

MASTER'S PROGRAMME

SPATIAL PLANNING

FACULTY OF GEOSCIENCES

UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0726
© 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

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME SPATIAL PLANNING OF UTRECHT UNIVERSITY 5

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
APPENDICES	21
APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE	23
APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	25
APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	26
APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	27
APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	29

This report was finalised on 7 October 2019

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME SPATIAL PLANNING OF UTRECHT UNIVERSITY

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands for limited programme assessments as a starting point (September 2018).

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Master's programme Spatial Planning

Name of the programme:	Planologie
International name of the programme:	Spatial Planning
CROHO number:	66622
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	-
Location(s):	Utrecht
Mode(s) of study:	full-time, part-time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/11/2019

The visit of the assessment panel Human Geography and Urban Planning to the Faculty of Geosciences of Utrecht University took place on 21, 22 and 23 May 2019. The judgements in this report refer to the full-time and part-time modes of study, unless otherwise indicated.

The programme's management proposes to change the CROHO programme name, see Standard 1.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 11 February 2019. The panel that assessed the master's programme Spatial Planning consisted of:

- Em. prof. dr. L.J. (Leo) de Haan, emeritus professor of Development Studies at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) of Erasmus University Rotterdam [chair];
- Em. prof. dr. C. (Christian) Kesteloot, emeritus professor at the Division of Geography and Tourism of KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. F.J.A. (Frank) Witlox, professor of Economic Geography at the Department of Geography at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Dr. C.J. (Kees-Jan) van Klaveren, senior auditor and data protection officer at Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences;
- Drs. J. (Judith) Borsboom-van Beurden, senior researcher Smart Sustainable Cities at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU, Norway);
- Dr. L.B.J. (Lianne) van Duinen, project manager at the Council for the Environment and Infrastructure (Rli);
- J. (Jim) Klooster BSc, master's student Economic Geography at University of Groningen [student member].



The panel was supported by dr. M. (Meg) van Bogaert and dr. M.J. (Marijn) Hollestelle, who acted as secretaries.

Due to personal reasons, prof. dr. Frank Witlox was not able to attend the site visit itself. In consultation with the programme and the NVAO, he stayed on as a panel member and read and commented upon the self-evaluation report, a number of theses and the draft reports.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The master's programme Spatial Planning at the Faculty of Geosciences of Utrecht University was part of the cluster assessment Human Geography and Urban Planning. In April and May 2019 the panel assessed nineteen programmes at four universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: University of Amsterdam, University of Groningen, Utrecht University, and Radboud University.

Panel members

The panel consisted of the following members:

- Em. prof. dr. L.J. (Leo) de Haan, emeritus professor of Development Studies, at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) of Erasmus University Rotterdam [chair];
- Em. prof. dr. C. (Christian) Kesteloot, emeritus professor at the Division of Geography and Tourism of KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. E.M. (Ellen) van Bueren, professor of Urban Development Management at the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment of Delft University of Technology;
- Drs. J. (Judith) Borsboom-van Beurden, senior researcher Smart Sustainable Cities at Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU, Norway);
- Dr. L.B.J. (Lianne) van Duinen, project manager at the Council for the Environment and Infrastructure (Rli);
- Dr. C.J. (Kees-Jan) van Klaveren, senior auditor and data protection officer at Rotterdam University of Applied Sciences;
- Prof. dr. M.A. (Maria) Koelen, professor of Health and Society at Wageningen University & Research;
- Prof. dr. F.J.A. (Frank) Witlox, professor of Economic Geography at the Department of Geography at Ghent University (Belgium);
- J. (Jim) Klooster BSc, master's student Economic Geography at the University of Groningen [student member];
- L. (Lars) Stevenson BSc, bachelor's student Political Science and master's student Comparative Politics, Administration & Society at Radboud University [student member];
- N.J.F. (Niek) Zijlstra, bachelor's student Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning at the University of Amsterdam [student member];
- Prof. dr. ing. C.M. (Carola) Hein, professor of History of Architecture and Urban Planning at the Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment of Delft University of Technology [referee assessment University of Groningen].

For each site visit, assessment panel members were selected based on their expertise, availability and independence.

The QANU project manager for the cluster assessment was dr. Irene Conradie. She acted as secretary in the site visit of the University of Amsterdam. In order to assure the consistency of assessment within the cluster, the project manager was present at the panel discussion leading to the preliminary findings at all site visits. All draft reports were checked by QANU. Dr. Meg van Bogaert and drs. Mariette Huisjes, freelance secretaries for QANU, acted as secretaries in the site visit of the University of Groningen. Dr. Meg van Bogaert also acted as secretary in the site visits of Utrecht University and Radboud University. Dr. Marijn Hollestelle, employee of QANU, was present at the site visit of Utrecht University, specifically for the ECA assessment report of quality in internationalisation of the master's

programme International Development Studies. The project manager and the secretaries regularly discussed the assessment process and outcomes.

Preparation

On 18 February 2019, the panel chair was briefed by the project manager on the tasks and working method of the assessment panel and more specifically his role, as well as use of the assessment framework. A preparatory panel meeting was also organised on 18 February 2019. During this meeting, the panel members received instruction on the tasks and working method and the use of the assessment framework. The panel also discussed the domain specific framework. A schedule for the site visit was composed. Prior to the site visit, representative partners for the various interviews were selected. See Appendix 4 for the final schedule. Before the site visit, the programmes wrote self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the project manager. She checked these on quality and completeness and sent them to the panel members. The panel members studied the self-evaluation reports and formulated initial questions and remarks, as well as positive aspects of the programmes.

The panel also studied a selection of theses and their assessment forms for the programmes. The selection consisted of fifteen theses, based on a provided list of graduates between 2017-2018. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

Site visit

The site visit to Utrecht University took place on 21, 22 and 23 May 2019. Prior to the site visit, the panel discussed its initial findings on the self-evaluation reports and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit. During the site visit, the panel studied additional materials about the programmes and exams, as well as minutes of the Programme Committee and the Board of Examiners. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 5. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners and the Programme Committee. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received. The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the panel's preliminary findings and general observations.

