia) Witteveen, academic director of the Psychobiology programme at the Faculty of Science of the University of Amsterdam
- (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, University College Groningen
- Y. (Yara) van Ingen, bachelor's student Maastricht Science Programme, Maastricht University
- M. (Maya) Ouwehand, bachelor's student Liberal Arts and Sciences, Utrecht University

For the assessment of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, two panel members (Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T.A Brus) were trained by the NVAO and appointed to head the assessment of the Distinctive Feature. Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen was involved in all site visits. Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. Brus was involved in the site visits at Leiden University College, University College Utrecht, University College Roosevelt, Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and Maastricht Science Programme.

The panel was supported by dr. Els Schröder as project coordinator of the cluster assessment Liberal Arts and Sciences. She also acted as secretary during the visit to Leiden University College, University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme. She was supported by dr. Joke Corporaal at University College Roosevelt, University College Utrecht, Liberal Arts and Sciences Utrecht, Amsterdam University College, Erasmus University College, University College Venlo, University College Maastricht and the Maastricht Science Programme, who also wrote the reports of the first five colleges. Dr. Marianne van der Weiden acted as secretary during the site visits to Groningen University College, University College Tilburg and University College Twente.

### *Amsterdam University College:*

The panel that assessed the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences consisted of eight members:

- Prof. dr. Th.L.M. (Theo) Engelen, professor in Historical Demography, and former Rector Magnificus, of the Radboud University [chair];
- Em. prof. H. L. (Laurent) Boetsch, founding executive co-director of the European Consortium of Liberal Arts and Sciences (ECOLAS) and emeritus professor Romance Languages at Washington and Lee University (United States) [vice-chair];
- Prof. dr. M.M.T.A. (Marcel) Brus, professor in Public International Law at the University of Groningen;
- Dr. H. (Helen) Brookman, director of Liberal Arts & Pro-Vice-Dean at King's College London (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. V. (Veronika) Lipphardt, professor in Science and Technology Studies at University College Freiburg of the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg (Germany);
- Dr. S.I. (Sylvia) Bergh, associate professor in Development Management and Governance at the International Institute of Social Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Hague;
- Prof. W.M. (Wayne) Cranton, assistant dean (research) at the Faculty of Science, Technology and Arts of Sheffield Hallam University (United Kingdom);
- (Isidora) Cvetkovska, bachelor's student of Liberal Arts and Sciences at University College Groningen [student member];

The following panel member was consulted as referees:

- Prof. C. (Carl) Gombrich, programme director of the BASc Art and Sciences at University College London (United Kingdom) [referee Sciences];

The panel was supported by dr. J. (Joke) Corporaal, who wrote the report, and dr. E. Schröder, who supervised the site visit and reporting process as project manager and secretary.

For the assessment of the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, two panel members (Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T.A Brus) were trained by the NVAO and appointed to head the assessment of the Distinctive Feature. The practice-based assessment took place on 28 september 2018 combined with the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme.

The NVAO approved the composition of the panel on 16 April 2018.

## WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

### *Preparation*

Before the assessment panel's site visit to Amsterdam University College of the University of Amsterdam and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the project coordinator received the programme's self-evaluation report, based on both the NVAO framework and the framework with the assessment criteria for the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education. The QANU project coordinator sent it to the panel and secretary after checking it for completeness of information. Upon reading the self-evaluation report, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings.

The panel also studied a selection of sixteen capstone theses and the accompanying assessment forms for the programme, based on a provided list with capstone theses of the last two years. This selection was made by the panel's chair, in cooperation with the secretary, based on input from the other panel members. The chair and secretary took care that a variety of topics and disciplines were covered, and made sure that the distribution of grades in the theses selection matched the distribution of grades over all theses. The panel chair, secretary and programme jointly composed a schedule for the site visit. Prior to the site visit, the programme selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 3 for the definitive schedule.



### *Site visit*

The site visit to Amsterdam University College of the University of Amsterdam and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam took place on 28 September 2018. At the start of the site visit, the panel held a preparatory meeting during which it was instructed regarding all assessment frameworks and procedures. After this, the panel discussed its working method and its preliminary findings for the site visit with respect to both the regular assessment and the assessment of the Distinctive Feature. It also paid attention to the content and use of the programme's domain-specific framework of reference, which is included in Appendix 1.

The visit started with a development conversation, in which the panel and representatives of the programme discussed various development routes for the programme. The result of this conversation are summarised in a separate report, which will be published through the programme's communication channels. The information received during the development conversation is not part of the conducted assessments.

After this initial meeting, the panel focused on its assessment. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programme and toured the premises to see the available facilities, and examined materials provided by the programme. An overview of these is given in Appendix 5. The panel used the final part of the visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards the panel chair gave an oral presentation, in which he expressed the panel's preliminary impressions and general observations.

### *Report*

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report with two separate chapters based on the assessment panel's findings: the first part of the report focuses on the regular NVAO programme assessment of the bachelor's programme, and the second part of the report specifically addresses the standards related to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the assessment panel and project coordinator. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project coordinator sent the draft report to the university in order to have it checked for factual irregularities. The secretary discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and adapted the report accordingly before its finalisation.

### *Definition of judgements standards*

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited programme assessments, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of both the standards and the programme as a whole.

#### **Generic quality**

The quality that, in an international perspective, may reasonably be expected from a higher education Associate Degree, Bachelor's or Master's programme.

#### **Unsatisfactory**

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard and shows shortcomings with respect to multiple aspects of the standard.

#### **Satisfactory**

The programme meets the generic quality standard across its entire spectrum.

#### **Good**

The programme systematically surpasses the generic quality standard.

#### **Excellent**

The programme systematically well surpasses the generic quality standard and is regarded as an international example.

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for the distinctive feature of small-scale and intensive education, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the standards:

**Meets the standard**

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

**Does not meet the standard**

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

The panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the programme as a whole:

**Positive**

All the criteria are scored as "meets the standard".

**Negative**

One or more of the criteria are scored as "does not meet the standard".



# SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

## *Summary Judgement Framework for Limited Programme Assessments*

### *Standard 1*

The panel considers the initial premise of the programme unique; AUC brings the research strengths of the two parent institutions together by realising a distinctive residential teaching-learning environment that addresses real world challenges through a flexible approach to learning and development. The programme has a convincing profile and strategic vision on where to go next. With the governance of AUC now being embedded in the science Faculties, there is a strong focus on science, the scientific method and scientific enquiry. AUC seems to have a well-balanced and sophisticated approach towards interdisciplinarity, and the panel applauds the programme's commitment to give back to society. The intended learning outcomes are clearly defined and convincingly mapped to the Dublin descriptors and the Domain-Specific Framework of Reference. In general, they tie in with the level and orientation of the programme. The panel considers some of the intended learning outcomes unrealistically formulated and therefore hard to realise. It recommends that the programme rephrases these to fit the high, yet achievable level for which the programme aims.

### *Standard 2*

The panel concludes that students at AUC benefit from a carefully aligned curriculum, which has evidently been an area of much consideration and development. The curriculum has been built on six themes that map onto global challenges. This articulation of learning in the context of real world challenges helps to equip the students with skills that are useful in their further study. The panel concludes that the programme offers a range of well-designed pathways and successfully draws on the principles of student-centred, research-based education and contextual learning. This didactical approach provides a good framework for delivery of the programme. The various aspects of the curriculum are carefully integrated so that the various strands of learning are supported. The curriculum is continuously evaluated and improved through an extensive PDCA-cycle and associated peer review system.

The panel considered the courses well-structured and aimed at the appropriate level. The graduation requirements are designed to empower learning in an impressively broad range of subjects and skills, including interdisciplinary skills, a foreign language, quantitative research skills and civic engagement. The panel also appreciates how attention to diversity is incorporated in the courses and projects. According to the panel, there is a stimulatingly broad range of optional courses, with many options to expand outside AUC. From talking to the students, the panel concludes that they do not feel limited by their choice of major, but instead stimulated to explore the many options available to them. The panel encountered a committed and socially engaged community of students and staff at AUC. It commends the programme on having established a collaborative culture amongst the students. AUC has highly qualified staff with the necessary research and teaching expertise to deliver AUC's courses. The programme is in the process of improving the tutor system to create more consistency of approach and clarity on the mission of tutoring. The panel considers the planned measures appropriate, and encourages the programme to implement them as soon as possible.

### *Standard 3*

AUC's assessment system has a number of strengths. The programme has a clear assessment policy, transparent grading rubrics which are directly linked to course objectives, a comprehensive vision on grading and an extensive quality control cycle, which involves the teachers (peer review), the Heads of Study, Director of Education and the Board of Examiners overseeing the whole process. In addition, all exams and assignments are peer reviewed before they are carried out. According to the panel, assessment is well-designed, with a good variety of assessment methods and unambiguous model answers. Further work needs to be done to improve the amount of feedback that students receive during some of the courses. The Board of Examiners fulfils its safeguarding role sufficiently, by regularly checking course assessment and thesis assessment, carrying out many administrative tasks



and suggesting good guidelines to streamline processes. However, it needs better support so it can further contribute to an improvement of AUC's assessment system.

#### *Standard 4*

The panel concludes that AUC delivers graduates of a high standard who easily find their way in top-ranked university programmes. The programme definitely surpasses the minimum required level for a bachelor's programme. The panel was impressed by most of the capstone theses it read, which generally gave evidence of extensive research, a good grasp of the subject and convincing presentation of the results. The students convincingly achieve the overall intended learning outcomes of the programme.

The panel assesses the standards from the *Assessment framework for Limited Programme Assessments* in the following way:

#### *Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences*

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	good
Standard 3: Student assessment	satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	good
General conclusion	good

The chair, prof. dr. Theo Engelen, and the secretary of the panel, dr. Els Schröder, 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: 27/03/2019

## *Summary judgment Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education*

### *Standard A*

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) clearly aim for students to achieve a high level in their discipline, while encouraging them to develop personal and social responsibility and becoming engaged in the local and global community. The ILOs are well balanced and convincingly mapped to the Dublin descriptors and the Domain-Specific Framework of Reference. They meet and, in some places, exceed the requirements of academic bachelor's level. The panel appreciates AUC's well-balanced and sophisticated approach towards interdisciplinarity – students learn how to integrate insights from different disciplines at an early stage. It also values AUC's commitment to give back to society. Both aims are clearly reflected in the ILOs. In general, the ILOs tie in with the level and orientation of the programme. Nevertheless, the panel considers some of the ILOs overambitious and thereby hard to achieve. It advises the programme to rephrase these. From seeing how constructively AUC has responded to suggestions from the previous assessment, the panel is confident that AUC will take this suggestion to heart.

### *Standard B*

The panel concludes that there is a clear link between the curriculum and co- and extra-curricular activities. AUC has an active and professional study association, which offers many extra-curricular activities, often together with staff and external organisations. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. According to the panel, there is a clear link between extra-curricular and co-curricular activities and the goals and intended learning outcomes of the programme.

### *Standard C*

The panel verified that the set-up of the programme, including its residential setting, is aimed at creating a tight-knit academic community. Classes are small-scale and teaching formats are intensive, as is in line with AUC's learner-centred approach. The panel concludes that the students have sufficient hours of face-to-face teaching during the semester. It commends the programme and the students on the environment they have established; the sense of community is strongly conveyed by students and staff. The programme's commitment to 'give back to society' is evidenced in many socially relevant extra-curricular activities.

