

LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

ERASMUS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM

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: Q0696.EUR

© 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 BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF ERASMUS UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	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	7
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	11
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	17
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF SMALL-SCALE AND INTENSIVE EDUCATION	29
APPENDICES	43
APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE	45
APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	47
APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	51
APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	53
APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED.....	55

This report was finalised on 29 March 2019





REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES OF ERASMUS 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:	50393
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Location(s):	Rotterdam
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Expiration of accreditation:	01/01/2020

The visit of the assessment panel Liberal Arts and Sciences to Erasmus University College of Erasmus University Rotterdam took place on 5 - 6 November 2018.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Erasmus University Rotterdam
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 Erasmus University, 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 BSc 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, Assistant Professor at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and external lecturer at 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
- I.(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) Ouweland, 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.

The project coordinator attended all site visits, briefed all panel members and read and commented on draft versions of each report in order to monitor the consistency of the assessments and the resulting reports. Calibration of the assessments took place between the core panel members at several moments during, between and after the various site visits.

Erasmus 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 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. 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;
- Dr. A. (Alyssa) Schneebaum, Assistant Professor at Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU Wien) and external lecturer at Universität Wien (Austria);
- M. (Maya) Ouwehand, bachelor's student of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Utrecht University [student member];

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, Prof. dr. Th.L.M. Engelen and prof. dr. M.M.T.A Brus) headed the assessment of the Distinctive Feature. The practice-based assessment took place on 5-6 November 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 Erasmus University College, 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 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 fifteen theses and the accompanying assessment forms for the programme, based on a provided list with 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 was 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 4 for the definitive schedule.

Site visit

The site visit to Erasmus University College took place from 5-6 November 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 assessment.

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 materials 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 reports to the university in order to have these 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

Standard 1

EUC has a clear mission: to educate students to become critical world citizens. This aim and the set-up of the programme are evidently in line with a liberal arts and sciences philosophy. According to the panel, the programme has a few distinctive features: it is embedded in the highly international and multicultural city of Rotterdam, it has a diverse student body, it uses problem-based learning, and has an interesting double degree option as well as the option to follow a pre-medical major. The panel is of the opinion that EUC can emphasise these distinctive features better in its profile and intended learning outcomes (for instance, what does the urban setting contribute to the programme and the other way around?) as a means to demarcate its position among the other University Colleges more clearly. The intended learning outcomes meet the requirements of the discipline and correspond to the Dublin descriptors at academic bachelor's level. The intended learning outcomes are, in general, relatively clear, but could be better phrased by matching the formulation of the learning goals to the way that these goals are assessed in the programme. The panel advises the programme to further refine the ILOs.

Standard 2

EUC has clearly matured over the years under consideration. Student numbers have risen considerably and EUC has worked hard to broaden its curriculum and extend the courses on offer. EUC's curriculum is in line with a liberal arts education. The curriculum has a strong academic core, with nine academic core courses ensuring that all students acquire a minimum level of knowledge and (qualitative and quantitative) research skills across the disciplines. The panel also values the broad choice of majors, including interdepartmental and custom-made majors, and the flexibility that these majors provide for the students. The number of options in economics has been strengthened, in line with earlier recommendations. In general, courses deal with interesting, often current problems and have varied assignments/assessment with clear instructions. The level of the courses overall matches the intended level. The panel recommends further linking the course objectives to the programme's intended learning outcomes, for example by using Bloom's Taxonomy to indicate the level of the learning goal. Staff members mentioned during the site visit that students' interdisciplinary skills could be further challenged beyond the academic core. The panel agrees with this view and sees in this example evidence of EU's development-oriented drive. All in all, the panel concludes that EUC offers a challenging and stimulating curriculum for students of good quality, with plenty of choice.

EUC's didactical format (problem-based learning) connects well with the aims of the programme; it is small-scale, demands active participation from the students, encourages self-directed learning, and creates a challenging and interactive teaching-learning environment. The panel likes how EUC tries to maximise the exchange of ideas in the tutorials. It also appreciates how teachers/tutors are specifically trained in guiding PBL-sessions. As some courses are better served with other didactical approaches, the panel agrees with using a variety of didactical approaches from the second year onwards. It appreciates the programme's flexibility in its implementation of its leading didactical approach. According to the panel, EUC's staff members have the necessary expertise to deliver the programme, together with EUC fellows and tutors. Students are very enthusiastic about their teachers and rated their support as outstanding. The panel also found the staff dedicated to the programme and its educational format.

The panel considers EUC's curriculum, staff, flexible implementation of its didactical approach and good facilities all evidence of EUC's inspiring and challenging learning environment of good quality. EUC's support system has been functioning well over the period under consideration, students are enthusiastic about the programme and extensively praise their teaching staff for their attention to detail and tailor-made advice, often freely given in an informal setting. Some challenges to this strong teaching-learning environment lay ahead, especially with respect to EUC's faculty and advisory system. Currently, career advancement options for staff members are limited. In the future, this may influence the existing teaching-learning environment. The panel is therefore



pleased that EUC is well aware of the staff's concerns and that the management tries to create further opportunities. In the light of EUC's rapid growth, it is also important not to overburden staff members, to set clear boundaries and to communicate clearly about the types of support available. The panel strongly advises EUC to continue developing its current advisory system. In its view, students would also benefit from knowing how much support they may reasonably expect. The panel learnt during the site visit that the management is aware of these challenges, listens to student feedback and reflects on the functioning of its current advisory system, including career advice. Therefore, the panel trusts EUC to develop further its advisory system in the coming years, paying attention to academic advisory and other support needs.

Standard 3

Assessment at EUC is of satisfactory quality, and its assessment system has both strong features and some areas for improvement. The panel concludes that EUC has a good assessment policy in place. It was impressed with the extensive way in which EUC's assessment policy describes assessment and creates clear and consistent guidelines for examiners. The panel also appreciates the transparency and clarity of using three pre-defined assessment formats within the courses and the use of an exam grading tool and assessment matrix in the courses. It does recommend coupling the course objectives to the programme's intended learning outcomes.

Work remains to be done to further improve the transparency of the assessment procedure for the capstone. EUC has recently introduced a double blind procedure in which the first supervisor and the second reader only contact each other to establish the final grade after they have decided on the grades independently. The panel considered this an important improvement. It also concluded that the Examination Board needs additional support for the coming years. Even though the Board fulfilled its legal requirements in the period under consideration for this programme assessment, it often relies on other parties to verify whether its procedures are followed. This system guaranteed the proper functioning of the assessment system in a sufficient manner for as long as EUC was small and the lines of communication were direct. Now that EUC has grown into a college of over 500 students, the limits of this system have been reached and the reliability of the assessment system is becoming vulnerable. This is acknowledged by the Examination Board and the management, who work hard to address these issues with limited resources. The panel recommends to continue professionalising EUC's assessment. It supports the Examination Board's wish to establish an Assessment Committee that can help the Examination Board with various dedicated tasks under the Board's responsibility.

Standard 4

On the basis of the selected theses, its meeting with alumni and with the programme management, the panel concludes that graduates reach the programme's intended learning outcomes. Alumni find their way into – sometimes very selective – master's programmes, both in the Netherlands and abroad. 30% choose to work, volunteer or do an internship. The panel suggests keeping track of EUC graduates' future career.

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	satisfactory
General conclusion	satisfactory

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: 29 March 2019

*Summary judgment Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education**Standard A*

The panel concludes that EUC's intended learning outcomes are well in line with a liberal arts education. They aim for students to reach depth and breadth in their curriculum, but also have a broader aim: to help student develop into critical world citizens. The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes meet the requirements of the discipline and correspond to the Dublin descriptors at academic bachelor's level. The intended learning outcomes are, in general, relatively clear, but could be phrased more concisely by matching their formulation to the course objectives and course assessment. The panel sees this as a matter of further fine-tuning, rather than of complete revision.

Standard B

The panel has seen convincing evidence of EUC's curriculum tied to relevant co- and extracurricular activities. The College has an active student association that offers a wide variety of extracurricular activities and annually evaluates if these still match their members' interests. Taking part in extracurricular activities helps students reach the intended learning outcomes. According to the panel, the number of activities that involve Rotterdam's wider community can be increased.

Standard C

The panel concludes that teaching formats at EUC are small-scale and intensive. Students have at least 15 hours of face-to-face teaching per week, and they play an active role during classes, where they have to take responsibility for their own learning process. According to the panel, a beneficial side effect of PBL is that it helps creating an academic community across the various cohorts and between students and staff. EUC's campus, student association and the EUC Honours Code also contribute to establishing an academic community. The panel found both the students and the staff clearly committed to this community.

Standard D

EUC has a good admissions procedure in place. As a result, the programme succeeds in attracting motivated and talented students. The panel commends EUC on its efforts to create a truly international and diverse classroom, and encourages further initiatives to support this goal.