Report

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to QANU for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project manager sent the draft reports to the faculty in order to have these checked for factual irregularities. The project manager discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty of Geosciences and University Board.

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 the standards:

Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.



Partially meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard to a significant extent, but improvements are required in order to fully meet the 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

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

The programme meets standard 1 and partially meets a maximum of two standards, with the imposition of conditions being recommended by the panel.

Negative

In the following situations:

- The programme fails to meet one or more standards;
- The programme partially meets standard 1;
- The programme partially meets one or two standards, without the imposition of conditions being recommended by the panel;
- The programme partially meets three or more standards.

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The master's programme Spatial Planning has a clear profile which is broad, focuses on a research orientation, shows a close connection between academic and professional aspects, and puts an emphasis on sustainability. According to the panel the link between sustainability and land use and transport could be stressed more. The ILOs are in line with the Domain-Specific Framework of Reference (DSFR) for the Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain in the Netherlands. They fit the profile well and are in line with the international requirements regarding the level and orientation of an academic master's programme. The panel recommends reconsidering the order and structure of the ILOs. Finally, the proposal of the programme to use only the English name is supported by the panel.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

According to the panel, the curriculum is well-structured and aims at progression from knowledge acquisition to knowledge integration and application. The students have an adequate freedom of choice in a number of ways, and there are clear links to the spatial planning labour market. The panel is positive about the shift from process orientation to a better balance between object and process orientation and encourages the programme to continue this development. The quality of the courses is good, and the relation between the course objectives, ILOs and the Dublin descriptors demonstrates that the curriculum enables the students to achieve the ILOs. The programme offers a variety of teaching methods that stimulate active learning. The panel compliments the programme on its reflective and constructive attitude. Internationalisation is developing at a good pace and aims to support students better in preparing for a labour market that is still oriented to the Netherlands, but becoming more and more internationally oriented. All teaching staff members combine research and teaching and are qualified in both. The faculty pays appropriate attention to professionalisation of the teaching staff. The perceived work pressure is high, but the panel finds that the faculty is paying sufficient attention to this subject. The lecturers are also actively looking for solutions to reduce the workload. In conclusion, the panel finds that the programme offers students a teaching-learning environment that enables them to achieve the ILOs.

Standard 3: Student assessment

The increased attention paid by the programme and faculty to a systematic method of assessment and associated quality assurance has led to a good system of assessment. The students are informed about and are actively involved in the assessment by means of providing peer-feedback. The programme uses a wide variety of assessment methods, and the final assessment of a course is always based on multiple assessment moments. The thesis assessment is appropriate, with a clear and independent assessment by the second examiner. However, the assessment form should clearly show the independent assessment of both examiners. The manner in which the thesis is assessed is adequately organised. The panel agreed with the grades given by the supervisor and second examiner. It points out that the sometimes limited amount of written feedback on the assessment forms could be improved. The Board of Examiners and the quality assurance system are functioning properly, and the panel notes that the Board of Examiners has taken important steps in the past period, for example the implementation of the faculty's assessment policy. The panel concludes that the assessment is sufficiently reliable, valid and transparent.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The panel reviewed a random selection of theses produced by graduates of the Spatial Planning programme, which sufficiently demonstrated that they had realised the ILOs. Attention to the labour market is good, and the employability of the graduates is very good. Based on the selection of master's theses, the alumni survey and interviews with alumni during the site visit, the panel concludes that the students realise the ILOs as formulated by the programme.



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

Master's programme Spatial Planning

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	meets the standard
Standard 3: Student assessment	meets the standard
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	meets the standard
General conclusion	positive

The chair, prof. dr. Leo de Haan, and the secretary, dr. Meg van Bogaert, of the panel hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 7 October 2019

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

Context

The Faculty of Geosciences has four departments and is one of the seven faculties of Utrecht University (UU). Within the Faculty of Geosciences, the Department of Human Geography and Spatial Planning is responsible for the education in various programmes, including the master's programme Spatial Planning. The department focuses on research, teaching and outreach related to the Urban Futures research programme, investigating urban issues in the context of an ongoing global trend of increasing urbanisation. The responsibility of coordinating and managing the master's programme Spatial Planning is assigned to the department's Director of Education. The daily management of all master's programmes is carried out by the Education Coordination Team (ECT), composed of the bachelor coordinator, the master coordinator, the education coordinator and is chaired by the Director of Education. The ECT is advised on issues pertaining to the programme by the Master Education Committee.

Part-time programme

The master's programme Spatial Planning offers a full-time and part-time programme. The number of students in the part-time programme is very limited (two students enrolled in 2017, three in 2018). In principle, part-time students follow the same curriculum as full-time students, but at a slower pace. The findings and considerations in this report apply to both part-time and full-time students, unless stated otherwise.

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

Within spatial planning as a discipline, the increasing complexity in the way our urban areas are functioning is reflected in growing attention being paid to dealing with global societal challenges. These include climate change, sustainable development, smart city and smart governance, and the energy transition in both the global North and South. Although sustainability is part of the profile, the link between sustainability and land use and transport could be emphasized more. In addition, consideration could be given to contemplating how the profile of reflection on the planning practice might be reinforced by integrating a deeper understanding of planning and design practice in the courses. In the light of these ongoing challenges, the master's programme Spatial Planning aims at teaching students to apply solutions to complex planning problems in different research or policy contexts, training the ability to integrate knowledge and insights from different disciplines into one's own knowledge base and the ability to develop a critical academic attitude. The programme builds on the competences learned at the bachelor's level with regard to theory, methodology, and professional and research skills in spatial planning. It has four central aims. Students are challenged to develop 1) in-depth theoretical insights into spatial planning, 2) appropriate research skills to investigate spatial issues, 3) a critical attitude to reflect upon spatial development within the political and societal context, and 4) substantive and process-oriented knowledge and skills to handle complex spatial issues and challenges in an appropriate way. The content of the programme is strongly embedded in the current international literature, which is supported by teaching staff being actively engaged in academic research in the Urban Futures research institute.