### *Standard D*

The programme has a sound admissions procedure in place. As a result, AUC succeeds in admitting motivated and talented students. The panel is pleased that AUC is trying to increase the number of first generation students and students with a migration background as these are currently underrepresented in the programme. The admissions procedure generally results in a good match between students and programme.

### *Standard E*

The panel notes that the teachers are committed to teaching in a liberal arts and sciences environment. Teachers are properly trained and qualified to deliver small-scale, intensive teaching and the available expertise is well-tuned to the various academic demands of the programme. The programme has shown good progress regarding career opportunities for staff. The panel suggests considering the establishment of a teaching-learning centre devoted to AUC and its liberal education philosophy.

### *Standard F*

The panel concludes that AUC has sufficient staff to fulfil the demands posed upon a small-scale, intensive programme. The programme has established good contacts between students and teachers.

### *Standard G*



The panel concludes that AUC's facilities create a suitable teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities. AUC's state-of-the-art-building and the programme's location within Amsterdam Science Park provide the students with many opportunities to take learning beyond the classroom.

*Standard H*

The panel considers the level of the selected theses as high. In general, students choose interesting and ambitious topics and perform extensive research. The graduation rates of the programme are higher than 90%. The majority of students (66-77%) graduate without any study delay. After AUC, students enrol in highly ranked master's programmes in the Netherlands and abroad. Most graduates work in the commercial sector (over 40%), in academia (app. 30%) or for not-for-profit organisations (app. 15%).

*Practice-based assessment*

With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that AUC meets all standards. In its assessment under Standards C, the panel paid specific attention to the tutoring system, as this was identified as an area of improvement in the 2012 assessment. The panel concludes that the three measures that AUC has taken (a revision of the Tutor Handbook, a review of the tutor training process and a reduction of the tutor's major administrative tasks) are appropriate. It is confident that the programme will ensure that students receive a more uniform tutoring experience. The fact that all criteria meet the standard, results in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature by the panel a positive advice regarding the practice-based assessment.

The panel assesses the standards from the *Assessment framework for limited programme assessments* in the following way:

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences*

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	good
Standard 3: Student assessment	satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	good
General conclusion	good

The panel assesses the standards from the *Assessment framework for the Distinctive Feature of Small-scale and Intensive Education* in the following way:

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences*

Standard A: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard B: Relationship between the goals and content	meets the standard
Standard C: Structure and didactic concept	meets the standard
Standard D: Intake	meets the standard
Standard E: Quality of staff	meets the standard
Standard F: Number of staff	meets the standard
Standard G: Available facilities	meets the standard
Standard H: Level realised	meets the standard
General conclusion	positive

The chair, prof. dr. Theo Engelen, and the secretary of the panel, dr. Els Schröder, 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: 27/03/2019

# DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS

## **Organisational context**

Amsterdam University College was founded in 2009 by the University of Amsterdam (UvA) and the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU). It is a selective, residential honours college, leading to a joint degree from both universities. Since 2016, AUC's governance structure is part of VU and UvA's Science Faculties, which are located at the Zuidas and the Amsterdam Science Park, respectively. The AUC Board, comprising the Science Deans of VU and UvA, is among other things responsible for AUC's strategic management, educational policies, staffing and quality assurance system. The AUC Board appoints the Board of Studies and an International Advisory Board, and receives advice from these two bodies and the Student Council. The AUC Board also appoints the Board of Examiners. AUC students are covered by VU's judicial protection. Therefore the Board of Examiners works according to VU regulations.

The AUC Dean reports to the AUC Board. Together with the Director of Education and the Managing Director, he forms AUC's core Management Team. In its extended form, this team also consists of the four Heads of Studies and the Senior Tutor. The extended team meets once a month to implement the AUC vision and provide strategic leadership.

### **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**

### *Profile*

AUC's mission statement is 'Excellence and Diversity in a Global City'. The programme is based on the premise that leadership requires excellence and the understanding and appreciation of diversity. According to AUC, a global perspective requires 'active engagement with other individuals, communities, and the world'. The self-evaluation report describes the five distinctive features of the programme that follow from AUC's strategic vision for 2017-2021 as: (1) an innovative curriculum; (2) a socially responsible learning community; (3) a learning-centred approach; (4) a dynamic engagement with the global city of Amsterdam; (5) a unique focus on scientific inquiry. When describing its ambitions, AUC stresses its cooperation with many research institutes, commercial partners and communities nearby, which offers opportunities to take learning 'beyond classroom walls'.

AUC believes that students should engage with interdisciplinarity 'from the ground up'. For this purpose, it has designed courses that integrate disciplines and encourage meta-cognitive reflection. These courses provide the foundation for the acquisition of interdisciplinary skills. Student development is at the centre of the programme; AUC wants to encourage students to (among other things) develop a self-aware, constructive and critical disposition and to make complex connections across and within disciplines as a basis for further specialisation at graduate level.

The panel concludes that AUC has a very convincing profile and strategic vision, in which both the visions of UvA and VU are well represented. AUC has chosen to emphasise diversity, interdisciplinarity and real world application of learning. The programme's civic and global aspects include a clear commitment to giving back to society. The panel appreciates these focus areas, and considers them well attuned to the domain-specific framework of reference (DSFR), and to liberal arts and sciences in general.



### *Intended learning outcomes*

The programme's central aim is 'to educate students to become multilingual, informed and engaged global citizens, with well-developed intercultural competences, able to read intelligently, think critically and write effectively on the processes shaping our world'. This central aim has been translated into 31 intended learning outcomes (see Appendix 2), which have been grouped along the Domain Specific Framework of Reference (DSFR) and the Dublin Descriptors (knowledge, academic skills, learning skills, interdisciplinary skills and communication skills), supplemented with the categories 'engagement at local and global levels' and 'personal and social responsibility'.

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are clearly defined and, in general, tied to the level and orientation of the programme and professional/disciplinary expectations. They provide a well-balanced consideration of diversity, critical and constructive disposition, social community engagement, transdisciplinarity, reflection and interdisciplinarity. The panel thought, however, that some of the intended learning outcomes are over-ambitiously formulated and thereby hard to reach. For instance, making sure that students gain the interdisciplinary skills mentioned in ILO4 B ('be able to assess which research methods are most suitable in a particular situation'), C ('be able to integrate the content and research methods from disciplines relevant to a particular situation'), and D ('be able to defend a well-considered viewpoint covering the relevant methods from disciplines'), is a huge task. The same is true for ILO1 D, which states that graduates have 'a (general) knowledge of the physical and natural world, a (general) knowledge of European and world histories, philosophical traditions, major religions, and cultural life worlds and an understanding of economic forces and political dynamics'. According to the panel, these ILO's go beyond what the programme can achieve within a limited number of mandatory courses. The panel consequently recommends rephrasing these ILOs in a more realistic manner, and harmonising them with the rest of the programme's intended learning outcomes.

### **Considerations**

The panel considers the initial premise of the programme unique; AUC brings the research strengths of the two parent institutions together by realising a distinctive residential teaching-learning environment that addresses real world challenges through a flexible approach to learning and development. The programme has a convincing profile and strategic vision on where to go next. With the governance of AUC now being embedded in the science Faculties, there is a strong focus on science, the scientific method and scientific enquiry. AUC seems to have a well-balanced and sophisticated approach towards interdisciplinarity, and the panel applauds the programme's commitment to give back to society. The intended learning outcomes are clearly defined and convincingly mapped to the Dublin descriptors and the DSFR. In general, they tie in with the level and orientation of the programme. Nevertheless, the panel considers some of the ILOs unrealistically formulated and thereby hard to realise. It recommends that the programme rephrase these to fit the high, yet achievable level for which the programme aims.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'satisfactory'.*

### **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**

#### *Curriculum*

AUC is a three-year fulltime, English-taught bachelor programme. Students start the first year with mandatory academic core courses and elective courses. After the first year, they specialise in one or more of three majors: Humanities, Social Sciences and Sciences. Depending on the major(s) of choice, this will lead to a BA or BSc degree. AUC offers approximately 250 courses, divided over

three majors and Academic Core courses. Within the majors, courses are grouped in tracks, series of disciplinary aligned courses. All courses account for 6 EC, except for some research-based internships and the concluding capstone project, which account for 12 EC.

The academic year at AUC is divided into two semesters of 20 weeks each. Students follow 4 courses during the first 16 weeks of a semester, and one short, intensive course during the last four weeks, for example language courses, lab courses or community projects. All courses are offered at introductory (100), intermediate (200) and advanced level (300). Before following a course at 300 level, students first need to take preceding courses at 100 and 200 level. The beginning and end of semesters at AUC coincide with those of VU and UvA, so students can take courses at those universities and UvA and VU honours students can follow courses at AUC.

The programme has defined six overarching themes for the curriculum: (1) 'Health and wellbeing', (2) 'Social Systems', (3) 'Energy, climate and sustainability', (4) 'Cities and Cultures', (5) 'Information, communication, cognition' and (6) 'Life, evolution, universe'. The programme distinguishes between major-specific and major-transcending interdisciplinary skills, which are respectively embedded in the major (Theme Courses) and in the Academic Core (Big Questions courses). Theme Courses focus on far-reaching academic and societal questions such as global change, public health, cultural differences, value systems, openness and inclusiveness. They teach students to integrate insights from different disciplines. Big Questions courses provide the foundation for the acquisition of interdisciplinary skills, and encourage students 'to work beyond major-specific boundaries'. Degree requirements describe which courses students have to take in order to meet AUC's intended learning outcomes. These requirements include, among other things, one logic and method course, two academic writing courses (the first year course Academic Writing Skills and the third year course Advanced Research Writing), at least one course in every major, two consecutive language courses in a foreign language, ten courses in the major, and at least two Theme Courses and one Big Questions course. In addition students can follow a minor at AUC or at another university, or study abroad for one semester. They conclude their study at AUC with a capstone project and an internship (which can include a research component) or community project. There are separate guidelines describing the learning goals, supervision and assessment criteria of these three curriculum components.

The panel has studied the curriculum as a whole and a few interdisciplinary courses (Academic Writing Skills, Comparative Democracy, and Global Identity Experience) in more detail. In these courses, the panel could see evidence of integrating interdisciplinary learning from an early stage, which is in line with what the programme sets out to do. The panel considered the courses well-structured and it appreciates how they included applying theories and raising awareness for research ethics. The curriculum and programme requirements seem designed effectively to empower learning in an impressively broad range of subjects and skills, including a foreign language and quantitative research skills. The panel considers the core curriculum strong; there is a stimulatingly broad range of optional courses, with options to expand outside AUC and the number of required courses is appropriate to help meet the learning outcomes. During the treasure trove, the panel observed that students are, indeed, able to successfully integrate various disciplines. However, both students and graduates said that the level of the Theme Courses differs, with some courses being less demanding and other being more demanding than the declared level. The panel suggests looking into this. On a positive note, both groups did not feel limited by the degree requirements, but instead stimulated to explore the many options available to them.

### *Didactics*

AUC's educational vision is a synthesis of the UvA and VU visions on teaching and learning. The programme takes a learner-centred approach and situates learning within twenty-first century contexts. The programme wants to create new pathways across traditional (disciplinary) dividing lines and places emphasis on the following five areas of learning: (1) research-based learning (active learning, based on the students' own questions), (2) methods and reasoning (development of analytical and abstract thinking skills), (3) interdisciplinarity (integrating insights to develop a greater



understanding of complex problems), (4) global knowledge, international and intercultural competence (understanding of economic forces, interdependence and political dynamics), and (5) civic knowledge and community engagement (active engagement with diverse communities and real-world challenges). A table in the SER links the learning activities to the intended learning outcomes and (indirectly) to the areas of focus. For instance, all 300-level courses engage students in research. From 2019-2020 onwards, the programme wants all students to take one lab course, starting with the science students. The rationale behind this is that such courses allows students to explore what learning by doing means: how do you set up an experiment, how do you observe and report?