Standard E

The panel concludes that the lecturers have the required academic knowledge and didactic skills to deliver the programme. Staff members are committed to the programme, its didactical format, the LAS approach and the students.

Standard F

The panel concludes that the staff to student ratio at EUC is very low. This fits the didactical approach and enables a good execution of the programme.

Standard G

The panel concludes that the facilities in the EUC's faculty building are well suited to the programme's didactical format. Students start their first year at EUC by living together in the Lucia building, which has state-of-the-art student rooms and common rooms for social activities. EUC's infrastructure helps to establish an academic and social community.

Standard H

The panel considered the level of the theses appropriate for academic bachelor's level. The panel was impressed with the quality of a few theses, which it considered exceptionally good pieces of work for an undergraduate programme. While noting that the success and graduation rates of the programme remain higher than those of bachelor programmes offered at Erasmus University, the panel felt compelled to raise the question of the unusual drop in the completion rates for the cohort 2015-2016. In depth discussion of the issue with the EUC management, staff and students

convinced the panel that this was a temporary aberration and the panel accepted the possible explanations for its occurrence. More importantly, the panel is persuaded that EUC has correctly addressed the issue and that the measures it has taken to ensure significantly higher graduation rates for the future should prove successful. After EUC, students have no difficulties being accepted into high quality master's programmes at universities in the Netherlands and abroad.

Practice-based assessment

With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that EUC meets all standards. In its assessment under Standard B, it paid specific attention to the number of extracurricular activities and the connection between those activities and issues that are specific for Rotterdam, as recommended by the 2012 assessment panel. This panel concludes that EUC now offers a sufficient number of relevant extracurricular activities. Some of them have a clearer connection with the Rotterdam community than others, and the panel suggests increasing the number of extracurricular activities that are aimed at a broader audience and that benefit from EUC's urban setting. From seeing how constructively EUC has responded to suggestions and recommendations by the first assessment visit, the panel is confident that EUC will take this suggestion seriously. The improvement shown, the development plans, and the fact that all criteria meet the standard, result in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature combined with a positive advice regarding the practice-based assessment by the panel.

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: 29 March 2019





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

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

Erasmus University College started in 2013 as the undergraduate honours college of Erasmus University Rotterdam. As a broad Liberal Arts and Sciences college, it aims to provide students with breadth and depth in their academic studies, while preparing them for the challenges of the 21st century. The programme's aim is 'to help students develop into critical world citizens.' EUC has four departments, covering the fields of Economics & Business, Life Sciences, Humanities and Social & Behavioural Sciences. According to the programme's self-evaluation report (SER), apart from specialising within one of these fields, students are encouraged to 'develop themselves scientifically in an interdisciplinary academic environment'. The programme follows a problem-based learning approach. The SER lists five specific skills that students should acquire by working in small workgroups: critical thinking, academic creativity, social abilities, international and intercultural awareness and societal engagement.

In its profile, EUC stresses the importance of its urban environment; it views the city of Rotterdam as a living lab in which much of its education is grounded. EUC participates in a double degree programme with the Rotterdam Arts and Science Lab (RASL). This 5-year programme enables students to combine EUC with a bachelor of music (at Codarts) or a bachelor of arts (at the Willem de Kooning Academy). Upon graduation, students receive two degrees, one from EUC and one from the partner institute. The College also collaborates with Erasmus Medical Centre by offering students the possibility to apply for the Medical Master of Erasmus MC after a one-year premaster programme.

The panel concludes that EUC's main goal is well-tuned to the liberal arts and sciences: to educate 'citizens' of the world. The programme has a clear academic orientation, as evidenced in its intended learning outcomes. The panel appreciates the academic and creative freedom that EUC offers its students, for instance in the double degree programme where students can combine their scientific and artistic talents, and in the pre-medical major, which prepares students for a Master of Science in Medicine. However, the panel also thinks that EUC could rearticulate its future goals and demarcate its position among the other university colleges more clearly. The panel agrees with the programme management that this, among other things, can be achieved by 'intensifying the connection and relationship with the city of Rotterdam', a highly international and multicultural environment that is, indeed, very suitable as a 'living lab'. At the moment, the programme has not been specific enough about how EUC benefits from being situated in the heart of Rotterdam. The panel also thinks the programme could emphasise its didactical approach (see section 'didactics' in Standard 2) and diverse student body as unique features of this programme.

Intended learning outcomes

EUC has formulated 14 intended learning outcomes (ILOs) by condensing its 24 original ILOs down to 14, by placing more focus on the programme's international nature, and by trying to make the ILOs more easily assessable. A table in the SER links the ILOs to the Dublin Descriptors. The panel has studied the ILOs and concludes that they are generally well formulated and complete; they are in line with the programme's main goals and the Domain-Specific Framework of Reference (DSFR). The ILOs aim for students to reach a certain depth and breadth in their curriculum, but also pay attention to important skills such as the ability to cooperate in a group with members from different backgrounds (ILO11) and to accept social and civic responsibilities (ILO12) as well as the



capacity to reflect on their own and other's conduct in science and society (ILO 14 and ILO4). The panel appreciates the fact that the programme has narrowed the ILOs. It also finds positive that 'reflection' as an intended learning skill is often mentioned in the ILOs.

The panel also saw further room for improvement. It recommends dedicating one ILO explicitly to the Dublin Descriptor learning skills, for example: Graduates are able to make informed and considered choices concerning their personal development and future career. (This was previously covered in ILO21-23). Also, the panel thinks that the phrasing of some ILOs could be more concise. For instance, ILO1 ('Graduates have fundamental academic knowledge of a variety of disciplines represented at the EUR') does not make clear what level is aimed for with 'fundamental knowledge' or which disciplines are included in 'a variety of disciplines'. ILO10 states that students '*should be able to* communicate in written and spoken academic English', whereas the panel regards '*are able to* communicate in academic English' as a better description.

Finally, the panel thinks that, in its current formulation, some of the ILOs are still hard to assess. This is the case for ILO10, ILO6 ("are able to contribute to science *and society* in a constructive way") and ILO12 ('are able to accept social and civic responsibilities and *speak out against prejudice, injustice and the abuse of power*'). The panel thinks that ILO6 could be reached within a dedicated part of the programme, for example by having students do community projects or internships, and that ILO10 and ILO12 could be rephrased in such a way that their formulation matches the manner by which they are assessed. The panel advises the programme to continue refining the ILOs.

Considerations

EUC has a clear mission: to educate students to become critical world citizens. This aim and the set-up of the programme are evidently in line with a liberal arts and sciences philosophy. According to the panel, the programme has a few distinctive features: it is situated in the highly international and multicultural city of Rotterdam, it has a diverse student body, uses problem-based learning, and has an interesting double degree option as well as the option to follow a pre-medical major. The panel is of the opinion that EUC can emphasise these distinctive features better in its profile and intended learning outcomes. It also thinks that the College can further specify the contribution of its urban setting to the programme and the way in which this setting informs EUC's profile and ILOs. This would also demarcate EUC's position among the other University Colleges more clearly.

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes meet the requirements of the discipline and correspond to the Dublin descriptors at academic bachelor's level. The intended learning outcomes are in general relatively clear, but could be better phrased by matching the formulation of the learning goals to the way that these goals are assessed in the programme. The panel advises the programme to continue refining the ILOs.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Liberal Arts and Science: 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

EUC is a three-year, full-time programme, taught in English. At EUC, the academic year is divided into two semesters. Each semester consists of two periods ('quads') of 8 weeks each. Students follow 12 courses a year, 3 courses per quad. Most courses account for 5 EC, with the exception of a minor (15 EC) and the capstone project (15 EC). In the first year, students take 9 mandatory

academic core courses alongside 3 optional courses. The mandatory core courses are 'Big History', 'Brain & Behaviour', 'Economic Behaviour', 'Man & Society' and 'Modernity', and the mandatory skills courses are 'Academic Writing & Presentation', 'Research Methods & Design', 'Basic Statistics' and 'Project Development'.

At the end of the first year, students choose in which of the various majors, offered by the four departments, they wish to specialise. Each major consists of a set of mandatory and optional courses within the department of the major. The major requirements are described in the programme's Course Catalogue, which contains a short description of all courses, plus the level of the course (100, 200 or 300-level) and the prerequisites, if applicable. The department of Economics & Business offers 3 majors; Humanities organises 6 majors; the department of Life Sciences has five majors (including the Pre-Med Major and two interdepartmental majors, organised together with the department 'Social Sciences & Behavioural Studies'); and 'Social & Behavioural Sciences' includes seven majors, including the two interdepartmental majors 'Global Health' and 'Biological aspects of public health'. Finally, students can opt for the Double Major 'Philosophy, Politics & Economics', take a second major, or draft a proposal for a custom major. The SER explains that all majors consist of at least 60 EC, with at least 20 EC rated at 300-level. This does not include the third-year capstone project, an individual project that EUC regards as an 'aptitude test' and which is rated at 400-level. For their capstone, students can either write an extensive literature review or conduct an empirical study. The content should relate to the student's major(s), and a EUC supervisor from the same department supervises the process.