According to the panel, the programme followed the recommendations in the previous assessment report to improve its profile, which is now broader and puts explicit focus on its research orientation. The panel is of the opinion that the programme has a clear focus on reflection on planning practice,



and it observes a shift in the programme from a mainly process-oriented approach to a better balance between process and object orientation. This is also appreciated by the students, who consider the close connection between academic and professional aspects a positive feature of the programme.

Intended learning outcomes

The Domain-Specific Framework of Reference (DSFR) for the Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain in the Netherlands was updated for this review by the four participating universities offering educational programmes in Human Geography and Planning. The panel was pleased to note that the programme makes use of the Dutch framework in formulating its ILOs. A total of twelve intended learning outcomes (ILOs) were defined in five categories (see Appendix 2). These categories are:

1. Students can analyse spatial planning problems with scientific methods;
2. Students can use existing knowledge and theories to find solutions;
3. Students can critically reflect on sustainable spatial development;
4. Students understand the governance and management of cities;
5. Students can independently apply their academic knowledge and skills.

The panel determined that the ILOs are academically oriented and at a master's level. Furthermore, they comply with the Dublin descriptors, and the level of the programme is clearly advanced. The ILOs specifically put emphasis on the capability to develop and apply solutions to complex spatial planning problems in different disciplines, incorporating information into one's own knowledge base, and the ability to develop a critical academic attitude. In its profile the spatial planning programme explicitly includes a focus on critical reflection on sustainable spatial development, which is found in the ILOs. Also, the ILOs have a strong focus on developing theoretical, methodological and empirical-analytical knowledge and skills. The programme is currently undergoing certification by the Association of European Schools of Spatial Planning (AESOP). According to the panel, the revised set of ILOs fits the updated profile well. A specifically impressive ILO is the one on integrating knowledge and skills through project-based settings throughout the curriculum. The panel does advise reconsidering the order and structure of the ILOs. Currently, it does not see a clear structure, and therefore some overlap is visible.

Proposed name change

At the time of the site visit, the programme had two CROHO names, one in Dutch (Planologie) and one in English (Spatial Planning). Taking the international profile and English as the medium of instruction into consideration, the programme prefers to use only the English name. The panel understands this motivation and agrees with it. It verified that no changes in the curriculum are made as a result of the proposed name. It considers the proposed name change to be adequate and should be approved for the master's programme Spatial Planning.

Considerations

The master's programme Spatial Planning has a clear profile which is broad, focuses on a research orientation, shows a close connection between academic and professional aspects, and puts an emphasis on sustainability, although the link between sustainability and land use and transport could be stressed more. The ILOs are in line with the Domain-Specific Framework of Reference (DSFR) for the Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain in the Netherlands. They fit the profile well and are in line with the international requirements regarding the level and orientation of an academic master's programme. The panel recommends reconsidering the order and structure of the ILOs. The panel concludes that the proposed name Spatial Planning is fitting with the aims and content of the programme. It therefore judges positively on the proposed name change.

Conclusion

Master's programme Spatial Planning: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

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*

The one-year (60 EC) master's programme Spatial Planning is divided into four periods (for an overview of the curriculum, see Appendix 3). After the review in 2013, the curriculum was restructured to allow for electives and a more consistent build-up of the programme. The structure of the curriculum aims at a general progression from knowledge acquisition to knowledge integration and application, allowing for a clear learning line throughout the programme.

The first semester is devoted to five distinctive courses offering theory, methods, object- and process-oriented courses. The courses are *Beyond Planning Theory* (7.5 EC), *Planning for Sustainable Cities* (7.5 EC), *Urban Governance* (5 EC), *Research Methods* (5 EC) and an elective (5 EC). Students can choose one of six electives. The courses in the first semester constitute the basis for the second semester, when the students write their master's thesis (30 EC). In the second semester additional activities are organised, such as several Return Days as an integral and compulsory part of the thesis process. The Return Days are intended to keep track of the thesis progress and to stimulate community building and exchange with the labour market during the second semester. In addition to a kick-off meeting, a mini-symposium is organised as well as a wrap-up meeting. Another noteworthy aspect is the development of a collaboration with the Copernicus institute which – according to the panel – provides a lot of potential for the programme. With regard to all the master's programmes assessed in Utrecht University, the panel is of the opinion that more attention should be paid to ecological aspects of sustainability and GIS/cartography. Ample attention is paid to this in the electives, but the panel believes that more attention can be devoted to these subjects in the core of the programme. Although the major part of the curriculum consists of mandatory courses, the students have some freedom of choice. In addition to the elective, they can choose their own topics for research assignments in several courses.

The students informed the panel that they appreciate the curriculum, specifically the attention given to practical aspects (professional skills) as well as to theory, methodology and academic skills. The guest lectures are appreciated, but students would also like more field trips or excursions. A previously organised skills-oriented assignment with a consultancy firm was a success, but unfortunately discontinued. Regardless of the reason for the discontinuation, the panel recommends looking for a replacement as it was highly appreciated by the students. The students told the panel that most of them want to use qualitative research methodology in their thesis. They consider themselves well trained in that. Although it is also possible to do quantitative research in the thesis project, the supervisory capacity in this field is limited.