The panel verified whether the programme is able to make laboratory courses mandatory. The programme management explained that they are, among other things, planning low-tech labs that only require small devices. A Comenius Teaching Fellowship will support the development of such labs. It also clarified that a film lab course is on the way. From reading the student chapter, the panel concludes that students value the lab courses. This is especially true for students in the social sciences and humanities, where courses like Peace Lab (in which twenty students go to Kosovo to learn about topics such as transnational justice, layers of identity and safety) put them in a good position compared to their peers when applying for competitive master's programmes. The panel concludes that the lab courses significantly enrich the curriculum and thinks that students should be made clearly aware of their value in choosing their courses. Mandatory courses linked to 'global knowledge, international and intercultural competence' and 'civic knowledge and community engagement' are for instance the first-year course Global Identity Experience (in which students conduct an investigation about identity and diversity in Amsterdam) and the Internship or Community project. The panel was impressed with the programme's various co-curricular activities; it could see how these successfully broaden theoretical concepts from the disciplines and show students how to play with knowledge and employ theories in different settings.

Students are expected to play an active role, in- and outside of class. In the self-evaluation report, the programme states: 'we challenge our students to define their own, individual objectives that go beyond the minimum learning objectives of the programme'. On average, students have 14.2 contact hours a week. Class sizes are kept to a maximum of 25 students per class, to allow them to participate actively during class. Each course is assessed by at least 4 different assignments (continuous assessment) and teachers organise a wide range of classroom activities, which involve students playing online games, mapping ideas, writing poems and raps, leading discussions and participating in experiential learning. During the site visit, the panel learned more about AUC's aim to not only teach students about diversity, but to try also to bring diversity into the courses as part of the didactical approach. For this purpose, texts in the language classes are, for instance, carefully chosen, so they do not merely represent a Western perspective and so that students are made aware of dialects as well. Tutors play an important role in AUC's educational vision by providing academic guidance (see section 'study guidance' below). In addition, AUC strongly encourages students to take part in extracurricular activities as these also contribute to students meeting the programme's intended learning outcomes. The panel thinks that the many co-curricular and extra-curricular activities tie in well with the programme's aims and intended learning outcomes. (For more information on co- and extracurricular activities, see standard B in the distinctive feature part of this report.)

The panel concludes that the programme has composed a good framework for delivery of the programme, by building the curriculum on six themes that map onto global challenges. This articulation of learning in the context of real world challenges is very positive, according to the panel, and will help to equip the students for study success. The panel concludes that the programme offers a range of well-designed pathways and successfully draws on the principles of research-based education and contextual learning. The various aspects of the curriculum are carefully integrated so that the various strands of learning are supported. The panel appreciates that this alignment has evidently been an area of much consideration and development for the College.

### *Curriculum development*

Peer reviewing plays an important role in AUC's quality control system. The peer review procedure is described in detail in the self-assessment report. Two teachers, operating in the same field of expertise, review each other's courses. In the peer review process, they discuss course manuals, course objectives, assignments and assessment, grading rubrics and course evaluations. The next peer review cycle includes and evaluates changes from the previous cycle. From reading about the peer review process, the panel was worried that this practice further increases the administrative pressure on staff. Therefore, it asked the staff how they experience the peer review system. It was glad to hear that the staff representatives did not find the system constraining, but saw it as a mutual learning experience. According to the staff members, the system serves three purposes: quality assurance, sharing best practices and preventing teachers from operating in isolation. The staff members did agree with the panel that there is a danger of placing too much focus on student evaluations.

Even though the panel members consider assessments important, as fellow-teachers they also pointed out that there is a limit to how much/how often one wants to be evaluated. The peer review system seems to work well, and the programme indicated that it considers evaluations also as an incentive for innovation. The panel finds it important that, within this system, staff is continuously encouraged to innovate teaching practices and implement good practices, and, in that way, celebrate the innovation that AUC instils in students and themselves. AUC indicated that Educational Development Initiatives (EDI) offer a framework and funding for innovative projects for core faculty. AUC is currently considering to open up the EDIs for partner faculty as well. This seems adequate to the panel, as long as staff members' workload is also closely monitored.

In addition to the peer review system and regular evaluations at the end of term, the Board of Studies and the Student Council have taken the initiative to have lecturers discuss their courses with two student representatives halfway term. The Director of Educates initiates these 'midterm reviews'. Also, every semester, the Heads of Studies (responsible for the Academic Core, Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities courses) review one discipline or study area in their department in more detail to see if, for instance, the courses line up as they should and the course objectives are in line with the programme's ILOs. They report proposed adjustments to the Board of Examiners.

The panel concludes that AUC clearly has a commitment to continuous innovation and improvement, represented in an extensive 'Plan, Do, Check, Act' cycle. The panel thinks that the programme's self-evaluation report, which includes a thorough SWOT analysis, gives a clear sense of the College's performance and planned ways to improve, while the student chapter gives a lively insight into the student experience at AUC. It supports AUC's plans to address the low response rates in yearly curriculum evaluation surveys, by working closely with the students in developing a new set of questions.

According to the panel, AUC has responded effectively to the recommendations from previous reviews. The panel also concludes that the students' opinions are regarded as very important at AUC. It was impressed with the student commitment that speaks from documents such as the Student Council Policy Plan 2018/2019. According to the panel, the students have perceived some weaknesses in the programme (they suggest ways of improving tutor support, for instance) and offered good suggestions. The panel is pleased that the programme takes these suggestions to heart, as it believes that the students do an impressive job in helping to shape their programme.

### *Study guidance*

During his or her time at AUC, each student is guided by a personal tutor. Tutors are core faculty members who welcome students to the AUC community, provide them with academic advice, help them select courses in line with the graduation requirements and evaluate study progress. Halfway every semester, the teachers complete a report on each student's progress in their class and send it to the tutors – these reports are used to see how students are performing and to identify problems at an early stage. Students and tutors meet one-on-one at least four times a year: halfway and at



the end of each semester. The majority of students want to proceed to a master's programme. If required, tutors can help with the application process. Finally, the tutor verifies whether students who apply for graduation meet the requirements. For this purpose, students fill in a questionnaire that asks them, per requirement, how they fulfil them. The tutor performs an administrative check and a member of the Board of Examiners performs a second, final check. To reduce the administrative pressure on tutors, the graduation check has recently been transferred to a 'registrar'.

A subject that was discussed in more detail during the site visit is the consistency of approach across different tutors. This point was raised by the previous assessment visit and it is still relevant. From talking to the students, the panel understood, for instance, that AUC has good arrangements for students with functional impairments that might slow them down, such as dyslexia, autism, visual impairment or mental anxiety. However, these support mechanisms have been hard to access because the students that could have benefitted from them didn't know about it in time, nor did their tutors. The panel understands that some variety amongst tutors is to be expected for a diverse programme such as AUC. However, because tutoring is central to AUC's educational approach, the panel also believes that setting clear guidelines and managing expectations is important. Programme management clarified that AUC has had some challenges regarding administrative support. As a result, some tutors have been able to arrange things for the students that others could not. According to programme management, this has led to high expectations, which in turn creates high demands on the tutors. Actions taken in response to the previous assessment to improve the tutor system include the appointment of a new Senior Tutor in 2017, who is prioritising creating more uniformity in tutoring services. This is done by a revision of the Tutor Handbook, a review of the tutor training process and a review of the tutor's major administrative tasks such as course registration and graduation checks. This should create more clarity on what students can expect from their tutor and to a streamlining of administrative processes. The panel considers the planned measures appropriate, and urges the programme to implement them as soon as possible.

Tutors refer students with personal issues to the Student Life Officer, who guides and supports them and liaises with the UvA student psychologists, if needed. The panel thinks it excellent that the College has appointed a dedicated Student Life Officer and they heard good reports about this person. However, it does recommend carefully monitoring whether one Student Life Officer can provide sufficient support for the number of students at AUC with personal problems.

From talking to the graduates and the students, the panel concludes that, in addition to formal support systems, students also support each other. The graduates pointed out that, over the last years, a competitive attitude has made way for a more collaborative attitude between students. In their opinion this is beneficial to the community and the classroom. According to the graduates, peer support helped them to deal with the high demands that the programme at times places on students. The graduates also believed that the College has started to respond better to stress issues by, for instance, introducing the 'breathing and reading week', a week without any classes in October, and by introducing a mental health week. As a result, the atmosphere to talk about stress has become more open. The panel commends the programme on having taken concerns regarding the workload seriously. It also appreciates the Intro Week, organised by AUC's student association, which welcomes new students to the College and eases the transition from high school to the programme.

### *Staff*

Core faculty (staff members employed by AUC) and partner faculty deliver AUC's curriculum together. 'Partner faculty' are staff members with a position at UvA, VU and/or affiliated Amsterdam medical hospitals: AMC, VUmc and ACTA. External lecturers are lecturers from other universities and emeriti professors. In 2016-2017, external lecturers taught 26% of the courses; partner faculty delivered 32% of the courses (evenly distributed over UvA/AMC and VU/VUmc/ACTA); and AUC core faculty taught 42% of the curriculum. All new lecturers at AUC take part in a workshop, organised by the Heads of Studies, at the start of a new semester. This workshop introduces them to teaching in a liberal arts and sciences context and explains AUC's rules and regulations and grading system.

In 2016-2017, AUC employed approximately 40 core staff members. At that time, 80% held a PhD, 82% had obtained a Basic Teaching Qualification, and 10% had also obtained a Senior Teaching Qualification. The remaining 17% either had an equivalent teaching qualification or was in the process of obtaining the BTQ. The panel concludes that the programme has strong and committed core staff members with the necessary research and teaching expertise to deliver AUC's courses. Most core faculty are also tutors in the programme. The students spoke highly of their lecturers. They particularly appreciated the lecturers being accommodative to personal issues so the students could achieve their goals.

In the SER, AUC describes its two biggest lecturer-related challenges and planned solutions: the introduction and training of partner faculty and the work pressure at AUC. The College aims to decrease the number of external lecturers and increase the number of UvA and VU lecturers. The panel agrees that lowering the number of external lecturers is a good idea, because it supports the idea of 'forging ongoing partnerships' between core and partner faculty. By having partner faculty teach in the AUC programme, students receive research-led education, while conversely it could be attractive for AUC core staff members to combine a research position with their AUC teaching role. The panel suggests considering the establishment of a teaching-learning centre devoted to AUC and its liberal arts education philosophy.

The research ambitions of AUC staff are hampered by their inability to access Dutch research funds. The panel approves of the Education-Linked Scholarship Allowance for all core faculty. The ELSA scheme started in September and enables core faculty to spend 7.5% of their time on 'academic knowledge and pedagogical practices', such as organising lunchtime research seminars or participating in academic conferences. The panel learnt that, currently, only 5 core staff received a Research Time Allocation of 0.2 fte, but is happy to see that this will increase to 11 staff members by 2021. There is also a small fund for lectures and students to jointly engage in research. Finally, the panel is pleased to see that the programme management is well aware of how the structure of the programme adds to the work pressure for staff. It considers the measurements taken, increased administrative support for tutors, necessary and appropriate.