In addition to curricular activities, EUC offers an extracurricular programme. The panel concludes that the extracurricular activities, as well as EUC's residential requirement, also help students to reach some of the intended learning outcomes. Furthermore, there are options for students who want to earn more credits and/or gain additional experiences. EUC participates in the EUR-wide Honours Programme. It also has its own selective EUC Leadership Programme, a 12-month programme that teaches students about leadership and which includes field projects. The panel appreciates these extracurricular opportunities.

The panel has studied the curriculum in general, and a few selected courses in more detail. In these selected courses, the course design was clear. Courses seem to deal with interesting, often current problems and have varied assignments/assessment (at least three) with clear instructions. According to the panel, the expectations of the courses match the intended level, though some courses at 200-level used introductory literature that the panel would rate at 100-level. The panel also noted that, in the course descriptions, the course objectives were not related to the programme's intended learning outcomes. It recommends that this should be done, so students can understand how the courses they take help them to satisfy these ILOs. It would also enable the Board of Examiners to verify that students who have successfully passed the courses meet the ILOs (see Standard 3). In some cases, the panel also thought that the course objectives could be phrased differently to match better the assessment of the course. It would, for instance, rephrase 'the student understands' as 'the student can describe or explain', using Bloom's Taxonomy to indicate the level of the learning goal.

The panel recognises that, after its pioneering phase, EUC has now become an established College, with new opportunities and challenges. In line with recommendations by the previous assessment panel, the programme has strengthened its Economics & Business Department. The panel appreciates that the College has taken the previous panel's recommendations to heart and considers the current curriculum of good quality. In general, it concludes that the programme identifies goals and methods that are well in line with a liberal arts education. The curriculum has a strong academic core, with nine academic core courses ensuring that all students acquire a minimum level of knowledge across the disciplines. The academic core also includes mandatory courses in qualitative and quantitative research methods that give alpha, beta and gamma students a good overview of what methods can be used and combined. The panel valued the broad choice of majors (including interdepartmental and custom made majors) and the flexibility that this



provides for the students. Staff members mentioned during the site visit that students' interdisciplinary skills could be further challenged beyond the academic core. The panel agrees with this view and recommends introducing some assignments in the second and third year courses that require students to reflect on their learning journey from an interdisciplinary perspective. Alternatively, students could be asked to revisit the interdisciplinary issues from the academic core courses in the preparation for the capstone. The panel considers these observations as further proof of EUC's development-oriented drive and trusts the College to find a suitable answer to this challenge in the coming years.

From talking to the Programme Committee's members during the site visit, the panel concludes that sufficient time should be formally allocated for its task; to contribute to and improve the teaching-learning environment. At the time of the site visit, the Programme Committee had just gone through a period of critical transition during which most of the committee members had left. The current members pointed out that the workload is higher than they anticipated. The programme management assured the panel that it is willing to increase the amount of time for the Programme Committee, if this proves necessary. The panel is pleased with this promise. It also appreciates that the Programme Committee (as well as staff in general) has a good working relationship with the interim Dean, that students are well-represented in the PC and that this Committee's advice is taken seriously.

Didactics

As mentioned above, EUC uses problem-based learning (PBL) as its main didactical approach. The programme is of the opinion that problem-based learning helps create opportunities for further knowledge and understanding, while addressing many of the intended learning outcomes (in particular reflective, intercultural and communication skills). The self-evaluation report describes the various steps involved in the learning process. Students meet in small workgroups of 10-12 students, where they work on a specific academic problem under guidance of a tutor. Even though the students learn in a self-directed and active way by setting their own learning goals and conducting self-study, the tutor is there to make sure that the course objectives and programme ILOs are also met. For this purpose, tutors are specifically trained in EUC's own University Teaching Qualification programme (since 2016). EUC also uses other interactive learning methods later in the programme, such as project-based learning, when this fits the course better. On average, students meet for at least 15 hours of face-to-face teaching each week. The format of PBL and the fact that all courses are assessed by at least three different formats (EUC calls this the 'triple assessment structure') ensures that students study regularly and that the workload is spread out over the quad.

The panel concludes that problem-based learning is a good educational format for the programme; it is small-scale and demands active participation from, as well as cooperation between the students themselves and between the students and their tutor. The panel appreciates the fact that EUC tries to maximise the exchange of ideas by the students, of different national and cultural backgrounds in the tutorials. It was impressed to see that the programme has managed to create such small group sizes. The panel also observes with favour the means by which teachers/tutors are specifically trained in guiding PBL-sessions. From talking to students and staff during the site visit, it learned that they are enthusiastic about problem-based learning. The students also appreciated exchanging ideas and the possibility to challenge each other as well as the tutors. For some of the students, PBL had been the main reason to choose to study at EUC. The panel was also pleased to hear that, after two years, students were still enthusiastic about PBL. However, it agrees with the programme management that some courses are better served with other didactical approaches. For that reason, the programme also employs project-based learning and other didactical formats in some of the second and third year courses. The panel is pleased with this flexibility.

Given the high number of hours that students are expected to study a week (15 hours of face-to-face teaching and 35 self-study hours), the panel checked if the students think the programme is

feasible and that assignments and exams are well spread out over the quads. The students acknowledged that the workload is indeed very high, even though students are dedicated and work hard. For this reason, students said that they generally plan extracurricular activities around the quads. From the panel's point of view the workload can be better balanced. The panel noted that, in its annual report 2017-2018, the Programme Committee gave some good recommendations on how to reduce the workload for students by, among other things, creating a list of the various exams throughout the quad and discussing the workload in meetings for course coordinators. It trusts the programme management to follow up on these recommendations.

Study guidance

EUC's support system consists of an Office for Student and Educational Affairs (OSEA), student counsellors, and a Student Life Officer. Students can contact OSEA with questions about facilities, rules and regulations at EUC. Student counsellors (in Dutch 'studieadviseurs') are connected to a cohort and offer support and advice. According to the SER, students meet regularly with their student counsellors to reflect, among other things, on their study plan, professional behaviour, grades and future goals. The Student Life Officer, finally, supports students with housing issues and acts as a liaison between EUC and the EUC Student Association.

The panel learned that EUC does not have a tutor system, where students are assigned a personal tutor or advisor who supports them with academic advice throughout the programme. In their first year, students are sufficiently advised for choosing their major and drafting a study plan. From talking to the students and graduates, the panel concludes that students receive a minimal amount of academic counselling during their second and third year. There is support, but students need to ask for it and it is provided on an ad-hoc basis. Staff members indicated that, together, they feel confident that they are able to identify students who are experiencing problems and they bring these students to the student counsellor's attention. In addition, the programme management explained that there are plans to formalise academic counselling, by appointing a dedicated career counsellor that can act as a broker between students and staff.

Students indicated that they were pleased with the informal advice and help received from staff members. They also appreciate the support offered by student ambassadors; these are fellow students who are trained to provide support. Nevertheless, the panel is concerned that with the rapid increase in the number of students at EUC, the informal support system will become too much of a burden on staff in the future and may present problems for students who are not identified as 'struggling' soon enough. Also, it seemed that students were not always sure whom to approach with which problem; communication could thus be improved. The panel strongly advises to formalise student advising and to introduce some formal measures, especially in year 2 and 3. According to the panel, academic advising and student support, including counselling, can be organised in various ways, as long as it is clear to the students where they should go if they have a problem. The panel recommends maintaining a clear dividing line between general academic advising regarding students' individual study path and student counselling in cases in which students have personal, mental and/or financial challenges, because a too close combination of these two roles could compromise confidentiality.

Every half year, the Student Academic Advice Council and EUC staff organise a Future Week; attendance is voluntary. The purpose of this week is to help students decide on which major suits them best and to ease the transition from EUC to master's programmes (EUC has made significant efforts here by making arrangements with master's programmes at EUR, see Standard 4). For this last purpose, there are CV workshops and master presentations and students are given the opportunity to network with ex-students and keynote speakers. The SER states that attendance of the Future Week is relatively low and that, as a result, EUC has made plans to improve career advice. The panel agrees that career advice is important, as this will help students deciding on the right courses to take and to learn about master prerequisites at an early stage for those students that want to continue their studies. The panel is pleased that the programme is paying attention to this issue and thinks improving the communication around the Future Week is a good place to



start. Potentially, career advice could also be embedded in this more formalised structure of student advice.