All courses are subject to standard course evaluation and subsequent reflection by the course coordinator on the outcomes. This often leads to adjustments (minor) of the courses. An appendix to the self-evaluation report provides the connection between the course objectives, the ILOs and the Dublin descriptors. Based on this extensive document, the panel concludes that the courses are aligned with the ILOs. In order to form a picture of the course content, it had access to the educational material of a number of courses during the site visit (see Appendix 5). The content and level of the courses the panel looked at in more detail are good. For example, The *Real Estate* course deals with the functioning of different types of real estate markets, in addition to the housing market also retail, office and industry markets. It is precisely because of this that differences and similarities become apparent between the various markets and also in the governments' control of those markets. In addition to reflecting on market analysis, students also perform critical, normative reflection: when is a non-functioning market a social problem? In the *Techniques of futuring* course students learn to apply and critically reflect on different techniques available and on the conceptual perspectives of each of them. The innovative and open approach of academic education and the combination of



theory and hands-on experience ensure that the student is challenged on several fronts. Not only the ideas are taught, but also the connection of ideas to action.

The link with the spatial planning labour market is facilitated in a number of ways, for example through guest lectures, the Return Days and an internship in the spatial planning practice. The view of the staff, students and management is consistent with respect to the professional field of the future. The panel shares this view and refers to it here as planning practice. It thinks that the curriculum is well-structured and appropriate for a master's programme in the spatial sciences. The programme has a clear view of the required development of analytical skills in combination with preparing for a position in the professional field. The first semester provides students with the required knowledge and skills, e.g. theoretical and methodological courses, for doing an internship and thesis project in the second semester. The foreseen shift from a predominantly process-oriented curriculum towards a balance between object and process orientation is good. The panel is positive about this shift, although it needs to be sustained further in the upcoming years.

Master's thesis and internship

The master's thesis is designed to give students an opportunity to conduct a substantial theory- and fieldwork-based individual research project on a preferably self-chosen research topic related to spatial planning. Many students choose to combine the master's thesis with a non-obligatory internship, which is meant to support them during the empirical part of the thesis and prepare them for a professional career after graduation. In these cases, the explicit wishes of the host organisation may also inspire a thesis topic. It is up to the student to find a balance between their own interests, the academic orientation and the practical desires of an internship orientation. The panel is of the opinion that research internships fit well into the research and practice orientation of the programme on the one hand and may also contribute to the student's employability, while on the other, internships (especially prolonged ones) may lead to student delay, one of the reasons why the programme has put a delay reduction policy in place. The students work under the supervision of a senior staff member who supports their thesis research. Daily supervision is often in the hands of the supervisors from the host organisation. The students establish peer-feedback groups that they can consult during the thesis process. Peer-feedback groups define a topic of common interest, which is discussed during the mini-symposium.

Didactic approach, teaching methods and teaching-learning environment

Within the master's programme Spatial Planning, a number of didactic and organisational principles are applied, in line with university and faculty policy. The Utrecht Education Model has four pillars, the first of which is a clear distinction between bachelor's programmes with a broad education and master's programmes with a specialisation. Flexibility and freedom of choice form the second pillar; the students largely determine their own study path. The third pillar is the programme's aim for small-scale education with activating working methods. Finally, the fourth pillar focuses on the professional development of the instructors. The self-evaluation report described how the structure of the programme supports both interactive classroom settings and independence in learning. This is visible through progression from more teacher-led courses in the first semester, in which individual and group work is combined, towards more freedom of choice in the second semester (internship and thesis). Courses in the first semester generally use an interactive classroom setting in which students are engaged in a variety of formats, including lectures, workshops, seminars and tutorials. For example, in the *Beyond Planning Theory* course, the students become equipped to explore answers to theoretical questions – e.g. on justice and ethics – based on small assignments and in an interactive classroom session. In the *Planning for Sustainable Cities* course, guest lectures are used to help students learn to reflect critically and debate on sustainability issues. The organisational structure of the courses results in the students typically spending four days a week on campus. This fosters a strong community feeling in the first semester. Contact in the second semester – both with the teaching staff and other students – is limited as students are required to exercise a considerable degree of independence.

Throughout the interviews during the site visit, the panel noticed a reflective, constructive attitude that is clearly aimed at improvement of the programme. It compliments the programme on this and is confident that this attitude will help the programme to develop further in the coming years.

Internationalisation

Since 2016/17 the master's programme Spatial Planning has been taught entirely in English. The content is increasingly focussed on a global rather than a Dutch view of planning. It also focusses on further internationalisation in the composition of the staff. The choice to teach in English is a step towards an international learning environment that helps students to gain the international and intercultural skills to work in the globalised labour market and reflects the orientation of the programme. It also reflects the increasing presence of international staff in the department and their research activities. The panel is pleased with the developments regarding internationalisation. Despite a number of teething problems in setting up an international classroom, it has great confidence in its further development. The group of students is diverse and heterogenous, and the staff is also becoming increasingly international. The fact that the focus of the future labour market lies within the Dutch context does not seem to hamper internationalisation. The renowned reputation of Dutch planning methods and systems abroad might even be deployed better to recruit more international students. The panel notes that the international context is regularly addressed in the courses, as well as the comparison between the different international perspectives.

Enrolment, admission, supervision and study ability

An Admissions Committee evaluates the applications based on multiple factors, including whether the candidate possesses a relevant bachelor's degree in geography or planning, a motivation letter and the average grade. For students with a different bachelor's degree than Human Geography and Planning at Utrecht University (UU), the Admissions Committee determines if the student has to do a pre-master's programme (typically 30 or 60 EC). The master's programme Spatial Planning has a mixed influx of students. Figures from 2018-2019 show influx from the department's bachelor's programme (38%), other UU bachelor's programmes (8%) or a geography/planning degree from a different Dutch university (21%), and students with a different background (13% of which is international). The influx is steady at around 30 students per year. The success rates are still low compared to other master's programmes in the department. According to the teaching staff, this is partly due to the position of the internship at the end of the curriculum in combination with a labour market with a high demand for graduates. The students tend to include the summer in their internship and are often offered a job by the internship provider. To improve the success rates with respect to duration, the programme included the research design of the master's thesis into the research methodology course. And as a result of introducing a strict delay protocol, study delay has decreased over the past year. The self-evaluation report described this protocol to address delay and enlarge awareness about graduating in time. It specifically focusses on the duration of the thesis (in combination with the internship), which should be completed by the end of the second semester. If not, the programme uses the protocol that involves close contact with the student. The panel appreciates the active way of dealing with students who are at risk of a delay exceeding six months.