### **Considerations**

The panel concludes that students at AUC benefit from a carefully aligned curriculum, which has evidently been an area of much consideration and development. The curriculum has been built on six themes that map onto global challenges. This articulation of learning in the context of real world challenges helps to equip the students with skills that are useful in their further study. The panel concludes that the programme offers a range of well-designed pathways and successfully draws on the principles of student-centred, research-based education and contextual learning. This didactical approach provides a good framework for delivery of the programme. The various aspects of the curriculum are carefully integrated so that the various strands of learning are supported. The curriculum is continuously evaluated and improved through an extensive PDCA-cycle and associated peer review system.

The panel considered the courses well-structured and aimed at the appropriate level. The graduation requirements are designed to empower learning in an impressively broad range of subjects and skills, including interdisciplinary skills, a foreign language, quantitative research skills and civic engagement. The panel also appreciates how attention to diversity is incorporated in the courses and projects. According to the panel, there is a stimulatingly broad range of optional courses, with many options to expand outside AUC. From talking to the students, the panel concludes that they do not feel limited by their choice of major, but instead stimulated to explore the many options available to them. The panel encountered a committed and socially engaged community of students and staff at AUC. It commends the programme on having established a collaborative culture amongst the students.

AUC has highly qualified staff with the necessary research and teaching expertise to deliver AUC's courses. The programme is in the process of improving the tutor system to create more consistency



of approach and clarity on the mission of tutoring. The panel considers the planned measures appropriate, and encourages the programme to implement them as soon as possible. Students rate their student-learning environment as challenging and are positive.

## Conclusion

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'good'.

### **Standard 3: Student assessment**

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

## Findings

### *Assessment policy*

AUC's assessment policy follows the assessment plans of the VU and the UvA, to which it has made three additions: AUC has a continuous assessment policy, a no-resit policy, and a strict attendance policy. Continuous assessment is meant to promote uninterrupted learning and result in a higher retention of knowledge and skills and a higher understanding of course material. A no-resit policy and strict attendance policy should stimulate students to take their study seriously. Assessment at AUC serves three purposes: (1) to provide students with insight in their learning process; (2) to promote continuous learning throughout the year; (3) to monitor whether students meet the intended learning outcomes. Assessment requirements are that assessment should be valid, reliable, transparent, guarantee a certain level (for this purpose, test scores are compared to a defined standard), and fair ('appropriate for all examinees irrespective of race, gender, religion and age').

Assessment is aligned with course objectives, which in turn comply with the programme's intended learning outcomes. That way, by successfully passing the courses, students realise the intended learning outcomes. The programme uses a criterion-referenced grading system, which means that students' grades are not based on the general performance level ('grading to the curve') but on the achievement of specified course objectives. The programme believes this system is fair and enhances student performance. Students are rated on a scale from A+ (excellent) to F (fail). A conversion table converts these grades into grade points. For instance, an A- equals 3.7 grade points.

There are a number of procedures in place to ensure the quality of assessment. The Board of Examiners appoints examiners, who are all lecturers with the necessary qualifications and experience to set exams. All assignments and exams are peer-reviewed as part of the peer review system, including a discussion of the model answers and grading rubrics. If necessary, assignments and/or exams are adjusted. Finally, both the Heads of Studies and the Board of Examiners perform regular checks of the quality of assessment in the programme. Recently, the programme has identified some points of improvement in these quality checks. Two of these are that the peer-review process of exams is often not recorded or monitored sufficiently by the Heads of Studies, and that the peer review meeting in which student evaluations are to be discussed does not always take place when partner faculty is involved. These findings have led to a new peer review implementation plan for 2018-2019 in which these points will be addressed.

The panel concludes that AUC has a clear assessment policy, which is based on well-proven experience through the two parent Universities, but with a more rigorous approach to continuous assessment. The panel appreciates how grading of assessments is linked to the learning outcomes of the course, and how quality control of assessments is structured and efficient. However, the panel agrees with the programme that there needs to be confidence in the rigour of verification in the peer review system at all stages, to ensure a positive and effective student experience. The programme has a framework for this purpose and is evidently aware of the system's strengths and weaknesses, but as highlighted in the SER, an action plan needs to be implemented to address areas of concern. In addition, the panel thinks it may be beneficial to reflect on how the attendance policy and no resit policy (but instead establishing an 'academic probation contract') are impacting student wellbeing.

The SER notes that in case of 'medical emergency' an exemption is made, but based on its meeting with the students, the panel thinks that the arrangements for students with ongoing health difficulties such as chronic physical disabilities or mental health conditions such as anxiety should be communicated more clearly. On a positive note, the panel was impressed with the Heads of Studies performing regular evaluations of assessment procedures to ensure consistency of standards, and with the fact that an external agency, commissioned by the Director of Education, regularly tests a selection of AUC course and assessment samples.

### *Assessments*

Because of the diversity of course objectives, the College gives lecturers the freedom to select the most appropriate assessment methods for their courses. These methods must meet the assessment requirements described above. In line with the continuous assessment policy, each course is assessed by a mix of at least four assignments. The panel concludes that the programme uses a good variety of assessment methods, including creative products such as poems, blogs, raps and performances, alongside written exams, essays, (individual and group) presentations and video interviews. The panel also appreciates the fact that all assessment components are peer reviewed before being carried out. From studying a number of courses, including their assessment and grading rubrics, the panel confirms that the documentation is generally clear and transparent. Courses include a good range of assignments, which together connect well to the course objectives and intended learning outcomes. A risk of continuous assessment is that it can lead to a high workload for the students when assignments overlap. The panel recommends keeping good track of the balance and reducing the number of assignments in courses when necessary.

The panel considers the autonomy of lecturers a very positive aspect of the programme, but it can also see that this leads to more discrepancies in assessment methods and feedback given. Despite the programme's clear grading policy and transparent assessment criteria, which students can access in the feedback sheets, the amount of feedback that students receive from individual lecturers varies. According to the students, some lecturers do not submit feedback forms. The staff agreed that the implementation of the assessment procedures could be improved. The panel thinks that feedback during the course is an important feature of continuous assessment and advises the programme to implement the procedures more rigorously.

Students complete a capstone project during their last semester at AUC. This project must demonstrate that they have realised the intended learning outcomes. To this end, students carry out the various phases of a research project, from gathering information and sources and formulating a research question to communicating their findings clearly and coherently. They do this independently, but guided by a supervisor. The programme has outlined the procedure and assessment of the capstone in the revised Capstone Guidelines. This document also contains the capstone's eight learning goals, which are linked to eight grading rubrics. For example, the first goal, 'the student can identify a suitable topic, formulate objectives and situate these within an academic field of study', is linked to the grading rubric 'quality of the research question and/or thesis'. Other rubrics include 'methodology', 'analysis and argumentation', 'discussion and implications', and so forth. The Capstone Grading Form invites assessors to list at least two strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, and to write at least 300 words to explain how the different scores have been weighted and how the final grade was arrived at. Two assessors assess the capstone independently: the supervisor and a second reader. Both fill in a grading form. The capstone supervisor can be a partner faculty member, but in that case the programme requires the second reader to be a core faculty member.

The panel concludes that the Capstone Guidelines and capstone grading form are exemplary, inviting detailed statements showing students clearly how performance in each area has been measured and at what level. This makes the assessment of the thesis clear and insightful. The panel did notice that in the section 'explanation of the grade' the assessors do not always provide a narrative of why the grade is justified, using the grading rubric. The panel suggests clarifying this in the assessors' instructions.



### *Board of Examiners*

The Board of Examiners is responsible for safeguarding the quality of assessments and providing assurance that students have obtained the programme learning outcomes upon graduation. The Board consists of five members: three lecturers from the different majors at AUC, and an external member and chair who are both based at the VU. All members have been selected by the Director of Education and the Dean, in consultation with the existing Board of Examiners. The plenary Board meets 4 to 5 times a year. In addition, the internal members meet regularly to discuss individual students' requests. The SER notes that the graduation check is one of the major tasks of the Board of Examiners. Another major task is monitoring and assessing quality assurance mechanisms in the programme. For this purpose, the Board takes random samples of course assessment, checks peer reviews and external testing results, and evaluates Capstone and Community Project/Internship assessment. At the time of the site visit, it had just completed a review of the capstone assessment to establish, among other things, if the grades given were appropriate.

The panel is enthusiastic about the flexibility of the programme, but also concludes that this flexibility creates a lot of work for the Board of Examiners. During the site visit, it asked the Board if the workload is feasible. The Board members explained that they have reduced the workload immensely by streamlining processes and writing clear guidelines. However, according to the Board members, some processes remain time-consuming, for instance checking the quality and level of off campus courses. The panel suggests adding a permanent support staff member to the Board who deals with students' requests on a weekly basis so that only the more complicated cases need to be discussed by the plenary Board. The panel had the impression that the internal board members at present lean much on AUC's programme management and the external advisor. While the panel recognises that the BOE successfully fulfils its tasks, it suggests that its members take further advantage of the training resources available and that it not hesitate to exert the independence necessary to its oversight role.

### **Considerations**

AUC's assessment system has a number of strengths. The programme has a clear assessment policy, transparent grading rubrics which are directly linked to course objectives, a comprehensive vision on grading (see Standard 4) and an extensive quality control cycle, which involves the lecturers (peer review), the Heads of Study, Director of Education and the Board of Examiners overseeing the whole process. In addition, all exams and assignments are peer reviewed before they are carried out. According to the panel, assessment is well-designed, with a good variety of assessment methods and unambiguous model answers. Further work needs to be done to improve the amount of feedback that students receive during some of the courses.

The Board of Examiners fulfils its safeguarding role sufficiently, by regularly checking course assessment and thesis assessment, carrying out many administrative tasks and suggesting good guidelines to streamline processes. However, it needs better support so it can further contribute to an improvement of AUC's assessment system.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.*

#### **Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes**

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

### **Findings**

#### *Final achievement level*

As discussed under Standard 1, the panel has concluded that a number of the programme's intended learning outcomes are formulated in an unrealistically ambitious way, and are unlikely to be realised

in practice. Considering the recommendation for rephrasing given under Standard 1, the panel assessed the realised learning outcomes according to their 'spirit' rather than their literal phrasing.

As described above, assessment is aligned with course objectives, which are geared towards the programme's intended learning outcomes. That way, by successfully passing the courses, students obtain the intended learning outcomes. The intended final level is realised in level 300 courses and in the capstone project. The Board of Examiners checks that the assessment rules and policies are followed properly and monitors if students applying for graduation meet the requirements. The panel concludes that Appendix 5 in the self-evaluation report provides extensive mapping of the courses to the intended learning outcomes, so that it is easy to see how these are achieved. It also thinks that the curriculum design, based on six themes, allows students to achieve the learning outcomes against the background of complex, real-world problems. The Capstone project, finally, provides students with a mechanism to consolidate a number of key learning outcomes through a major piece of work, for which the panel considers the assessment and moderation to be clearly described.

The panel studied a selection of sixteen capstones. It noted that the term 'capstone thesis' is confusing, because this implies that all theses have a multi- or interdisciplinary approach. Some of the theses indeed had a clear interdisciplinary approach, but others could have equally well have been written in the remit of monodisciplinary programmes. The panel has taken notice of the programme's plans to 'develop a strong narrative regarding the (inter)disciplinarity of capstones', and advises the programme to choose the most appropriate term for the final work, depending on the kind of thesis students wish to write. Based on its own sample check, it concludes that the theses are, in general, of high quality. In the majority of theses, the authors surpass the minimum required level for a bachelor's programme. In these theses, the students chose interesting and ambitious topics, performed extensive research, gave evidence of a broad knowledge and a good grasp of the subject and presented the results in a convincing way. The panel also appreciated the use of the capstone grading form, which, again in the majority of cases, was appropriately critically constructive and provided a well-evidenced rationale for the scores given. In most cases, the panel agreed with the high scores given, but in approximately 20% of the theses it considered the grades to be too high.