Staff

EUC employs teaching assistants, tutors, lecturers, senior lecturers and assistant professors. Approximately 35 (senior) lecturers design the courses, together with 'EUC fellows', staff members of other faculties and departments of Erasmus University and other universities. The SER explains that EUC fellows act as experts in their field of research by giving lectures, setting assignments and providing advice. Only EUC staff members coordinate courses to ensure proper course alignment, assessment, didactics and quality control. The programme has set up its own educational training course, which leads to the EUC University Teaching Qualification. The course has been offered from September 2016 onwards. New teaching staff is expected to obtain their EUC-specific teaching qualification within two years. Tutors lead the PBL sessions. Many of them are employed on small contracts. Some are in the process of obtaining their PhD alongside teaching at EUC.

The SER states that EUC encourages staff to do research and stay in touch with their field. Senior lecturers can get research vouchers for this purpose. Alongside dedicated research time, the panel raises the possibility of career development on the basis of teaching, including making this available for international staff members by offering the training for the Senior Teaching Qualification in English (at the moment of the site visit, the training was only offered in Dutch). The panel considers these matters as important, as they also bind staff more permanently to EUC than currently is the case. In its view, staff stability and seniority also positively influences students' study experience and EUC's learning environment. The panel was pleased to learn that staff's career perspectives are already high on the management's agenda and strongly supports any initiatives in this matter.

From talking to the students, the panel concludes that they experience the support given by teachers and support staff as outstanding. According to the students, teachers are always willing to provide insight, share their experiences and provide tailored advice. One of the students remarked that at EUC 'you are not a number'. The panel concludes that staff members are dedicated to the programme and create a safe, supportive and challenging learning environment for students.

Considerations

The panel concludes that EUC has clearly matured over the years under consideration. Student numbers have risen considerably and EUC has worked hard to broaden its curriculum and extend the courses on offer. EUC's curriculum is in line with a liberal arts education. The curriculum has a strong academic core, with nine academic core courses ensuring that all students acquire a minimum level of knowledge and (qualitative and quantitative) research skills across the disciplines. The panel also values the broad choice of majors, including interdepartmental and custom-made majors, and the flexibility that these majors provide for the students. The number of options in economics has been strengthened, in line with earlier recommendations. In general, courses deal with interesting, often current problems and have varied assignments/assessment with clear instructions. The level of the courses overall matches the intended level. The panel recommends further linking the course objectives to the programme's intended learning outcomes, for example by using Bloom's Taxonomy to indicate the level of the learning goal. Staff members mentioned during the site visit that students' interdisciplinary skills could be further challenged beyond the academic core. The panel agrees with this view and sees in this example evidence of EU's development-oriented drive. All in all, the panel concludes that EUC offers a challenging and stimulating curriculum for students of good quality, with plenty of choice.

EUC's didactical format (problem-based learning) connects well with the aims of the programme; it is small-scale, demands active participation from the students, encourages self-directed learning, and creates a challenging and interactive teaching-learning environment. The panel likes how EUC tries to maximise the exchange of ideas in the tutorials. It also appreciates how teachers/tutors are specifically trained in guiding PBL-sessions. As some courses are better served with other didactical

approaches, the panel agrees with using a variety of didactical approaches from the second year onwards. It appreciates the programme's flexibility in its implementation of its leading didactical approach. According to the panel, EUC's staff members have the necessary expertise to deliver the programme, together with EUC fellows and tutors. Students are very enthusiastic about their teachers and rated their support as outstanding. The panel also found the staff dedicated to the programme and its educational format.

The panel considers EUC's curriculum, staff, flexible implementation of its didactical approach and good facilities all evidence of EUC's inspiring and challenging learning environment of good quality. EUC's support system has been functioning well over the period under consideration, Students are enthusiastic about the programme and extensively praise their teaching staff for their attention to detail and tailor-made advice, often freely given in an informal setting. Some challenges to this strong teaching-learning environment lay ahead, especially with respect to EUC's faculty and advisory system. Currently, career advancement options for staff members are limited. In the future, this may influence the existing teaching-learning environment. The panel is therefore pleased that EUC is well aware of the staff's concerns and that the management tries to create further opportunities. In the light of EUC's rapid growth, it is also important not to overburden staff members, to set clear boundaries and to communicate clearly about the types of support available. The panel strongly advises EUC to continue developing its current advisory system. In its view, students would also benefit from knowing how much support they may reasonably expect. The panel learnt during the site visit that the management is aware of these challenges, listens to student feedback and reflects on the functioning of its current advisory system, including career advice. Therefore, the panel trusts EUC to develop further its advisory system in the coming years, paying attention to academic advisory and other support needs.

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

EUC's assessment rules are described in its assessment policy plan. The Examination Board, the Programme Committee, EU staff and the management team have developed this plan together. It aims to provide transparency on assessment to students and staff. EUC's main assessment principles are (1) that assessment gives students the opportunity to show what they have learned (each assessment should be a learning opportunity and encourage students to rethink the material and make new connections), and (2) that grades are comparable and based on similar grading criteria. As outlined in the SER, EUC has started working with three pre-defined assessment formats for courses. When designing courses and assessment, teachers can choose from these three formats. They each describe a different combination of assessment and give grading percentages for the individual components. The three formats have in common that a course is always assessed by at least three exercises ('triple assessment'), including professional behaviour, and that no part of the assessment counts for more than 60%. Assessment formats are written exams, large academic assignments, smaller exams and/or academic assignments. These assignments can take many forms, from writing essays to making power-point presentations.

The panel has studied the assessment policy, and was impressed with the extensive way in which it describes assessment. The policy plan creates clear and consistent guidelines for examiners. The panel also appreciates the transparency and clarity of using three pre-defined assessment formats within the courses and the use of an exam grading tool and assessment matrix in the courses. As mentioned before, the panel does recommend coupling the course objectives to the programme's



intended learning outcomes. EUC admits that professional behaviour (10% of the final grade) is too often graded on attendance only. In future, it wants tutors to focus more on course preparation and active participation. The panel agrees that the mark for professional behaviour should adequately reflect the students' development of this skill.

Assessments

During the site visit, the panel has studied a selection of courses, including their assignments and exams. The panel confirms that the documentation is generally detailed and clear. In most courses, the smaller assignments seem to serve as a good preparation for the final exam. On the whole, the panel thought that the courses had a good mix of assignments and that the assessment was in line with the level of the course.

As described under Standard 2, the programme sees the capstone as an 'aptitude test'. The learning objectives and assessment procedure are described in the capstone course manual. This document guides students in choosing a topic, finding a supervisor and making agreements about the content and frequency of supervision. It also gives an overview of the various deadlines, the thesis guidelines and the thesis assessment form with the various grading rubrics. Every department has a capstone coordinator who reads the students' topic proposals and assigns individual supervisors. First supervisors are always based at EUC and have expertise related to the students' major. Students taking a double major are assigned two EUC supervisors, one from each department related to their majors. The SER explains that there can also be an external supervisor. In that case s/he will be consulted for input by the first supervisor. The Examination Board has proposed changes to the capstone assessment procedure. One of these changes is the requirement of having a second assessor, which was formally implemented in the academic year 2017/2018. If there is no second supervisor or external supervisor, then the capstone coordinator now assigns a second reader. Up until 2017/2018, both supervisors filled in an assessment form together. Students receive two grades, one for the thesis (90%), and one for the capstone process (10%).

The panel concludes that the programme has a good capstone manual with clear assessment criteria, which should help students to write a high quality thesis. The panel does note that the word 'capstone' usually refers to an interdisciplinary final work. The theses that the panel read were, in general, written within the remit of one discipline. The panel therefore suggests either adding an interdisciplinary element in the capstone project, or abandoning the name 'capstone' to avoid confusion. Though the panel agrees that having a second assessor is necessary to increase the transparency and quality of the capstone assessment, it was surprised to read that up until 2017/2018 the first and second supervisor/external supervisor/second reader grade the thesis together. In the selection of theses that the panel studied, assessment was not always done in a structured way, following pre-set criteria. Though a second grader was (informally) involved, it was clear that they had had contact with the first supervisor during the process of grading. To ensure that the grading is done independently, the programme has introduced a double blind procedure, in which both supervisors grade the thesis and both fill in an assessment form, before coming to an agreement on the final marks. The panel considered this an important improvement. According to the panel, the programme should also formalise what happens if there is a difference of more than 15 points (on a 100 point scale) in grading between the first and second assessor. Finally, the panel concludes that the assessment forms should provide insight in the grading process and contain clear and substantial written feedback on the thesis and the process. In its sample check, such written feedback was often lacking.

Examination Board

The Board of Examiners is responsible for safeguarding the quality of assessments and providing assurance that the programme learning outcomes are met. The Board consists of three members, which have been appointed for a period of two years, and a secretary. The secretary and the chair meet on a weekly basis to discuss individual student' requests. The Examination Board as a whole meets every month. The Board distinguishes between routine cases and more complicated cases. The secretary is able to deal with most routine cases, after consulting the chair. The Board has

regular contact with the Dean to give advice on the quality of assessment in the programme. The various tasks and the authority of the Examination Board are described in a separate document. The Board's main tasks are appointing examiners, safeguarding and assessing the quality of assignments and examinations, establishing guidelines and procedures, and granting exemptions. The Examination Board regularly checks a random sample of capstone theses. It does not check the quality of course assessment. This is done by OSEA.