Teaching staff

The teaching staff comprises both young and more experienced members, including three full professors. All senior staff members are active in both teaching and research in the department-wide research programme Urban Futures. The diversity of the staff is increasing. Moreover, all staff members actively engage in international academic debates on the wider themes of sustainability, governance and urbanisation. For these themes they have a joint interest in and focus on the spatial planner's orientation on changing actor constellations and institutional transformations in cities. The quality of the staff's research is indicated by a significant number of publications in international peer-reviewed journals with an above-average impact factor in the field as well as obtained research grants. All staff members have a Basic Teaching Qualification (*Basis Kwalificatie Onderwijs*, BKO) or are in the process of obtaining one. Additionally, two staff members have a Senior Teaching Qualification (SKO), and one is in the process of obtaining one. The department pays sufficient attention to professionalisation of the teaching staff, and the panel is impressed by the high



percentage of staff members with a SKO (32%). The research of staff members is closely connected to the master's programme, and the quality of research of the teaching staff is good according to the panel. The staff-student ratio decreased over the assessment period from 1:40 in 2012/13 to 1:36 in 2017/18, predominantly as a result of the recruitment of young assistant professors. The share of teaching by tenured staff varies between 50-80%, and the workload is perceived by the staff as high. The causes of the high perceived workload are the fact that lecturers teach in several courses, they are committed to teaching and often spend more time than the hours assigned (which are rather tight), and the challenge of finding a balance between research and teaching. The panel is pleased to notice that the perceived work pressure is recognised by the management of the programme and the faculty. However, it is an issue that should continue to receive attention.

Considerations

According to the panel, the curriculum is well-structured and aims at progression from knowledge acquisition to knowledge integration and application. The students have an adequate freedom of choice in a number of ways, and there are clear links to the spatial planning labour market. The panel is positive about the shift from process orientation to a better balance between object and process orientation and encourages the programme to continue this development. The quality of the courses is good, and the relation between the course objectives, ILOs and the Dublin descriptors demonstrates that the curriculum enables the students to achieve the ILOs. The programme offers a variety of teaching methods that stimulate active learning. The panel compliments the programme on its reflective and constructive attitude. Internationalisation is developing at a good pace and aims to support students better in preparing for a labour market that is still oriented to the Netherlands, but becoming more and more internationally oriented. All teaching staff members combine research and teaching and are qualified in both. The faculty pays appropriate attention to professionalisation of the teaching staff. The perceived work pressure is high, but the panel finds that the faculty is paying sufficient attention to this subject. The lecturers are also actively looking for solutions to reduce the workload. In conclusion, the panel finds that the programme offers students a teaching-learning environment that enables them to achieve the ILOs.

Conclusion

Master's programme Spatial Planning: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

System of assessment

All master's programmes in the department follow the UU PDCA cycle. In the past period the department has systematised and improved the assessment and grading system, which includes the development of an elaborated Assessment Plan. This plan covers the complete implementation of the assessment policy at the curriculum and course levels, and shows the relationship between the learning objectives of the courses and the ILOs of the programme. In addition, each course has an assessment matrix that shows how the course-level learning objectives are assessed. The course coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the course is assessed in accordance with the requirements of validity, reliability and transparency. The panel finds that the Assessment Plan, which consists of the course matrices, provides insight into the assessment of the final attainment levels of the programme. It is also evident that all the ILOs in the curriculum are covered and adequately assessed. Before the start of each course, the students are informed about the assessment method, the rules for participation and the conditions for resits. In line with the Utrecht Education Model, the programmes apply a system of continuous assessment. The final grade for a course does not depend on one final exam but on at least two assessment moments and includes the grades for several types of assessment, such as take-home assignments, presentations, group seminars and intermediate tests. According to the self-evaluation report, the programme chooses to offer a mixture between

individual and group assignments, as it acknowledges the need for graduates to be able to work both individually and in teams, which is common practice in the labour market. An example of mixed assignments is found in the *Urban Governance* course in which students do a book review, policy brief assignment, and a tender/bid for an external organisation.

Students informed the panel that they are in general positive about the quality of assessment, and this confirms the information from the student chapter. They appreciate the diversity in assessment and the assessment of group projects. They were critical, however, about the assessment of one specific course that focussed strongly on knowledge replication rather than application. This was a new course in which a number of start-up problems were identified. The panel established that the teaching staff are collaborating to tackle the issue and improve the course. It is confident that given its quality culture, the programme will solve these problems the next time the course is given.

Quality assurance of assessment

The faculty-wide Board of Examiners plays the role of internal supervisor of the quality of examinations. It guarantees the quality of assessment in various ways, such as random checking of the quality of an assessment. As a result of the previous assessment report, a number of points were addressed, such as the implementation of the faculty's assessment policy and the safeguarding of the quality of the theses. At the request of the Board of Examiners, a Committee of Assessment carries out test analyses (or has them carried out) and submits its conclusions. The selection of courses for which examinations are assessed is partly random and partly based on lecturer and/or student evaluations. The Director of Education has overall responsibility to implement and monitor all measures that assure the quality of the programmes, courses and assessments. The panel thinks that the establishment of a Committee of Assessment is a good development and was pleased to notice that this committee is giving advice to the Board of Examiners, which is (and considers itself) ultimately responsible for assuring the quality of assessment. The Board of Examiners verifies the quality of the theses every other year by checking the quality of the thesis and the assessment form of a random selection of theses.