During the site visit, the panel met with a number of alumni. All of them had continued to study in a highly ranked master's programme and none of them had experienced problems being accepted in their programme of choice. Reflecting on their time at AUC, alumni felt that having been at the College had opened up many doors and that they had learned a lot, also in terms of personal and social skills. When comparing themselves to their peers, the graduates noted that they benefitted from good writing skills and the ability to condense information into clear arguments. When asked what they liked best and least at AUC, graduates said they valued the academic freedom and support of AUC best, and the work pressure least. They agreed that studying at AUC had been too stressful at times, even though they received support from friends who were also struggling now and then. Based on the students' and graduates' testimonies, the panel concludes that AUC is aware of the high pressure and has taken appropriate measures to create a more supportive atmosphere. Finally, the panel recommends establishing a better relationship with the programme's alumni. There is an alumni association, but this does not seem effective in reaching the alumni, for instance because the topics of events do not match the graduates' interests. The panel believes that close contacts with alumni can help the programme to improve even more. Alumni could also help attracting new students, e.g. by establishing an International Ambassador Programme which would rely on alumni as ambassadors representing AUC at Educational Fairs..

#### *Success rates*

AUC has very high success rates. Over 90% of students that re-enrol in the second year continue to successfully complete the programme. Between 66 and 77% of students graduate within three years. The number of students leaving the programme during or after the first year is low (10.1% in 2016/2017, the programme's target is less than 10%) and has gone down (from 13.3% in 2014/2015). The panel concludes that the College is monitoring data on student progression and



attainment carefully. The data reveals impressive outcomes, with high and consistent student performance and graduate outcomes. Again, this shows AUC's commitment to continuous improvement and responding to data and feedback.

#### *Performance of graduates*

In the fall of 2017, an independent research center conducted the national Liberal Arts and Sciences alumni survey, which included 263 alumni from the AUC programme. Prior to that, in 2016, AUC had also conducted a survey amongst its graduates, to which 223 alumni responded. Both surveys suggest that the majority of graduates continue with a master's programme, and that some subsequently continue with a PhD programme. After AUC, between 50 and 60% of graduates chose a master's programme in the Netherlands, most often (approximately 30%) at the UvA or the VU. Approximately 20% of graduates continued studying in the UK, where for instance Oxford University, University of Cambridge and the London School of Economics were popular destinations. According to these two surveys, over half of AUC's graduates is accepted at a graduate programme at one of the 100 top-rated universities in the world (Shanghai ranking). Only a small minority (less than 8%) of graduates left Europe for their master's programme after AUC. Most graduates end up working in the commercial sector (over 40%), in academia (app. 30%) or for not-for-profit organisations (app. 15%). Based on its meeting with graduates and based on the (general) information regarding these two surveys, the panel concludes that AUC students do well in master's programmes and on the job market. They are more than sufficiently prepared to continue their study in a master's or PhD programme, and equally qualified to directly enter the job market.

#### **Considerations**

The panel concludes that AUC delivers graduates of a high standard who easily find their way in top-ranked university programmes. The programme definitely surpasses the minimum required level for a bachelor's programme. The panel was impressed by the capstone theses it read, which generally gave evidence of extensive research, a good grasp of the subject and convincing presentation of the results. The students convincingly achieve the intended learning outcomes of the programme (which are to be rephrased). The panel also appreciated the use of the capstone grading form, which it considered appropriately critically constructive.

#### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'good'.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel considers the initial premise of the programme unique; AUC brings the research strengths of the two parent institutions together by realising a distinctive residential teaching-learning environment that addresses real world challenges through a flexible approach to learning and development. The programme has a convincing profile and strategic vision on where to go next. With the governance of AUC now being embedded in the science Faculties, there is a strong focus on science, the scientific method and scientific enquiry. AUC seems to have a well-balanced and sophisticated approach towards interdisciplinarity, and the panel sympathises with the programme's commitment to give back to society. The intended learning outcomes are clearly defined and convincingly mapped to the Dublin descriptors and the DSFR. In general, they tie in with the level and orientation of the programme. The panel considers some of the ILOs unrealistically formulated and thereby hard to realise. It recommends the programme to rephrase these to fit the high, yet achievable level the programme aims for (Standard 1).

The panel concludes that students at AUC benefit from a carefully aligned curriculum, which is continuously evaluated and improved through an extensive PDCA-cycle and associated peer review system. The curriculum has been built on six themes that map onto global challenges. This articulation of learning in the context of real world challenges helps to equip the students with skills that are useful in their further study. The panel concludes that the programme offers a range of well-

designed pathways and successfully draws on the principles of student-centred, research-based education and contextual learning. The panel considered the courses well-structured and aimed at the appropriate level. The graduation requirements are designed to empower learning in an impressively broad range of subjects and skills, including interdisciplinary skills, a foreign language, quantitative research skills and civic engagement. The panel also appreciates how attention to diversity is incorporated in the courses and projects. According to the panel, there is a stimulatingly broad range of optional courses, with many options to expand outside AUC. AUC has highly qualified and committed staff with the necessary research and teaching expertise to deliver AUC's courses. The programme is in the process of improving the tutor system to create more consistency of approach and clarity on the mission of tutoring. The panel considers the planned measures appropriate, and encourages the programme to implement them as soon as possible (Standard 2).

AUC's has a clear assessment policy, transparent grading rubrics which are directly linked to course objectives, a comprehensive vision on grading (see Standard 4) and an extensive quality control cycle, which involves the lecturers (peer review), the Heads of Study, Director of Education and the Board of Examiners overseeing the whole process. In addition, all exams and assignments are peer reviewed before they are carried out. According to the panel, assessment is well-designed, with a good variety of assessment methods and unambiguous model answers. Further work needs to be done to improve the amount of feedback that students receive during some of the courses and to empower the Board of Examiners so it can take the lead in improving AUC's assessment system (Standard 3).

The panel concludes that AUC delivers graduates of a high standard who easily find their way into top-ranked university programmes. The programme definitely surpasses the minimum required level for a bachelor's programme. The panel was impressed by most of the capstone theses it read, which generally gave evidence of extensive research, a good grasp of the subject and convincing presentation of the results. The students convincingly achieve the (to be rephrased) intended learning outcomes of the programme (Standard 4).

The panel assesses standard 2 and 4 as 'good' and standard 1 and 3 as 'satisfactory'. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, the panel therefore assesses the programme as 'good'.

### **Conclusion**

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences* as 'good'.





# DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF SMALL-SCALE AND INTENSIVE EDUCATION

## Introduction

The bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences offered by Amsterdam University College started in 2009. Given the prominence of its educational approach, the bachelor's programme was awarded the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education in 2012. This allows AUC to select new students up to its full College capacity of 900 students. An admission procedure has been established for this purpose. In addition to the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme, which is discussed separately in the preceding chapter of this report, the panel performed a practice-based assessment to verify whether the distinctive, small-scale and intensive character of the bachelor's programme can be reaffirmed. Two panel members were specifically trained and appointed by the NVAO to lead the assessment of this Distinctive Feature. The practice-based assessment took place on 28 September 2018 in combination with the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme.

The practice-based assessment pays explicit attention to the quality and intensity of tutoring at AUC, as this was seen as an area of improvement by the panel of the initial assessment of the Distinctive Feature in 2012. This subject will be discussed under Standard C of this report.

### A. Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes are not only aimed at achieving a high level in the relevant academic discipline and/or professional practice, but also have a broader aim: to train socially skilled and initiative-rich scholars and/or professionals with a wide interest in social developments and issues within a multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary context.

## Findings

AUC has defined its intended learning outcomes (ILOs) in line with the Dublin Descriptors at academic bachelor's level and the domain-specific framework of reference. The 31 ILOs are divided over 7 categories: Knowledge (ILO1 a-d); academic skills (ILO2 a-h); learning skills (ILO3 a-b); interdisciplinary skills (ILO4 a-e); communication skills (ILO5 a-c); engagement at local and global levels (ILO6 a-d); and personal and social responsibility (ILO7 a-e). The last two categories are not part of the Dublin Descriptors, nor are 'interdisciplinary skills'. They are part of the DSFR.

The panel considers the intended learning outcomes clearly defined and, in general, in line with the high level and orientation of the programme and professional expectations. The ILOs exceed the level described in the Dublin Descriptors, especially for communication and academic skills and that of the Domain-Specific Framework of Reference (DSFR) for interdisciplinary skills, local and global engagement and personal and social responsibility. According to the panel, together AUC's intended learning outcomes provide a well-balanced consideration of diversity, critical and constructive disposition, social community engagement, transdisciplinarity, reflection and interdisciplinarity.

The panel believes that some of the intended learning outcomes are over-ambitious and thereby hard to reach. For instance, making sure that students gain the interdisciplinary skills mentioned in ILO4 B ('be able to assess which research methods are most suitable in a particular situation') C ('be able to integrate the content and research methods from disciplines relevant to a particular situation') and D ('be able to defend a well-considered viewpoint covering the relevant methods from disciplines') is a huge task. The same is true for ILO1 D which states that graduates have 'a (general) knowledge of the physical and natural world, a (general) knowledge of European and world histories, philosophical traditions, major religions, and cultural life worlds and an understanding of economic forces and political dynamics'. These ILOs go beyond what the programme actually can achieve within a limited number of mandatory courses, the panel thinks. It recommends rephrasing these ILOs in a



more realistic manner, and harmonising them with the rest of the programme's intended learning outcomes.

### **Considerations**

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes clearly aim for students to achieve a high level in their discipline, while encouraging them to develop personal and social responsibility and becoming engaged in the local and global community. The ILOs are well balanced and convincingly mapped to the Dublin descriptors and the DSFR. They meet and, in some places, exceed the requirements of academic bachelor's level. The panel appreciates AUC's well-balanced and sophisticated approach towards interdisciplinarity – students learn how to integrate insights from different disciplines at an early stage. It also values AUC's commitment to give back to society. Both aims are clearly reflected in the intended learning outcomes. In general, the ILOs tie in with the level and orientation of the programme. Nevertheless, the panel considers some of the ILOs overambitious and thereby hard to achieve. It advises the programme to rephrase these. From seeing how constructively AUC has responded to suggestions from the previous assessment visit, the panel is confident that AUC will take this suggestion to heart.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard A as 'meets the standard'.

### **B. Relationship between the goals and content of the programme**

The content of the programme is inseparably connected to relevant extra-curricular activities, which ensures a high level and broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes.

### **Findings**

AUC is a residential college. As a result, students interact with each other and with staff members in- and outside of class. The programme hosts and actively encourages many co- and extra-curricular events. Co-curricular events involve visiting galleries, research institutes, botanical gardens, students participating in research projects that deal with civic issues, and guest speakers ('citywide experts') being invited into the classroom. AUC's student association, AUUSA, hosts many extracurricular activities. All students are automatically members. The study association functions as an umbrella organisation for 27 subcommittees, each organising different activities. Some examples are the dancing and theatre society, the seminar series 'Who's in Town', a Model United Nations platform, and AUC's own Tedx meetings (for more examples, see Standard C). According to AUC's self-evaluation report, these co- and extracurricular activities emphasise personal and social responsibility, civic and intercultural knowledge and engagement at a local and global level.