EUC started with 86 students and now has over 500 students. As a result, the workload in the Examination Board has grown considerably. The Board has many individual students' requests with which to deal. The panel learned that the Board has just received increased support, and the members told the panel they were now catching up on the work fast. However, the Examination Board members also thought that they should ideally have a representative from all departments at EUC. The panel agrees that the Examination Board would benefit from having more members and/or other forms of additional support. This would enable the Board to initiate new plans that lead to a general improvement of the transparency, validity and reliability of assessment in the programme. The Examination Board would like to set up a dedicated assessment committee, to discuss and decide on EUC's assessment policy. The assessment committee could also help to check the quality of assessment before assignments are given and exams are being held. The panel concludes that, at present, the Examination Board seems to rely very often on the examiners and OSEA to verify whether its rules are followed properly and whether course descriptions are indeed linked to the programme's intended learning outcomes. This system is, in the panel's view, vulnerable in light of the rapid growth of EUC over the last years. Giving the Examination Board more support will help this Board to formalise further its procedures and to establish and safeguard the quality of assessment at EUC.

Considerations

Assessment at EUC is of satisfactory quality, and its assessment system has both strong features and some areas for improvement. The panel concludes that EUC has an adequate assessment policy in place. It was impressed with the extensive way in which EUC's assessment policy describes assessment and creates clear and consistent guidelines for examiners. The panel also appreciates the transparency and clarity of using three pre-defined assessment formats within the courses and the use of an exam grading tool and assessment matrix in the courses. It does recommend coupling the course objectives to the programme's intended learning outcomes.

Work remains to be done to further improve the transparency of the assessment procedure for the capstone. EUC has recently introduced a double blind procedure in which the first supervisor and the second reader contact each other to establish the final grade after they have decided on the grades independently. The panel considered this an important improvement. The panel also concluded that the Examination Board needs additional support for the coming years. Even though the Board fulfilled its legal requirements in the period under consideration for this programme assessment, it often relies on other parties to verify whether its procedures are followed. This system guaranteed the proper functioning of the assessment system in a sufficient manner as long as EUC was small and the lines of communication were direct. Now EUC has grown into a college of over 500 students, the limits of this system have been reached and the reliability of the assessment system is becoming vulnerable. This is acknowledged by the Examination Board and the management, who work hard to address these issues with limited resources. The panel recommends to continue professionalising EUC's assessment. It supports the Examination Board's wish to establish an Assessment Committee that can help the Examination Board with various dedicated tasks under the Board's responsibility.

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*

Students achieve the ILOs by passing the courses and by successfully completing the capstone. Prior to the site visit, the panel read a selection of 15 theses. In general, the panel considered the level of the theses appropriate for academic bachelor's level. The panel was impressed with the quality of a few theses, which it considered exceptionally good pieces of work for an undergraduate programme. These theses contained strong methodology sections, were analytically sound, gave evidence of a wide and deep research process, and presented the results clearly and articulately. The panel thought that the majority of theses was satisfactory, with an adequate albeit not very deep analysis. By and large, the panel agreed with the grading.

From talking to alumni, the panel concludes that they benefit from having studied at EUC. When comparing themselves to peers from monodisciplinary, larger-scale programmes, the graduates said they thought they were able to quickly catch up when they came across new information and to take responsibility for their own learning trajectory. They also felt more confident to speak up during class. Some of them missed problem-based learning and the opportunity to sit around the table and challenge their peers and teachers in their master's programmes. All of them would choose EUC again, though some of them would then take different courses.

Performance of graduates

The first cohort at EUC graduated in 2016, and EUC does not have substantial information on graduates' future careers. In its SER, the College states that 70% of EUC graduates continue in a premaster, master or research master programme, and that 30% choose to work, volunteer or do an internship. EUC has put a lot of effort into easing the transition from EUC to master's programmes at EUR. For this purpose, it has made agreements with the various EUR faculties. EUC students have access to 89 master's programmes and 11 research master's at EUR. The programme management explained that most programmes have no additional prerequisites, but that for some master programmes (for instance Dutch law) students do need some in-between courses or a pre-master to make up for missing courses. The panel compliments EUC on the impressive work it has done to help students to gain acceptance into master's programmes at EUR. The programme management also said that students have no difficulties being accepted into quality foreign universities. Additionally, EUC is becoming more well-known in the Netherlands. The panel is pleased to hear this. It suggests gathering more information on alumni and their career after EUC. This could, for example, be done via regular alumni surveys and/or by establishing an alumni association. The fact that students continue in master's programmes, some of them competitive and highly ranked ones, is seen as convincing proof of the quality of the programme.

Considerations

On the basis of the selected theses, its meeting with alumni and with the programme management, the panel concludes that graduates reach the programme's intended learning outcomes. Alumni find their way into – sometimes very selective – master's programmes, both in the Netherlands and abroad. 30% chooses to work, volunteer or do an internship. The panel suggests keeping track of EUC graduates' future career.

Conclusion

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

GENERAL CONCLUSION

EUC's mission and the set-up of the programme are evidently in line with a liberal arts and sciences philosophy. According to the panel, the programme has a few distinctive features: it is embedded in the highly international and multicultural city of Rotterdam, it has a diverse student body, it uses problem-based learning, and has an interesting double degree option as well as the option to follow a pre-medical major. The panel is of the opinion that EUC can emphasise these distinctive features better in its profile and intended learning outcomes (for instance, what does the urban setting contribute to the programme and the other way around?) as a means to demarcate its position among the other University Colleges more clearly. The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes meet the requirements of the discipline and correspond to the Dublin descriptors at academic bachelor's level. The intended learning outcomes are, in general, relatively clear, but could be better phrased by matching the formulation of the learning goals to the way that these goals are assessed in the programme. The panel advises the programme to further refine the ILOs (Standard 1).

The panel concludes that EUC has clearly matured over the years under consideration. Student numbers have risen considerably and EUC has worked hard to broaden its curriculum and extend the courses on offer. The curriculum has a strong academic core and the panel also values the broad choice of majors and the flexibility that these majors provide for the students. In general, courses deal with interesting, often current problems and have varied assignments/assessment with clear instructions. Staff members mentioned during the site visit that students' interdisciplinary skills could be further challenged beyond the academic core. The panel agrees with this view and sees in this example evidence of EU's development-oriented drive. All in all, the panel concludes that EUC offers a challenging and stimulating curriculum for students. EUC's didactical format (problem-based learning) connects well with the aims of the programme; it is small-scale, demands active participation from the students, encourages self-directed learning, and creates a challenging and interactive teaching-learning environment. According to the panel, EUC's staff members have the necessary expertise to deliver the programme, together with EUC fellows and tutors. Students are very enthusiastic about their teachers and rated their support as outstanding. The panel also found the staff dedicated to the programme and its educational format. Currently, career advancement options for staff members are limited. In the future, this may influence the existing good teaching-learning environment. The panel is therefore pleased that EUC is well aware of the staff's concerns and that the management tries to create further opportunities. Some challenges lay ahead, especially with respect to EUC's faculty and advisory system. The panel strongly advises EUC to continue developing its current advisory system. The panel learnt during the site visit that the management is aware of challenges, listens to student feedback and reflects on the functioning of its current advisory system, including career advice. Therefore, the panel trusts EUC to develop further its advisory system in the coming years, paying attention to academic advisory and other support needs (Standard 2).

The panel concludes that EUC has a good assessment policy in place. It was impressed with the extensive way in which EUC's assessment policy describes assessment and creates clear and consistent guidelines for examiners. The panel also appreciates the transparency and clarity of using three pre-defined assessment formats within the courses and the use of an exam grading tool and assessment matrix in the courses. It does recommend coupling the course objectives to the programme's intended learning outcomes. Work remains to be done to further improve the transparency of the assessment procedure for the capstone. EUC has recently introduced a double blind procedure in which the first supervisor and the second reader only contact each other to establish the final grade after they have decided on the grades independently. The panel considered this an important improvement. It also concluded that the Examination Board needs additional support for the coming years. The panel recommends continuing professionalising EUC's assessment. It supports the Examination Board's wish to establish an Assessment Committee that can help the Examination Board with various dedicated tasks under the Board's responsibility (Standard 3).



On the basis of the selected theses, its meeting with alumni and with the programme management, the panel concludes that graduates reach the programme's intended learning outcomes. Alumni find their way into – sometimes very selective - master's programmes, both in the Netherlands and abroad. 30% choose to work, volunteer or do an internship. The panel suggests keeping track of EUC graduates' future career (Standard 4).