Assessment of the master's thesis

The master's thesis is considered the ultimate test of whether a student merits a master's degree. The thesis is assessed by the supervisor and a second reader (staff member). For the assessment, a standardised grade sheet (based on a rubric) is used. The panel reviewed the procedure of thesis assessment and is of the opinion that the rubric is used consistently. The teaching staff informed the panel that the first and second examiners usually independently fill out an assessment form. Subsequently, the supervisor fills out the final assessment form in collaboration with the second examiner, then the supervisor communicates the outcome to the student. Although the comments and assessment of the second examiner are not separately specified on the assessment form, the panel thinks that the procedure allows for an independent assessment by the second examiner. However, it is of the opinion that the independent assessment procedure should be clearly documented, i.e. the assessment form should show the assessment of both examiners. The panel did notice that written comments were sometimes very brief and thinks they could be elaborated more, specifically in cases of high and low marks. Students and alumni informed the panel that to them the procedure of assessment was clear, regular meetings with the supervisor are informative, and the feedback (both written and oral) is appreciated. The panel appreciates the use of a rubric, as it assures a reliable and valid assessment of the theses. At the same time, use of a rubric entails the risk that aspects relating to content, such as relevance, coherence and creativity, will be overlooked in the assessment. The panel recommends not neglecting these aspects in the thesis assessment. The panel reviewed a sample of the theses and found that, in general, the master's theses are validly and reliably assessed. The final grade by the panel was in all cases similar to that on the assessment form (less than one grade difference).

Considerations

The increased attention paid by the programme and faculty to a systematic method of assessment and associated quality assurance has led to a good system of assessment. The students are informed



about and are actively involved in the assessment by means of providing peer-feedback. The programme uses a wide variety of assessment methods, and the final assessment of a course is always based on multiple assessment moments. The thesis assessment is appropriate, with a clear and independent assessment by the second examiner. However, the assessment form should clearly show the independent assessment of both examiners. The manner in which the thesis is assessed is adequately organised. The panel agreed with the grades given by the supervisor and second examiner. It points out that the sometimes limited amount of written feedback on the assessment forms could be improved. The Board of Examiners and the quality assurance system are functioning properly, and the panel notes that the Board of Examiners has taken important steps in the past period, for example the implementation of the faculty's assessment policy. The panel concludes that the assessment is sufficiently reliable, valid and transparent.

Conclusion

Master's programme Spatial Planning: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Achieved learning outcomes

Prior to its site visit, the panel studied a sample of 15 recent master's theses. Without exception, they sufficiently demonstrated, in its view, that the graduates realise the ILOs. The self-evaluation report mentioned that the top 10% of the master's theses is leading to academic and/or professional joint publications with supervising staff or national or international conference presentations. Overall, the panel was impressed by the quality of the theses it read, specifically those with high grades. The theses clearly argued the relevance of the topic to the field of spatial planning. Use of methodology and analysis were good, and both qualitative and quantitative research methodology was used by students. The panel also appreciated the use of mixed methods that it observed in a number of theses. Critical points it found related to the fact that the practical and planning approach sometimes limited the scientific relevance. Also, some theses were a bit descriptive, or the theoretical framework was too general.

Labour market

In the self-evaluation report the opportunities for graduates on the labour market are considered to be excellent. In addition to 20% of graduates already having a job by the time of graduation, another 50% manages to find a job within three months. Within a year after graduation, 90% or more has found a job at the proper level. Graduates work most often as a consultant, trainee, researcher or project leader, mostly at consultancy agencies (30%). About 40% is employed in the public/governmental sector, and the remaining 30% is scattered over other institutions, including NGOs or teaching/research organisations. Some students, typically one or two per year, continue to do a part-time, external PhD project alongside their regular employment in a professional organisation. The self-evaluation report mentioned that when looking at the network contacts between staff members and representatives of the planning practice, there are many recurring offers for internships from the professional field each year.

Alumni are of the opinion that the research and professional skills prepared them well for the labour market. The programme has invested in more involvement of alumni, for example inviting them for Return Days, at which they are invited to give a presentation about their current position. The programme is working furthermore on making more explicit the activities it organises to prepare students for their professional career. The panel is pleased with the attention the programme has paid to preparing students for the labour market.

Considerations

The panel reviewed a random selection of theses produced by graduates of the Spatial Planning programme, which sufficiently demonstrated that they had realised the ILOs. Attention to the labour market is good, and the employability of the graduates is very good. Based on the selection of master's theses, the alumni survey and interviews with alumni during the site visit, the panel concludes that the students realise the ILOs as formulated by the programme.

Conclusion

Master's programme Spatial Planning: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel's judgement on standards 1, 2, 3 and 4 for the master's programme Spatial Planning at Utrecht University is 'meets the standard'. Therefore, according to the rules of the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders, the general and final judgement is positive.

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *master's programme Spatial Planning* as 'positive'.



APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain in the Netherlands

The current domain-specific reference framework confines itself to a substantive description of the two core disciplines, in combination with the general expectations regarding the competencies of graduates. Therefore, it is a more concise document than the previous (2012) one. The exit qualifications for bachelor and master programmes are no longer included, partly because the Dublin descriptors already provide an adequate general description of the desired scientific level, but also to give the programmes taking part in the reaccreditation ample opportunity to demonstrate their own specific profile in their self-studies.

The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain is very broad and diverse, and the different academic programmes within the Netherlands highlight different elements. They vary, for example, in the balance between scientific and professional training, degree of research intensity, degree of integration between the two core disciplines, opportunities to specialize, and types of specialization offered. This domain-specific reference framework emphasizes the common features applying to all programmes.

The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain revolves around the complex relationship between people (society) and their environment (space). There are five qualities that determine the mind set of geographers and planners. First of all, the ability to think from a time-space perspective, these being the two dimensions within which human action unfolds. Secondly, the ability to study the relation between people and environment in the context of intertwined spatial scale levels (local, regional, national, global). Insight into socio-spatial transformations is gained by studying the interaction between these scale levels (the multi-scalar perspective), without making prior assumptions about the dominance of any one level (e.g. the global level) over another (e.g. the local level). Thirdly, the mind set of geographers and planners is based on the idea that space and society closely interact and shape each other. Human actions, and the behavioural patterns that develop in the course of time (institutions), crystallize in space, while conversely, spatial structures and place-related features trigger and shape human actions. A fourth quality relates to the strong multidisciplinary orientation in the work of geographers and planners; relationships between humans and their environment are studied from a range of mutually supplementary disciplinary perspectives. The precise combinations chosen, depend on the nature of the socio-spatial problems being studied and will vary per programme within the domain. Finally, the fifth quality is closely linked with all the above: the integrative character of the geographical and planning approach. This crux is an ambition to understand the mutual cohesion between economic, social, cultural and political phenomena and processes within their specific spatial contexts.