During the treasure trove, the panel learned about a few co-curricular activities in more detail, including creative assignments for the 'Introduction to biology' course and 'Visual culture' (creating a children's book about evolutionary biology and performing an art project), and student participation in the Peace Lab course, Media Lab course and in various community projects, which are linked to longer-running projects in the local community. Some of the outreach activities are arranged by AUC's 'outreach coordinator'. The panel was impressed with the various activities; it could see how these successfully broaden theoretical concepts from the disciplines and show students how to play with knowledge and employ theories in different settings. It also liked the products the students came up with. The panel thinks that the co-curricular and extra-curricular activities tie in well with the programme's aims and intended learning outcomes. Some extra-curricular activities have a clear link with the curriculum, such as the seminar series 'Who's in Town' or the Tedx meetings. The panel believes that the students involved develop valuable skills that are in line with the programme's ILOs and that are also relevant for the students' future career.

## Considerations

The panel concludes that there is a clear link between the curriculum and co- and extra-curricular activities. AUC has an active and professional student association, which offers many extra-curricular activities, often together with staff and external organisations. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests. According to the panel, there is a clear link between extra-curricular and co-curricular activities and the goals and intended learning outcomes of the programme.

## Conclusion

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard B as 'meets the standard'.

### C. Structure and didactic concept

The concept of the programme is aimed at creating an academic and/or professional community. Key terms are small-scale and intensively organised education, leading to a high number of hours of face-to-face teaching, close involvement between students and teachers and between students among themselves and socially relevant extra-curricular activities.

## Findings

AUC's takes a learner-centred approach and situates learning within twenty-first century contexts. A table in the SER links the learning activities to the intended learning outcomes. On average, students have 14.2 hours of face-to-face teaching per week. The maximum number of students per class is 25, and the average number is 19. The teaching format depends on the lecturer, but in all courses, students are expected to play an active role by participating in a wide range of classroom activities. The system of continuous assessment, with at least four assignments per course, ensures that students study regularly. In addition, AUC strongly encourages students to take part in extracurricular activities as these also contribute to students meeting the programme's intended learning outcomes. Finally, the fact that all students live on campus facilitates contact between the students among each other and between student and staff. The panel commends the programme and the students on the teaching-learning environment they have established; the sense of community is strongly conveyed by students and staff and there is a fruitful exchange with external organisations.

Tutors play an important role in the programme by providing academic guidance. Tutors are core faculty members who welcome students to the AUC community, provide them with academic advice, help them select courses in line with the graduation requirements and evaluate study progress. Halfway every semester, the lecturers complete a report on each student's progress in their class and send it to the tutors – these reports are used to see how students are performing and to identify problems at an early stage. Students and tutors meet one-on-one at least four times a year: halfway and at the end of each semester. The majority of students want to proceed in a master's programme. If required, tutors can help with the application process. Finally, the tutor verifies whether students who apply for graduation meet the requirements.

The previous assessment panel noted that the quality and intensity of the supervision provided seemed to differ per individual tutor. This panel suggested developing pathways for improvement. The programme has taken a few steps in response to this recommendation. It has appointed a new Senior Tutor in 2017, who is prioritising creating more uniformity in tutoring services. This is done by a revision of the Tutor Handbook, a review of the tutor training process and a review of the major administrative tasks (course registration and graduation checks) that tutors are faced with. This should create more clarity on what students can expect from their tutor and to a streamlining of administrative processes. The panel considers the planned measures appropriate, and urges the programme to implement them as soon as possible.



AUC states in the SER that it has a clear commitment to give back to society. The panel saw evidence of this commitment in various types of socially relevant activities, such as the mandatory community project, which entails students spending 168 hours (ten hours a week) on a project that serves the wider community. Examples of projects that students can sign up for are JeugdLab, which offers educational activities to children, the Zeeburgia project, where students help young football talents with their homework, and Right2Education, which provides refugee students with educational and social opportunities. The panel thinks these projects give the students valuable learning experiences, and praises the programme for its clear social and civic engagement.

### **Considerations**

The panel verified that the set-up of the programme, including its residential setting, is aimed at creating a tight-knit academic community. Classes are small-scale and teaching formats are intensive, as is in line with AUC's learner-centred approach. The panel concludes that the students have sufficient hours of face-to-face teaching during the semester. It commends the programme and the students on the environment they have established; the sense of community is strongly conveyed by students and staff. The programme's commitment to 'give back to society' is evidenced in many socially relevant extra-curricular activities.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard C as 'meets the standard'.

#### **D. Intake**

The programme has a sound selection procedure in place, aimed at admitting motivated and academically and/or professionally talented students.

### **Findings**

AUC's admission policy is based on academic excellence (a GPA of at least 3.0), motivation to study at a Liberal Arts and Sciences programme and commitment to contribute to AUC's international community. Every year, AUC receives approximately 900 applications. About half of the students receive an offer, and approximately 70% accepts. As a result, over 300 students start the programme each year. In 2017/2018 875 students were enrolled, the highest number since AUC's start in 2009.

The application procedure has three steps: (1) the AUC Admissions Committee reviews all applications, (2) applicants who meet the selection criteria are invited for Admissions Day – a day during which they learn more about studying at AUC, (3) the Admissions Committee decides which students receive an offer. The programme has no formal interviews, which it considers to have no further predictive value. Instead, it approaches Admissions Day as a matching process. During this day, students have a personal meeting with a prospective tutor to discuss study plans and motivation. Depending on motivation, these matching interviews are held by one or two members of staff. Good indicators for study success, according to AUC, are the applicants' level of mathematics and English. Students apply with a certain major in mind; the programme aims to recruit up to 50% science students and wishes to have an even distribution over the other two majors. Finally, the admissions procedure tries to establish an academic community 'that reflects the social, cultural and economic diversity of our globalising world'. There is a scholarship scheme to support this aim, the AUC Scholarship Fund. The Admissions Committee is also trying to reach first generation students and students with a migrant background, because these two groups are currently underrepresented in the programme. The AUC Scholarship Fund (partially) supports students from less privileged backgrounds. Approximately 10% of students receive a scholarship. In addition, the Admissions Committee can grant access to up to 10 students who may not meet the excellence criteria, but score high on diversity criteria and motivation. The student representatives that the panel met with described the admission procedure as 'straightforward, pleasant and fair'.

AUC aims to have a 50/50 mix of international and Dutch students. The programme is close to meeting this aim, as many of the Dutch students (58%) have also lived abroad and/or have a double nationality. Of the international students, 9% has a non-European nationality. AUC has more female than male students: 66% versus 34%.

### **Considerations**

The programme has a sound admissions procedure in place. As a result, AUC succeeds in admitting motivated and talented students. The panel is pleased that AUC is trying to increase the number of first generation students and students with a migration background as these are currently underrepresented in the programme. The admissions procedure generally results in a good match between students and programme.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard D as 'meets the standard'.

#### **E. Quality of staff**

The teachers have high-quality knowledge of the relevant subject and feel involved in the distinctive nature of the programme.

### **Findings**

ACU's curriculum is delivered by three groups of lecturers: AUC core staff, lecturers from the partner universities and their affiliated medical hospitals, and external lecturers. In 2016-2017, AUC core faculty taught 42% of the curriculum. All new lecturers at AUC take part in a workshop, organised by the Heads of Studies, before the start of a new semester. This workshop introduces them to teaching in a liberal arts and sciences context and explains AUC's rules and regulations and grading system.

In 2016-2017, AUC employed approximately 40 core staff members. At that time, 80% held a PhD, 82% had obtained a Basic Teaching Qualification, and 10% had also obtained the Senior Teaching Qualification. The remaining 17% either had an equivalent teaching qualification or were in the process of obtaining the BTQ. The panel concludes that the programme has strong and committed core staff members with the necessary research and teaching expertise to deliver AUC's courses. Most core faculty are also tutors in the programme. The students spoke highly of their lecturers, and the lecturers of the students. According to staff members, you either like or dislike an LAS environment, and those that like it stay at AUC.

In the SER, AUC describes its two biggest lecturer-related challenges and planned solutions: the introduction and training of partner faculty and the work pressure at AUC. The College aims to decrease the number of external lecturers and increase the number of UvA and VU lecturers. The panel agrees that lowering the number of external lecturers is a good idea, because it supports the idea of 'forging ongoing partnerships' between core and partner faculty. By having partner faculty teach in the AUC programme, students receive research-driven education, while conversely it could be attractive for AUC core staff members to combine a research position with their AUC teaching role. The panel suggests considering the establishment of a teaching-learning centre devoted to AUC and its liberal education philosophy. It approves of the Education-Linked Scholarship Allowance for all core faculty. The ELSA scheme started in September and enables core faculty to spend 7.5% of their time on 'academic knowledge and pedagogical practices'. The panel learnt that, currently, only 5 core staff received a Research Time Allocation of 0.2 fte, but is happy to see that this will increase to 11 staff members by 2021. There is also a small fund for lectures and students to jointly engage in research. Finally, the panel is pleased to see that the programme management is well aware of how the structure of the programme adds to the work pressure for staff. It considers the measurements taken, increased administrative support for tutors, necessary and appropriate.



### **Considerations**

The panel notes that the lecturers are committed to teaching in a liberal arts and sciences environment. Lecturers are properly trained and qualified to deliver small-scale, intensive teaching and the available expertise is well-tuned to the various academic demands of the programme. The programme has shown good progress regarding career opportunities for staff. The panel suggests considering the establishment of a teaching-learning centre devoted to AUC and its liberal education philosophy.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard E as 'meets the standard'.

### **F. Number of staff**

There is sufficient staff available to provide small-scale and intensive education and to ensure and develop individual contact between teachers and students.

### **Findings**

In 2017-2018 AUC had 875 students and employed approximately 40 staff members. That year, AUC staff provided 42% of the courses. Partner faculty (32%) and external lecturers (26%) taught the rest of the courses. The majority of AUC core staff members are also tutor to the students. The students spoke highly of their lecturers and said they felt they could always approach them. The students appreciated how the lecturers helped them to achieve their goals.

### **Considerations**

The panel concludes that AUC has sufficient staff to fulfil the demands posed upon a small-scale, intensive programme. The programme has established good contacts between students and lecturers.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard F as 'meets the standard'.

### **G. Available facilities**

The programme has its own infrastructure with facilities for small-scale and intensive education and common extra-curricular social activities.

### **Findings**

Since 2012, AUC's has its own, purposely-built building at Amsterdam Science Park. It is sustainably built, with a green roof, solar panels and climate control by means of a heat and cold storage system. The building has approximately twenty classrooms that are suitable for small-scale, intensive teaching and another twenty study rooms where students can work on research projects. In addition, there is a large common room on the first floor that is suitable for bigger events such as the 'Who's in town' series. The panel has seen the teaching facilities and considers them state-of-the-art.

The student accommodations are next door to AUC. From talking to the students, the panel concludes that they appreciate the benefits of living on campus, such as having the opportunity to learn from roommates that are not in the same field and the campus providing a good platform for social activities. According to the panel, AUC has found the right balance between social activities at AUC and activities that involve the wider community such as the Right2Education project, JeugdLab project and AUC's partnership with Zeeburgia football.