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

Conclusion

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

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

Introduction

The bachelor's programme under review is offered by Erasmus University. Erasmus University College started in 2013 as a small-scale, selective, intensive, English-taught honours college. 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 EUC to select new students up to its full capacity. 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 5-6 November 2018 in combination with the regular assessment of the bachelor's programme.

The practice-based assessment pays attention to the following recommendations by the panel of the initial assessment of the Distinctive Feature in 2012:

- Offer sufficient extracurricular activities
- Connect the programme and extracurricular activities more clearly to issues that are specific for Rotterdam.

These recommendations will be discussed under Standard B.

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

As a broad Liberal Arts and Sciences college, EUC aims to provide students with breadth and depth in their academic studies, while preparing them for the challenges of the 21st century. The programme's aim is 'to help students develop into critical world citizens.' EUC has four departments covering the fields of Economics & Business, Life Sciences, Humanities and Social & Behavioural Sciences. According to the programme's self-evaluation report (SER), apart from specialising within one of these fields, students are encouraged to 'develop themselves scientifically in an interdisciplinary academic environment'. The programme follows a problem-based learning approach. The SER lists five specific skills that students should acquire by working in small workgroups: critical thinking, academic creativity, social abilities, international and intercultural awareness and societal engagement. The panel concludes that EUC's main goal is well-tuned to the liberal arts and sciences: to educate 'citizens' of the world. The programme has a clear academic orientation, as is evidenced in its intended learning outcomes. The panel appreciates the academic and creative freedom that EUC offers to its students.

EUC has formulated 14 intended learning outcomes (ILOs) and provided a table in the SER linking them to the Dublin Descriptors. The panel has studied the ILOs and concludes that they match what one would expect from a small-scale, liberal arts education. The ILOs aim for students to reach a certain depth and breadth in their curriculum, but also pay attention to important skills for lifelong learning such as the ability to cooperate in a group with members from different



backgrounds (ILO11), the ability to accept social and civic responsibilities (ILO12) and the ability to reflect on their own and other's conduct in science and society (ILO 14 and ILO4). According to the panel, the ILOs are generally well formulated and complete. The panel finds it positive that 'reflection' as a learning skill is often mentioned in the ILOs. The panel suggests dedicating one ILO explicitly to learning skills. Also, the panel recommends making the phrasing of certain ILOs more concise by matching their formulation with the course objectives and course assessment.

Considerations

The panel concludes that EUC's intended learning outcomes are well in line with a liberal arts education. They aim for students to reach depth and breadth in their curriculum, but also have a broader aim: to help students develop into critical world citizens. The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes meet the requirements of the discipline and correspond to the Dublin descriptors at academic bachelor's level. The intended learning outcomes are in general relatively clear, but could be phrased more concise by matching their formulation to the course objectives and course assessment. The panel sees this as a matter of further fine-tuning, rather than of a complete revision.

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

At EUC, students can take part in various extracurricular activities in order to develop themselves further and broaden their interests. At the time of the site visit, EUC's student association EUCSA provided support to 18 committees that offered a broad range of activities, ranging from cooking and sport committees to health and welfare and sustainability committees. The panel also learned that, every year, EUCSA's re-evaluates its committees and the activities they offer, to see if they still fit their members' interests. The panel saw a clear link between the curriculum and the extracurricular activities. For instance, the Performance Committee successfully draws on communication, presentation and problem-solving skills learned during the mandatory core courses, and so do EUC's own TEDx committee, EUCxInspire, and the Mass Media committee. The opposite way, the skills that students gain during organising, hosting or attending extracurricular activities feed back into the programme.

EUC has a selective Leadership Programme, a 12-month extracurricular programme that aims to provide students 'with the theory and practice to understand leadership across a broad range of sectors'. Selected students need to show an awareness of social issues and possess the 'skills, capabilities and passion to make significant changes within society'. The panel appreciates this initiative very much, and thinks it is well in line with two of the ILOs that are harder to realise: ILO6 ('graduates are able to contribute to science and society in a constructive way') and ILO12 ('graduates are able to accept social and civic responsibilities and to speak out against prejudice, injustice and the abuse of power').

In 2012, the panel that conducted the Distinctive Feature assessment at EUC recommended the programme to offer sufficient extracurricular activities. This panel concludes that EUC has succeeded in doing so; it thinks that students can easily find activities that appeal to them and that help them explore their talents and develop new skills. The previous panel also recommended connecting EUC's extracurricular activities more clearly to issues that are specific for Rotterdam. From talking to the teachers, the panel learned that members of staff, indeed, try to connect their

courses to the city of Rotterdam. For instance, in the course 'Understanding politics' students are encouraged to approach and meet with politicians in Rotterdam. In another course on religion, students visit a mosque. Outside co-curricular activities (activities that connect to the courses), there are also extracurricular activities that build on the relation with Rotterdam's community. Two examples are the Arts & Culture Programme, in which students visit six cultural institutions in Rotterdam and participate in events, such as meeting up with musicians from the Rotterdam Philharmonic Orchestra, and inviting Syrian poets to perform at the College. The rationale behind this project is that art, like sports, can be understood and enjoyed more fully the more you watch it. Another example is EUCSA's Charity Committee, which organises events and donates the money to both local charities in Rotterdam and to humanitarian causes across the globe. One of its activities is an annual dinner at EUC for refugees.

Though the panel is pleased to see that students benefit from a broad range of extracurricular activities, which successfully help broaden their horizon and which have a clear link with the courses, it did note that the majority of extra-curricular activities is aimed at EUC's own community. The panel did see some examples of activities that were also open to people from outside EUC, such as film nights and debates that were jointly organised with the Willem de Kooning academy and Codarts. From talking to the students, the panel thinks that the programme could encourage students to become involved in Rotterdam's community even more, especially since the programme is situated in the centre of town. That way, they can help build the strong urban network, the 'living lab' that EUC aims to be grounded in.

Considerations

The panel has seen convincing evidence that EUC's curriculum is tied to relevant co- and extracurricular activities. The College has an active student association that offers a wide variety of extracurricular activities and annually evaluates if these continue to match their members' interests. Taking part in extracurricular activities helps students to reach the intended learning outcomes. According to the panel, the number of activities that involve Rotterdam's wider community can be increased.

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

EUC uses problem-based learning as its main didactical approach. It believes that this didactical concept best ensures that students reach the intended learning outcomes. The self-evaluation report describes the various steps involved in the learning process. Students meet in small workgroups of 10-12 students, where they work on a specific academic problem under guidance of a tutor. Even though the students learn in a self-directed and active way by setting their own learning goals and finding the answers to the problems by conducting self-study, the tutor is there to make sure that the course objectives and programme's ILOs are also met. For this purpose, tutors are specifically trained in EUC's own University Teaching Qualification programme (since 2016).

EUC also uses other interactive learning methods, such as project-based learning, when these better fit the course. On average, students meet for at least 15 hours of face-to-face teaching each week: usually they participate in three three-hour tutorial sessions and they follow three two-hour



lectures. On top of that, they are expected to spend 35 hours on self-study. Together, this results in an intensive educational experience. Tutors and teachers confirmed these findings. They also demonstrated commitment to their students and to the didactical principle underlying EUC's didactical approach.

EUC has a low staff to student ratio of 1: 10.8. As a result, it is able to provide sufficient support for small-scale PBL sessions. The panel also appreciates the manner in which teachers/tutors are specially trained in guiding PBL sessions. From talking to the students during the site visit, the panel learned that they really enjoy problem-based learning; after two years they were still enthusiastic about this format. According to the students, PBL encourages them to ask critical questions, for example: 'what is this going to do for society?' and to make connections across the disciplines. The panel learned that a beneficial side effect of problem-based learning is that students get to know each other and the tutors really well. Students from different cohorts meet in the elective courses. However, the panel agrees with the programme management that some courses are better served with other didactical approaches, such as project-based or research-based learning and appreciates the level of flexibility introduced to courses in later years.

During their first year at EUC, students are required to live on campus. This gives them the opportunity to socialise outside classes, to learn from and support each another. The student association EUCSA also helps shaping EUC's community. From talking to the students and staff, the panel concludes that they experience EUC as a place where everyone is open and approachable. The students estimated that, during their second year, they would know most fellow students, either from face or by name. The extracurricular activities, in which both students and staff participate, add to this inclusive atmosphere. The panel appreciated the fact that the College has drawn up a EUC Honours code, a document that familiarises students and staff with the programme's core values and describes the professional behaviour that is expected of an academic. Finally, the panel verified that students are involved in socially relevant extra-curricular activities. It enjoyed learning about the Leadership Programme, the Charity Committee (see Standard B) and the 'Stichting Fairfight', a non-profit organisation that offers martial arts lessons to young girls in Zimbabwe and India. According to the panel, these initiatives are very much in line with the aim of the programme, to encourage students to become critical world citizens.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the teaching formats at EUC are small-scale and intensive. Students have at least 15 hours of face-to-face teaching per week, and they play an active role during classes, where they have to take responsibility for their own learning process. According to the panel, a beneficial side effect of PBL is that it helps to create an academic community across the various cohorts and between students and staff. EUC's campus, student association and the EUC Honours Code also contribute to establishing an academic community. The panel found both the students and the staff clearly committed to this community.