Key terms in the domain are space, place, location, scale, networks, linkages, spatial behaviour, place attachment, spatial quality, spatial design and spatial interventions. Within the domain socio-spatial problems are taken as starting points of scientific inquiry. These issues include spatial inequality, globalization, migration, segregation, diversity and identity, environmental burden, sustainable area development, mobility and governance. The aim is not only to make critical analyses of the issues concerned, but also to design plans and interventions that may solve or reduce socio-spatial dilemmas.

The international and comparative character of studying the relation between people and environment is inherent to the Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning disciplines. Socio-spatial problems, and planned actions to deal with them, are marked by the specific national, regional and local context in which they arise. The significance of the embeddedness of socio-spatial phenomena is the key to Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning. However, awareness of the importance of context does not imply that the disciplines are merely the sum of an endless series of case-studies. The ambition is to identify the international similarities and differences of socio-spatial processes and developments, in order to unravel both their unique and generic aspects. Both facets are typical of the quest of Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning to



formulate theories (explanation in context). To emphasize this international, comparative character, teaching does not focus solely on the Netherlands. And when studying Dutch cases, the international importance and international suitability of the theoretical perspectives and research angles developed will always be considered. Continuing on from this, the composition of staff and students in all the Dutch programmes in the domain is becoming increasingly diverse (in many ways). The 'international classroom' being introduced in more and more programmes, facilitates and reinforces the international-comparative orientation of both disciplines.

The Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning domain has evolved in close cohesion with the other social sciences. While it shares important qualities with the latter - such as attention for formulating theory and the need for rigid methodology - it is also distinct by emphasizing particular qualities. The strong empirical orientation, apparent in the importance attached to primary data collection and fieldwork, is a typical feature of our domain. Furthermore, 'learning by doing' has become an important part of all programmes, partly because it enhances sensitivity to the time and place (context)-bound character of social, cultural, political and economic phenomena and developments. Geographers and planners are constantly challenged to step outside the comfort zone of their own field. Finally, research within the domain has increasingly opened up for a wide spectrum of methods and techniques. This methodological pluralism corresponds with the choice to study socio-spatial problems at various scale levels, which precludes a standard method of analysis.

Human Geography and Urban and Regional Planning graduates are able to identify, analyse and explain socio-spatial problems, based on and contributing to the 'body of knowledge' adhering to the discipline. They are also fully conversant with general social-scientific methods and techniques, as well as more domain-specific research methods, such as GIS and spatial impact analysis. The Bachelor's programmes do this, in line with the basic level of the Dublin descriptors, by laying a broad scientific foundation in the two core disciplines, while the Master's programmes train students, again following the Dublin framework, at a theoretically and methodologically more advanced and specialist level.

The programmes under consideration prepare students for a variety of professions and sectors. Typical jobs include researcher, teacher/lecturer, consultant, policy official and project manager. A common characteristic of staff qualified in Human Geography and/or Urban and Regional Planning is their inclination for a comprehensive approach to problems, and their ability to create awareness on the spatial diversity of societal problems. Students with a specialist Master's degree often find themselves in professions directly connected with their specialism, such as spatial planning, area development, urban policy, construction and housing, regional policy, traffic and transport management or environmental policy. The self-studies of the individual degree programmes will inform more specifically on the professions and sectors in which graduates work.

The domain-specific framework of reference (DSFR) has been formulated by the national disciplinary meeting (Disciplineoverleg Geografie en Planologie). The former DSFR has been adjusted, i.e. updated and shortened by omitting the concrete exit qualifications for bachelor and master. The participating programmes have been able to comment on the draft. It has been laid down during the meeting on 6 September 2018.

APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Master's programme Spatial Planning

A1 Students can analyse spatial problems with scientific methods

This involves helping students to develop an advanced academic attitude and to acquire knowledge and skills in their chosen specialisation by offering an interactive learning environment inspired by the field of specialisation and the research activities of lecturers. This entails providing students with:

- a. a critical attitude towards academic research and debate and an awareness of the role and use of academic geographical knowledge in society
- b. knowledge and understanding of the research frontiers in spatial planning as well as their applications in society;
- c. research skills (advanced methods and techniques) for carrying out research in spatial planning.

A2 Students can use existing knowledge and theories to find solutions

Students learn how to use planning theory purposefully to analyse, develop and support spatial planning in practice and research. Therefore, students learn:

- a. to raise and discuss relevant questions in planning (related to the use of knowledge, market mechanism, ethics, etc.) and explore the answers to these questions;
- b. to conduct literature-based research in the field of spatial planning;
- c. to discuss academic arguments and theories in order to systematically and self-reliantly inquire into a certain planning topic;
- d. to evaluate and prioritise alternative spatial development options.

A3 Students can critically reflect on sustainable spatial development

Students discuss the sustainable development of cities and regions and develop skills to critically assess how sustainable certain spatial development practices are. Therefore, students:

- a. enhance their skills in designing and communicating sustainable developments and strategies to govern towards sustainable planned cities;
- b. learn to critically reflect upon sustainable planning literature and sustainable planning practices, both orally and in writing.

A4 Students understand the governance and management of cities

Students learn how planning and governance processes in the urban context work. Therefore, different theoretical perspectives on governance in spatial planning are discussed and the role of governance is analysed in case studies of complex spatial projects in the Netherlands and abroad. In this, the current attention to smart cities and smart governance is also explicitly considered. Students learn to:

- a. critically reflect upon current dilemmas and conflicts in scientific and societal debates related to the differentiated and complex nature of governance networks in spatial planning;
- b. enhance their skills in collectively designing and communicating spatial project and process management strategies for addressing complex spatial challenges in planning practice.