AUC benefits from the facilities at Amsterdam Science Park, such as UvA's University Sports Centre and laboratory facilities at the VU, UvA and academic medical hospitals. During the site visit, the

panel verified whether the programme is able to make laboratory courses mandatory for all students in the near future, starting with the science students in 2019-2020. The programme management explained that they are, among other things, planning low tech labs which only require small devices. Depending on the programme in which students want to continue these lab courses will suffice, but for other programmes students need an internship that provides them with sufficient laboratory skills. The programme management also clarified that a film lab course is on the way. From reading the student chapter, the panel concludes that students value the lab courses, especially students in the social sciences and humanities because these courses put them in a good position compared to their peers. The panel concludes that the lab courses significantly enrich the curriculum and thinks that students should be made clearly aware of their value in choosing their courses.

### **Considerations**

The panel concludes that AUC's facilities create a suitable teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities. AUC's state-of-the-art-building and the programme's location within Amsterdam Science Park provide the students with many opportunities to take learning beyond the classroom.

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard G as 'meets the standard'.

### **H. Level realised**

The content and the level of the final projects are in line with the level and the broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes. Graduates are admitted to prestigious postgraduate programmes and/or jobs. The success rates are substantially higher than those of other relevant programmes.

### **Findings**

#### *Final achievement level*

The panel studied a selection of sixteen capstones. Based on its own sample check, it concludes that the theses are, in general, of high quality. In the majority of theses, the authors surpass the minimum required level for a bachelor's programme. In these theses, the students chose interesting and ambitious topics, performed extensive research, gave evidence of a broad knowledge and a good grasp of the subject and presented the results in a convincing way. The panel agreed with most, but not all, of the high scores given.

During the site visit, the panel met with a number of alumni. All of them had continued to study in a highly ranked master's programme and none of them had experienced problems being accepted in their programme of choice. Reflecting on their time at AUC, alumni felt that having been at the College had opened up many doors and that they had learned a lot, also in terms of personal and social skills. When comparing themselves to their peers, the graduates noted that they benefitted from good writing skills and the ability to condense information into clear arguments.

#### *Success rates*

AUC has very high success rates. Over 90% of students that re-enrol in the second year continue to successfully complete the programme. Between 66 and 77% of students graduate within three years. The number of students leaving the programme during or after the first year is low (10.1% in 2016/2017, the programme's target is less than 10%) and has gone down (from 13.3% in 2014/2015). The panel concludes that the College is monitoring data on student progression and attainment carefully. The data reveals impressive outcomes, with high and consistent student performance and graduate outcomes. Again, this shows AUC's commitment to continuous improvement and responding to data and feedback.



### *Performance of graduates*

In the fall of 2017, an independent research centre conducted the national Liberal Arts and Sciences alumni survey, which included 263 alumni from the AUC programme. Prior to that, in 2016, AUC had also conducted a survey amongst its graduates, to which 223 alumni responded. Both surveys suggest that the majority of graduates continued in a master's programme, and that some continue in a PhD programme. After AUC, between 50 and 60% of graduates chose a master's programme in the Netherlands, most often (approximately 30%) at the UvA or the VU. Approximately 20% of graduates continued studying in the UK, where for instance Oxford University, University of Cambridge and the London School of Economics were popular destinations. According to these two surveys, over half of AUC's graduates is accepted at a graduate programme at one of the 100 top-rated universities in the world (Shanghai ranking). Only a small minority (less than 8%) of graduates left Europe for their master's programme after AUC. Most graduates end up working in the commercial sector (over 40%), in academia (app. 30%) or for not-for-profit organisations (app. 15%). Based on its meeting with graduates and based on the (general) information regarding these two surveys, the panel concludes that AUC students do well in master's programmes and on the job market.

### **Considerations**

The panel considers the level of the selected theses as high. In general, students choose interesting and ambitious topics and perform extensive research. The graduation rates of the programme are higher than 90%. The majority of students (66-77%) graduate without any study delay. After AUC, students enrol in highly ranked master's programmes in the Netherlands and abroad. Most graduates work in the commercial sector (over 40%), in academia (app. 30%) or for not-for-profit organisations (app. 15%).

### **Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences:* the panel assesses Standard H as 'meets the standard'.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes clearly aim for students to achieve a high level in their discipline, while encouraging them to develop personal and social responsibility and to become engaged in the local and global community. The ILOs are well balanced and convincingly mapped to the Dublin descriptors and the DSFR. They meet and, in some places, exceed the requirements of academic bachelor's level. The panel appreciates AUC's well-balanced and sophisticated approach towards interdisciplinarity. It also values AUC's commitment to give back to society. In general, the ILOs tie in with the level and orientation of the programme. The panel considers some of the ILOs overambitious and thereby hard to achieve. It advises the programme to rephrase these. From seeing how constructively AUC has responded to suggestions from the previous assessment visit, the panel is confident that AUC will take this suggestion to heart (Standard A).

The panel concludes that there is a clear link between the curriculum and co- and extra-curricular activities related to the goals and intended learning outcomes of the programme. AUC has an active and professional student association, which offers many extra-curricular activities, often together with staff and external organisations. Students have ample opportunity to pursue personal talents and broaden their interests (Standard B).

The panel verified that the set-up of the programme, including its residential setting, is aimed at creating a tight-knit academic community. Classes are small-scale and teaching formats are intensive, as is in line with AUC's learner-centred approach. The panel concludes that the students have sufficient hours of face-to-face teaching during semester. It commends the programme and the students on the environment they have established; the sense of community is strongly conveyed by students and staff. The programme's commitment to 'give back to society' is evidenced in many socially relevant extra-curricular activities (Standard C).



The programme has a sound admissions procedure in place. As a result, AUC succeeds in admitting motivated and talented students. The panel is pleased that AUC is trying to increase the number of first generation students and students with a migration background as these are currently underrepresented in the programme. The admissions procedure generally results in a good match between students and programme (Standard D).

The panel notes that the lecturers are committed to teaching in a liberal arts and sciences environment. Lecturers are properly trained and qualified to deliver small-scale, intensive teaching and the available expertise is well-tuned to the various academic demands of the programme. The programme has shown good progress regarding career opportunities for staff. The panel suggests considering the establishment of a teaching-learning centre devoted to AUC and its liberal education philosophy (Standard E).

The panel concludes that AUC has sufficient staff to fulfil the demands posed upon a small-scale, intensive programme. The programme has established good contacts between students and lecturers (Standard F).

The panel concludes that AUC's facilities create a suitable teaching-learning environment for small-scale intensive teaching and for common extra-curricular social activities. AUC's state-of-the-art building and the programme's location within Amsterdam Science Park provide the students with many opportunities to take learning beyond the classroom (Standard G).

The panel considers the level of the selected theses as high. In general, students choose interesting and ambitious topics and perform extensive research. The graduation rates of the programme are higher than 90%. The majority of students (66-77%) graduate without any study delay. After AUC, students enrol in highly ranked master's programmes in the Netherlands and abroad. Most graduates work in the commercial sector (over 40%), in academia (app. 30%) or for not-for-profit organisations (app. 15%) (Standard H).

#### *Practice-based assessment*

With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that AUC meets all standards. In its assessment under Standards C, the panel paid specific attention to the tutoring system, as this was identified as an area of improvement in the 2012 assessment. The panel concludes that the three measures that AUC has taken (a revision of the Tutor Handbook, a review of the tutor training process and a reduction of the tutor's major administrative tasks) are appropriate. It is confident that the programme will try and ensure that students receive a more uniform tutoring experience. The fact that all criteria meet the standard results in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature by the panel and a positive advice regarding the practice-based assessment.

#### **Conclusion**

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences* as 'positive'.



# APPENDICES



## APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

This reference framework is intended for the Liberal Arts and Sciences (LAS) programs in the Netherlands. This includes selective University Colleges as well as non-selective LAS programs situated within a university. These programmes are a constituent part of Dutch “scientific” or “scholarly” education (wetenschappelijk onderwijs). The LAS education framework articulated here distinguishes itself from (emerging) broad programs through its proximity to academic inquiry and research and through its commitment to wide-ranging intellectual formation not chiefly aimed at preparing students for particular professions.

As this accreditation process is reviewing an ever more diverse range of programs, this framework of reference is short rather than extensive. Rather, it is a reference framework that reflects shared educational aims with each of the programs under review.

Liberal arts and Sciences emphasises intellectual growth through both broad and deep learning as the foundation of the curriculum. Standing in the liberal arts tradition that seeks to free the individual through intellectual and ethical engagement, LAS encourages inquiry through profoundly open curricula that allows students to explore a diversity of academic fields from the Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences. This enables them to attain depth in disciplinary, multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary concentration areas of their own choosing. By combining the disciplinary depth and multi- or interdisciplinary learning with undergraduate research and communication skills, students develop their creativity, initiative-taking, skills in working together. Often conducted in a strongly international context, LAS programs regardless of setting promote intercultural understanding abilities and societal engagement.

LAS takes place within distinct learning and social communities. The formal program and extracurricular activities are often linked and in such cases students, faculty and staff participate actively in the governance of the program and the community. Teaching and learning experiences are typically characterized by small-scale and intensive education, with a high level of interaction between students and teachers and among students themselves. Giving this emphasis on active discussion and debate, LAS programs strive for diversity in their student population in terms of nationality, ethnicity, gender and cultural and socio-economic backgrounds and offer dynamic environments that invite curricular experimentation and educational innovation and attract academics dedicated to excellence in teaching.

Liberal Arts & Sciences programs have intended learning outcomes that include:

- a. multidisciplinary familiarity in the humanities, social sciences and natural sciences combined with depth of knowledge in a chosen concentration area;
- b. ability to approach complex questions or issues in an inter- or multidisciplinary way;
- c. advanced academic skills in communication, quantitative and qualitative methods, critical thinking, research and learning;
- d. attitudes and skills for engaged citizenship, including international and intercultural understanding, social skills and a will to contribute to solving societal issues;
- e. intellectual curiosity, reflexivity, integrity and an open mind, learning skills necessary for subsequent graduate studies and the workplace.