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

EUC's admission procedure aims to ensure that the classroom is diverse and international. Students are selected on the basis of their previous education (Dutch pre-university education or a foreign equivalent, the programme follows Nuffic's standards for establishing the level of international diplomas), grades (a minimum GPA of 7/10 in Dutch pre-university education),

motivation, international orientation, English language proficiency and proficiency in mathematics. An admissions officer verifies whether applicants meet the requirements. Students who don't meet the criteria completely can submit a mathematics or English proficiency test. A matching interview takes place after the selection procedure is completed, as the programme believes interviews prior to acceptance create bias. Only in rare cases do students receive a negative advice to register after the matching interview. The student representatives with whom the panel met had experienced the application process as straightforward. They appreciated the fact the interview was a matching interview rather than a selection interview. The panel concludes that the admissions procedure is sound and appropriately geared towards admitting motivated and talented students.

The selection procedure has been revised for the academic year 2018/2019. Instead of an open motivation letter, students now answer six questions about their motivation, what they expect to learn and what they think they will bring to EUC. The answers are scored. The students had seen the new admissions form, and thought it contained good questions. The panel thinks bringing more uniformity in the application process was a good idea as it further limits bias.

Over the assessment period, the number of applications has rapidly gone up, from 186 applicants in 2013/2014 to 578 in 2017/2018. On average approximately 60% of the applicants were selected, and approximately 43% accepted the offer. The number of students starting the programme in 2017/2018 was 217, the highest number so far.

EUC has dedicated strategies and funding to try to ensure that the student intake is diverse and international.

- The programme has a 'Marketing, Recruitment, Admissions & Integration team', which supports international students with their application and, for example, travel to the Netherlands and visa procedures.
- The programme admits a handful of students with a slightly lower GPA who have a very strong motivation and/or 'fitting background'.
- In cooperation with the Rotterdam Talent Scholarship (ROTAS), EUC runs the ROTAS scholarship programme for Dutch first-generation students from Rotterdam. Approximately 12 students at EUC receive this scholarship. The grant covers their tuition fees, housing costs and all costs connected to studying at EUC for a period of three years.
- EUC hosts the EUC junior project, a two-week course at EUC for 5th grade first generation high school students. The goal of the project is for these students to consider at least a university education, at EUC or somewhere else, by familiarising them with an academic environment
- For non-EU students with a GPA of 80% and up, there is the Holland Scholarship, a one-off gift of 5,000 euro for approximately 8 students every year, and the Scholarship of Excellence from the Erasmus University, a partial waiver of the tuition fee for one student.
- The EUC Scholarship is open to all applicants who require financial aid to study at EUC; it entails a partial waiver of the tuition fee for one year for approximately seven students.

The panel praises the programme for its efforts to create an international and diverse classroom. These efforts seem to pay off; the number of international students is increasing. 50% of the students starting the programme in 2018/2019 had a non-Dutch background. According to the SER, students at EUC can be traced back to more than 30 countries. However, as the programme admits, there are still financial barriers that prevent especially non-EU students from studying at EUC. The panel supports the College's plans to further increase opportunities for all groups that are currently underrepresented at EUC.

Considerations

EUC has a good admission procedure in place. As a result, the programme succeeds in attracting motivated and talented students. The panel commends EUC on its efforts to create a truly international and diverse classroom, and encourages further initiatives to support this goal.



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

EUC employs teaching assistants, tutors, lecturers, senior lecturers and assistant professors. EUC's Core Faculty Policy specifies the tasks and qualifications for the various types of positions, as well as the salary scale and promotion system. Approximately 35 (senior) lecturers design the courses, together with 'EUC fellows', staff members of other faculties and departments of Erasmus University and other universities. The SER explains that EUC fellows act as experts in their field of research by giving lectures, setting assignments and providing advice. Only EUC staff members coordinate courses, 'to ensure proper course alignment, assessment, didactics and quality control'. The programme has set up its own educational training course, which leads to the EUC University Teaching Qualification and pays specific attention to EUC's didactical format. The course has been offered from September 2016 onwards. New teaching staff is expected to obtain their EUC-specific teaching qualification within two years. The panel appreciates how teaching and support staff share one large room. This allows both groups to cooperate effectively.

EUC encourages staff to do research and stay in touch with their field. Senior lecturers can get research vouchers for this purpose. The panel asked the staff members how they experience the career development opportunities at EUC. According to them, the first stages of the promotion system are clear, but it is less clear how to become a senior lecturer or assistant professor. The training for the Senior Teaching Qualification, for instance, is only available in Dutch. The panel thinks non-Dutch teachers should have equal career opportunities as Dutch teachers and therefore recommends also offering this training in English. The staff members also expressed a wish for an in-house career advisor, someone who can connect what is happening in the different departments, and can fully utilize the staff members' qualities. The panel believes this is a good suggestion and concludes that EUC should make the career development path clearer. Alongside dedicated research time, the panel raises the possibility of career development on the basis of teaching, which is already happening at other university colleges. The panel was pleased to learn, however, that staff's career perspectives are already high on the management's agenda; a new policy with better career opportunities is on its way.

EUC has a low staff to student ratio. In 2017-2018 this was 1: 10.8, taking into account support staff as well. The panel concludes that staff members are dedicated to the programme and feel involved in the distinctive nature of the programme. The students said they experience the support given by teachers and support staff as outstanding. According to the students, teachers are always willing to provide insight, share their experiences and provide tailored advice. Having taught in more traditional educational programmes, the staff members said they appreciate the PBL approach. In their view, PBL manages to keep students motivated and enjoy the learning process. Not only does this make students more active, the staff also thought that it prevents the anxiety that students might suffer from when studying on their own.

Most teachers come from a monodisciplinary background. They explained that they view LAS as a mindset that equips students to deal with a quickly changing world and find new identities. The teachers noted that, even though EUC is a liberal arts and sciences programme, students at EUC don't seem to be drawn to interdisciplinarity so much. They think there is a gap to fill here, by letting staff develop the skills to create more interdisciplinary courses alongside the core courses. Ideally, interdisciplinarity would be in the DNA and in the marketing of the programme. The panel learned that this is also an ongoing discussion in the Programme Committee, whether following a

double major within the same field doesn't limit the students' possibility to combine various disciplines. The panel agrees that, after the core courses, the programme could pay more attention to students' interdisciplinary skills, for instance by including some reflective assignments in the second and third year courses and revisiting the core interdisciplinary issues in the preparation for the capstone.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the lecturers have the required academic knowledge and didactic skills to deliver the programme. Staff members are committed to the programme, its didactical format, the LAS approach and the students.

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

EUC aims to have a low staff to student ratio, between 1: 10 and 1: 11. So far, it has managed to do so. When taking the support staff into account as well, the staff to student ratio was 1: 10.8 in 2017-2018. Without support staff it was 1: 11.4. That year, there were 530 students at EUC (the highest number so far), and the programme employed 46.4 fte teachers and 2.7 fte for support staff.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the staff to student ratio at EUC is very low. This fits the didactical approach and enables a good execution of the programme.

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

EUC is located in a historic building in the city centre. The EUC building has 19 tailor-made tutorial rooms (rooms that are suitable for problem-based learning in workgroups of up to 12 students), open study spaces, a library, café, and communal space in the basement. During the tour of the premises, the panel saw the various rooms and study spaces and it attended a presentation about the student accommodation at the Lucia-building nearby, where all first-year students live. It considers that both fit their purpose and are in line with the small-scale and intensive characteristics of the programme. It also thinks both buildings are suitable for common extra-curricular activities. The panel was pleased to learn that the Lucia building has a night guard, as it is located in the city centre. It also enjoyed hearing how students are being consulted in the plans to improve the roof terrace. Finally, the panel appreciated how teaching and support staff share one large room, which allows both groups to cooperate effectively. Larger plenary lectures are scheduled at Woudestein Campus. Likewise, life science lab facilities are used at Erasmus MC and the Hogeschool Rotterdam. The panel concludes that these facilities suffice based on the evidence presented in the self-evaluation report and during the site visit.



Considerations

The panel concludes that the facilities in the EUC's faculty building are well-suited to the programme's didactical format. Students start their first year at EUC by living together in the Lucia building, which has state-of-the-art student rooms and common rooms for social activities. EUC's infrastructure helps establishing an academic and social community.