A5 Students can independently apply their academic knowledge and skills

Students prove their ability to apply the academic knowledge and skills acquired during the Master's study to specific spatial planning problems in an independent and self-responsible way.

APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Structure of the curriculum:

Period 1 (Sep-Nov)	Beyond Planning Theory (7.5 EC)		Planning for Sustainable Cities (7.5 EC)
Period 2 (Nov-Feb)	Research Methods (5 EC)	Urban Governance (5 EC)	Elective course (5 EC)
Period 3-4 (Feb-Jun)	Master's thesis + internship, Return Days (total 30 EC)		

In Period 2, students can opt for one of the following 5 EC elective courses:

- Real Estate
- Healthy cities
- Urban heritage
- Migration, mobilities and sustainable futures
- Techniques of futuring: imagining the city of the future
- Urban infrastructures

APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

DAY 0		Monday - 20 May 2019
16:30	18:00	Arrival of panel at the hotel, internal meeting (NVAO assessment framework, preliminary findings, preparation)
18:30	21:00	Dinner (panel meeting)
DAY 1		Tuesday - 21 May 2019
08:30	09:00	Arrival of panel / Welcome (with a short presentation at 8:45)
09:00	11:00	Internal meeting (ECA assessment framework, preliminary findings, preparation) and documentation review
11:00	12:30	Meeting with management (all programmes; 15 min. per programme and 15 min. ECA Frameworks, initial findings, preparation)
12:30	14:00	Lunch / internal meeting / consultation hour (13:15-13:45)
14:00	14:45	Meeting with students MSc Development Studies (including PC staff member) - last 15 min. ECA
14:45	15:30	Meeting with teaching staff MSc Development Studies (including PC staff member) - last 15 min. ECA
15:30	16:00	Internal meeting / break
16:00	16:45	Meeting with staff responsible for international(isation) activities
16:45	17:15	<i>Optional:</i> virtual tour through the building (including internationalisation facilities and digital learning environment)
17:15	18:00	Meeting with MSc Development Studies alumni and external stakeholders
18:00	18:30	Collecting preliminary findings
18:30	19:00	Travelling to the restaurant
19:00	21:00	Dinner (panel meeting)
DAY 2		Wednesday - 22 May 2019
08:30	09:00	Arrival and preparation
09:00	09:45	Meeting with BSc Sociale Geografie en Planologie students and alumni (including PC student)
09:45	10:30	Meeting with BSc Sociale Geografie en Planologie teaching staff (including PC staff member)
10:30	11:00	Internal meeting
11:00	11:30	Meeting with MSc Human Geography students (including PC student)
11:30	12:00	Meeting with MSc Human Geography teaching staff (including PC staff member)
12:00	12:45	Lunch / internal meeting
12:45	13:15	Meeting with MSc Spatial Planning students (including PC student)
13:15	13:45	Meeting with MSc Spatial Planning teaching staff (including PC staff member)
13:45	15:00	Collecting preliminary findings and preparing the next sessions



15:00	15:30	Meeting with MSc GIMA students (including PC student)
15:30	16:00	Meeting with MSc GIMA teaching staff (including PC staff member)
16:00	16:30	Collecting preliminary findings and internal meeting
16:30	17:30	Meeting with alumni MSc Human Geography, MSc Spatial Planning, MSc GIMA
17:30	18:00	Travelling to the restaurant
18:00	21:00	Dinner (panel meeting)
DAY 3 Thursday - 23 May 2019		
08:45	9:00	Arrival and preparation
09:00	9:30	Internal meeting
9:30	10:30	Meeting with Board of Examiners and Student Advisers all programmes
10:30	11:00	Internal meeting
11:00	12:00	Final interview with management
12:00	13:45	Lunch and deliberations panel, formulating preliminary findings and conclusions NVAO framework
13:45	14:15	Deliberations panel, formulating preliminary findings and conclusions ECA framework
14:15	14:45	Feedback of preliminary findings and conclusions
14:45	15:00	Break
15:00	16:00	Development dialogue
16:00	16:30	Departure

APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied fifteen theses of the master's programme Spatial Planning. 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):

1. Orientation to the professional field and alumni
 - Alumni newsletters
 - Arbeidsmarktmonitor
 - Orientation to the professional field by students
2. Bachelor board
 - Meeting documents 2018/17/16
3. Assessment forms bachelor and master
4. Course archive Ba/Ma 2017-2018 & 2018-2019
5. Diverse
 - Handboek Academische Vaardigheden NL-ENG
 - Docentenhandleiding SGPSL 2018-2019 NL-ENG
 - Overzicht bijeenkomsten Broodje Onderwijs 2018-2019
6. Board of Examiners
 - Centrale examencommissie Geowetenschappen
 - Kamer examencommissie SGPL
 - Toetscommissie
 - Reglement examencommissie UGB & GB
7. Kwaliteitszorg
 - Cursusmatrijzen
 - Instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg UU
 - Rapportage toetscommissie
8. Toetsplannen
 - MT Academic School – mastercoördinatoren overleg
 - Vergaderstukken 2018
 - Vergaderstukken 2017
 - Vergaderstukken 2016
9. Nationale Studenten Enquête
 - NSE 2018/17
10. OER 2018-2019 Ba/Ma
11. Onderwijsdag
 - Programma en overige informatie 2019/18/17
12. Opleidingscommissies
13. Stage (internship) Ba/Ma
 - Studiewijzer en formulieren stage bachelor 2018-2019
 - Course manual Internship IDS 2018-2019
 - Course manual Internship Human Geography 2018-2019
 - Course manual Internship Spatial Planning 2018-2019
 - Overzicht stage via Geobaan 2017, 2018