Approved in Tilburg on October 25, 2017 by

- Dean Amsterdam University College: prof. dr. Murray Pratt
- Dean Erasmus University College: prof. dr. Maarten Frens
- Dean Leiden University College The Hague: prof. dr. Judi Mesman
- Dean University College Groningen: prof. dr. Hans van Ees
- Dean University College Maastricht: prof dr. Matthieu Zegers
- Dean University College Roosevelt: prof. dr. Bert van den Brink
- Dean University College Tilburg: prof dr. Alkeline van Lenning
- Dean University College Twente: prof. dr. Jennifer Herek



- Dean University College Utrecht: prof. dr. James Kennedy
- Director Liberal Arts and Sciences @ Utrecht University: dr. Iris van der Tuin

## APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

### Dublin Descriptors, Domain Specific Framework and AUC Learning Outcomes (2018-19)

Domain	Dublin descriptors (Qualifications of Bachelor)	Domain-specific reference framework for liberal arts & sciences	AUC's learning outcomes
1. Knowledge	Have demonstrated knowledge and understanding in a field of study that builds upon and supersedes their general secondary education, and are typically at a level that, while supported by advanced textbooks, includes some aspects that will be informed by knowledge of the forefront of their field of study.	Multidisciplinary familiarity in the humanities, social sciences and sciences combined with depth of knowledge in a chosen interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary concentration area.	Graduates will have achieved: a. a deep knowledge base in the chosen field of study. This depth is to be found in the understanding of the knowledge domain and in the ability to apply concepts, and not only in the accumulation of facts; b. knowledge of and the ability to apply the most prominent theories and methodological foundations of the chosen field of study; c. understanding of the broader context in which the research issues of the chosen field of study are positioned; d. breadth of knowledge, as demonstrated by a (general) knowledge of the physical and natural world, a (general) knowledge of European and world histories, philosophical traditions, major religions, and cultural life worlds and an understanding of economic forces and political dynamics.
2. Academic Skills	Can apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner that indicates a professional approach to their work or vocation, and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study.	Intellectual curiosity, reflexivity, integrity and an open mind, learning skills necessary for subsequent graduate studies and the workplace.	Graduates will have: a. highly developed cognitive, analytic and problem-solving skills; b. the capacity for independent critical thought, rational inquiry and self-directed learning; c. the ability to work, independently and collaboratively, on research projects that require the integration of knowledge with skills in analysis, discovery, problem solving, and communication; d. mathematical skills relevant to their major; e. familiarity with the general scientific method; f. second-language competence; g. the ability to engage with socio-cultural frameworks and traditions other than their own; h. the ability to plan work and use time effectively.
3. Learning skills	Have developed those learning skills that are necessary for them to continue to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.	See above	Graduates will possess the attitude as well as the skills for lifelong learning, i.e. they: a. know how to obtain and evaluate information; b. are able to focus on a new knowledge domain, formulate an overview and determine their knowledge gaps.
4. Interdisciplinary skills	Not mentioned	Ability to approach questions or issues in an interdisciplinary way.	Graduates will demonstrate interdisciplinary skills, i.e. they will: a. be able to evaluate which disciplines are involved in the solution of complex issues; b. be able to assess which research methods are most suitable in a particular situation; c. be able to integrate the content and research methods from disciplines relevant to a particular situation; d. be able to defend a well-considered viewpoint covering the relevant disciplines; e. know which phenomena are being studied
			in the different disciplines and which research methods and theories are being used.
5. Communication skills	Can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.	Advanced academic skills in communication, quantitative methods, critical thinking, research and learning.	Graduates will demonstrate excellent communication skills, i.e. they will be able to: a. express themselves well verbally and at an academic level in writing; b. present ideas in a clear effective way; c. communicate knowledge to a public consisting of specialists or laypersons, making use of various modes of communication.
6. Engagement at local and global levels	Have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgements that include reflection on relevant social, academic or ethical issues.	Attitudes and skills for active citizenship, including international and intercultural understanding, social skills and a will to contribute to solving societal issues.	Graduates will demonstrate engagement at local and global levels, i.e. they will be able to: a. use a knowledge of cultures in explaining current problems in society; b. understand and appreciate cultural differences, not only at a distance, but in real life; c. live with different value systems in daily life, and reflect on their own value systems; d. demonstrate an international awareness and openness to the world, based on an understanding and appreciation of social and cultural diversity and respect for individual human rights and dignity.
7. Personal and social responsibility	See above	See above	Graduates will demonstrate: a. Respect for integrity, and for the ethics of scholarship; b. intellectual curiosity and creativity, including understanding of the philosophical and methodological bases of research activity; c. an openness to new ideas and unconventional critiques of received wisdom; d. reflection on their development as a student and an academic citizen; e. application of knowledge and skills acquired in university to non-academic settings.





## Humanities 2018-2019

Theme: Cities & Cultures

Literature	Film	Philosophy	History	Culture	Media	Art History
<b>300</b>						
<b>Theme Courses: Rethinking Play **; Rethinking Protest ***; Rethinking the Sublime **</b>						
Existentialism in Literature & Philosophy **		Existentialism in Literature & Philosophy **			Visual Culture **	
	Film Philosophy **			Cultural Studies of Affect & Emotion *	Game Studies **	
		Mathematical Logic **	Cultural Memory Studies *			
Political Shakespeare **		Legal & Social Philosophy *		Race, Class, Gender, Intersectionality *		
Literature of Social Exclusion *		Moral Dilemmas in Medical Practice *		Digital Anthropology **		
Literature in the Age of Globalisation *	Film & the Body **	Modern Philosophical Texts *	The History of Ideas **	Urban Anthropology Lab **	Media Lab **	The Art Market & Culture Industry **
Advanced Creative Writing **	Cinema in the Digital Age *	Ancient Philosophical Texts **	Revolutions in History *	Religion, Secularism & Violence *	Media Psychology **	Photograph as Socio-Political Document *
Modernism & Postmodernism **	Film Lab *	Philosophical Logic *	Environmental Archaeology **	Culture Lab **	New Media Literacies *	
<b>200</b>						
<b>Adaptation Studies **</b>						
Fictions of Empire *	National Cinemas *	Philosophy of Science *	Global History **	Sociology of the Other *	Narrative Across Media *	Global Modern & Contemporary Art **
Literature & Science *	Documentary *	Ethics	Democracy in Modern History **	Gender & Sexuality **	Journalism **	Urban Utopias **
Creative Writing	Film Analysis *	World Religions *	History & Heritage Dutch Golden Age **	Community & Society in a Globalised World **	Documentary *	Portraiture *
		Philosophical Problems **	Nations, Nationalism & Modernity **	Counterculture **	Perspectives on Games *	
<b>Methods 2: Introduction to Visual Methodologies</b>						
Performing Arts: Theatre *						Performing Arts: Music **
						Periods & Genres: Modern **
Poetry & Narrative **	Introduction to Film Studies	History of Philosophy	Early to Modern History **	Introduction to Cultural Analysis **	Media & Communication	Periods & Genres: Early *
<b>100</b>						
<b>Methods 1: Introduction to Literary &amp; Cultural Theory</b>						
<b>Theme Course: Introduction to Cities &amp; Cultures *</b>						

HUM | HUM/SSC | HUM/SSC/SCI | HUM/SCI | HUM/ACC

\* = Offered only in Semester 1  
 \*\* = Offered only in Semester 2  
 Italics = Only in January (\*) and/or June (\*\*)



## Social Sciences 2018-2019

Themes: Social Systems

Health & Well-being		Social Systems							JCC
Health	Anthropology	Environmental Economics & Policy	Economics	Law	Political Science	International Relations	Sociology	Cognition	
Theme: Global Politics**									
Theme HW: Lifestyle & Disease **	Digital Anthropology **	Theme: Global Culture**	International Economic Law **	Criminal Justice Systems **	European & International Institutions **	Theme: Global Economics**	Comparative Public Policy **	Theme: International Social Cognition **	
	Photograph as Socio-Political Document *		Market Failures *	International Business Contract Law *	Political Shakespeare **	The Changing World of IR *	The Development of Social Policy *		
Medical Anthropology**	Religion, Secularism & Violence *	Goodesign Lab **	Advanced Micro-Economics *	European Union Law *	Political Communication & Data Analytics *	International Crimes *	The Literature of Social Exclusion *	Brain & Cognition **	
Moral Dilemmas in Medical Practice *	Race Class Gender Intersectionality *	Global Environmental Governance	Advanced Macro-Economics **	Legal & Social Philosophy *	Revolutions in History *	Violence & Conflict	Migration, Integration & Diversity *	Media Psychology **	
Human Stress Research *	Urban Anthropology Lab **	Urban Environment Lab **	Promotion & Regulation of the Economy *	Moet Court Lab	Comparative Public Policy **	Diplomacy Lab *	Cultural Memory Studies *	Brain & Mind **	
Addiction **					Democracy in Modern History **			The Empathic Brain **	
	Culture Lab **			Human Rights Law & Politics *					
	World Religions *				Ethics **		Global Leadership**	Cognition Lab *	
	Journalism **		Economics **					Perception & Attention **	
International Public Health **	Ethnographic Fieldwork for the 21st Century *	Environmental Law & Policy *	International Trade, Growth & Development**	International Law **	The Middle East Today	Avaco Lab **	Inequality & Poverty **	School Psychology *	
Nutrition & Health *	Gender & Sexuality **	Risk Management & Natural Hazards *	Fundamentals of Macroeconomics *	Principles of Private Law **	The Politics of Modernity *	Human Rights & Human Security	Nations, Nationalism & Modernity **	Developmental Psychology **	
Epidemiology *	Community & Society in a Globalised World **	The Sustainable City **	Fundamentals of Micro-Economics *	Constitutional & Administrative Law **	European Integration **	International Political Economy *	Sociology of the Other *	Cognitive Psychology *	
		Environmental Economics **			Comparative Democracy *		Contemporary Sociological Thought *	Linguistics **	
Introduction to Public Health *	Classical & Modern Anthropological Thought *	Introduction to Environmental Sciences *	Economic Thought in a Historical Perspective	Law, Society & Justice **	Classical & Modern Political Thought	International Relations Theory & Practice	Classical & Modern Sociological Thought **	Psychology	
Theme HW: Introduction *		Theme: Political Science, Law, Economics (PLE) **			Theme: Sociology, Anthropology, Sustainability (SAS) **			Theme ICC: Introduction *	
		SSC	SSC/SOI	SSC/HUM	SSC/ACC	SCU/SSCIHUM			

\* = Offered only in Semester 1

\*\* = Offered only in Semester 2

*Italics* = Offered only in January (\*) and/or June (\*\*) Intensive

## APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Friday 28 Sept AUC	
8.45 - 9.00	<i>Arrival panel/welcome</i>
9.00 - 9.45	<i>Initial panel meeting AUC</i>
9.45 - 10.30	<i>Development dialogue</i>
10.30 - 11.15	<i>Programme management</i>
11.15 - 12.30	<i>Tour + treasure trove</i>
12.30 - 13.30	<i>Lunch and break</i>
13.30 - 14.15	<i>Students*</i>
14.15 - 15.00	<i>Teachers and tutors*</i>
15.00 - 15.15	<i>Break</i>
15.15 - 15.45	<i>Board of Examiners</i>
15.45 - 16.15	<i>Alumni</i>
16.15 - 17.30	<i>Internal panel meeting</i>
17.30 - 17.45	<i>Presentation findings</i>
17.45 - 18.00	<i>Goodbye and thank you</i>

\* Including members of the Programme Committee



## APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied fifteen theses of the bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Sciences. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

During the site visit, the panel studied, among other things, the following documents (partly as hard copies, partly via the institute's electronic learning environment):

- Onderwijs- en Examenregeling (OER);
- AUC assessment framework 2018-2019;
- Capstone guidelines 2017-2018;
- Strategic document AUC 21: Our community's vision for excellence, diversity and global citizenship;
- Annual report programme committee;
- Annual report Board of Examiners;

The following courses were available for further study during the visit:

• Global Identity Experience	ACC	100
• Logic, Information, Argumentation	ACC	100
• Academic Writing Skills	ACC	100
• Big Questions in Future Societies	ACC	100
• Basic Research Methods and Statistics II	ACC	200
• Spanish B2	ACC	300
• Theme course: Cities and Cultures	HUM	100
• History of Philosophy	HUM	100
• Adaptation Studies	HUM	200
• Philosophy of Science	HUM	200
• Cultural Memory Studies	HUM	300
• Theme course : Introduction to Life, Evolution, Universe	SCI	100
• Programming your World	SCI	100
• Molecular Techniques & Immunology Lab	SCI	200
• Moral Dilemmas in Medical Practice	SCI+SSC+HUM	300
• Introduction to Financial Mathematics	SCI	300
• Theme Course: Sociology, Anthropology, Sustainability	SSC	100
• Classical and Modern Political Thought	SSC	100
• Fundamentals of Micro-Economics	SSC	200
• Human Rights and Human Security	SSC	200
• Comparative Democracy	SSC	200