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

Students achieve the ILOs by passing the courses and by successfully completing the capstone. Prior to the site visit, the panel read a selection of 15 theses. In general, the panel considered the level of the theses appropriate for academic bachelor's level. The panel was impressed with the quality of a few theses, which it considered exceptionally good pieces of work for an undergraduate programme. These theses contained strong methodology sections, were analytically sound, gave evidence of a wide and deep research process, and presented the results clearly and articulately. The panel thought that the majority of theses was satisfactory, with an adequate albeit not very deep analysis. By and large, the panel agreed with the grading.

From talking to the alumni, the panel concludes that they benefit from having studied at EUC. When comparing themselves to peers from monodisciplinary programmes, the graduates said they felt more confident to speak up during class. They also thought they were able to catch up quickly when they came across new information and to take responsibility for their own learning trajectory. Some of them missed problem-based learning and the opportunity to sit around the table and challenge their peers and teachers in their master's programmes. All of them would choose EUC again, though some of them would then take different courses.

Success rates

Information about study success shows that the number of students leaving the programme prematurely is low. In its first year, 2013-2014, 20% of students stopped in their first year, 2% of students stopped after the first year, and 14% received a negative binding study advice. These numbers are lower than those of Erasmus University in the same year, which were 29%, 4% and 18% respectively. Since then, the dropout number in year one fluctuated between 5-16% (compared to 27-28% for EUR) in the first year. After year 1, drop out numbers for EUC were only 0-1% (compared to 3-4% for EUR) for the period under consideration. The number for a negative binding study advice went down to 5% in 2016-2017, compared to 16% for EUR in the same year. Based on these numbers, the panel concludes that students are well supported and/or know what to expect when they apply for and start studying at EUC.

After 4 years, 74% of the first cohort (2013-2014) had graduated; 56% of this first cohort of students completed the programme within 3 years. These numbers compare favourably to the numbers of graduates in other related programmes at EUR for 2013-2014: 55% of all EUR students graduated in 4 years and 39% in 3 years respectively. The success rate at EUC was therefore substantially higher at this point and increased further in the following year (cohort 2014-2015), when 69% of EUC students graduated in three years' time (EUR: 38%). The panel noted that this

number has gone down for the cohort that started in 2015-2016: 46% of students of the cohort 2015-2016 graduated in 3 years. Nevertheless, the success rate for this cohort is still substantially higher than the EUR success rate for the same year. In 2015-2016, only 16% of all EUR students completed their programme in 3 years and comparatively, EUC students still clearly outperforms students in other relevant programmes.

The drop in study success was discussed extensively between the panel and the programme. The panel was mostly looking for evidence that this drop in success rates was an incident rather than the new standard and that the EUC management was aware that this decrease should be addressed immediately. The management explained that two things were at play: the results of the Spring Intake of cohort 2016 and student behaviour. The Spring Intake of that particular year had not been very successful and therefore negatively affected the overall success rates. This was recognised by the management and the programme invested in a closer monitoring of the students of the new Spring Intake for cohort 2017, aiming to positively influence the results for the next year. The success rates for the Spring Intake of the cohort 2017 were not yet available during the time of the site visit, but the panel noticed in the information received from the programme after the site visit that no students of this particular cohort dropped out after year 1 and no students received a negative binding study advice, suggesting a solid monitoring system and good support in place. This information supports the programme's claim that the negative results from the Spring Intake of 2016 were incidental and also demonstrates that the measures taken by EUC to support these students were adequate. Since 2017-2018, EUC has no longer a Spring Intake as the College has now almost reached its full capacity

Additionally, student behaviour was also partly a cause for the drop in graduation rates for the cohort 2015-2016. The management and staff indicated that they had already noticed that the numbers were going to be negatively affected during the years of study of cohort 2015-2016, as many students chose additional modules and extended capstone projects to fit in as much as possible courses into their individual study programmes. The EUC staff and management tried to address this behaviour, but also felt that they could not forbid students from exploring new options during and at the end of their study time at EUC. The panel agreed with the EUC management and staff that this student behaviour is not necessarily a negative point: it also demonstrated that EUC has succeeded over the last years to encourage students to broaden their interests and explore new fields, and that the College offers a challenging learning environment in which students feel challenged to explore new options and feel at home. This was confirmed in discussions with the students and graduates of EUC, who show satisfaction with the broad range of options offered at EUC. Students and graduates also said that they felt sufficiently prepared to move on to a master's degree. They affirmed the management's analysis of the situation in 2015-2016.

Simultaneously, the management agreed with the panel that it should be clear to students that they are expected to graduate in three years. The programme now actively tries to discourage students from taking an additional year. Current third-year students confirmed these claims; they indicated that they were regularly reminded to stay on schedule and study nominally. The panel pointed out that the graduation rates of the programme are closely related to the way in which students are advised and monitored during their second and third year. Better academic counselling could also contribute in the future to an improvement of the success rates. Maybe, the panel suggested, the opportunity to take 'additional' modules could be approved on a case-by-case basis, to prevent students from taking on more than they can accomplish within the time of the programme. At the same time, the panel is confident that the effort that EUC has put into easing the transition from EUC to master's programmes over the period under consideration at EUR, and to other master's programmes, will be fruitful in the following years; for many master's programmes at EUR students do not often have to take extra courses.

The staff and management were open to suggestions by the panel to further improve the success rates and indicated that some measures were already considered, including a closer monitoring of the capstone project. The management was confident that the three-year completion rates for



2019-2020 (those of the EUC cohort starting in 2016-2017) would again be at the level of the 2014-2015 cohort. These combined findings, combined with the good way in which EUC reacted to suggestions received in the earlier assessment and the notably low dropout rates and negative binding study advices for the cohorts 2016-2017 and 2017-2018, raised confidence with the panel in EUC's success rates in the longer term. It also addressed any concerns regarding the cause of the noted drop in the 2015-2016 cohort.

Performance of graduates

The first cohort at EUC graduated in 2016. In its SER, the College states that 70% of EUC graduates continue in a premaster, master or research master programme, and that 30% chooses to work, volunteer or do an internship. EUC has put a lot of effort into easing the transition from EUC to master's programmes at EUR. For this purpose, it has made agreements with the various EUR faculties. EUC students have access to 89 master's programmes and 11 research master's at EUR. The programme management explained that most programmes have no additional prerequisites, but that for some master programmes (for instance Dutch law) students do need some in-between courses or a pre-master to make up for missing courses. This information was confirmed by alumni, who mentioned not to have difficulties entering master's programmes. The panel compliments EUC on the impressive work it has done to help students being accepted into master's programmes at EUR. The programme management also said that students have no difficulties being accepted into quality foreign universities, which was confirmed by students and alumni who offered several examples of students being accepted at high-ranking programmes in the United Kingdom, Germany and France. Additionally, EUC is getting better known in the Netherlands. The panel is pleased to hear this. It suggests gathering more information on alumni and their career after EUC. This could for example be done via regular alumni surveys and/or by establishing an alumni association. The fact that students continue in master's programmes, some of them competitive and highly ranked ones, is seen as convincing proof of quality of the programme.

Considerations

The panel considered the level of the theses appropriate for academic bachelor's level. The panel was impressed with the quality of a few theses, which it considered exceptionally good pieces of work for an undergraduate programme. While noting that the success and graduation rates of the programme remain substantially higher than those of bachelor programmes offered at Erasmus University throughout the full period under consideration, the panel felt compelled to raise the question of the unusual drop in the completion rates for the cohort 2015-2016. In depth discussion of the issue with EUC management, staff and students convinced the panel that this was a temporary aberration and the panel accepted the possible explanations and evidence for its occurrence. More importantly, the panel is persuaded that EUC has correctly addressed the issue and that the measures it has taken to ensure significantly higher graduation rates for the future should prove successful. After EUC, students have no difficulties being accepted into quality universities in the Netherlands and abroad.

Conclusion

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

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel concludes that EUC's intended learning outcomes are well in line with a liberal arts education. They aim for students to reach depth and breadth in their curriculum, but also have a broader aim: to help student develop into critical world citizens. The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes meet the requirements of the discipline and correspond to the Dublin descriptors at academic bachelor's level. The intended learning outcomes are, in general, relatively clear, but could be phrased more concisely by matching their formulation to the course objectives

and course assessment. The panel sees this as a matter of further fine-tuning, rather than of complete revision (Standard A).

The panel has seen convincing evidence of EUC's curriculum tied to relevant co- and extracurricular activities. The College has an active student association that offers a wide variety of extracurricular activities and annually evaluates if these still match their members' interests. Taking part in extracurricular activities helps students reach the intended learning outcomes. According to the panel, the number of activities that involve Rotterdam's wider community can be increased (Standard B).

The panel concludes that teaching formats at EUC are small-scale and intensive. Students have at least 15 hours of face-to-face teaching per week, and they play an active role during classes, where they have to take responsibility for their own learning process. According to the panel, a beneficial side effect of PBL is that it helps creating an academic community across the various cohorts and between students and staff. EUC's campus, student association and the EUC Honours Code also contribute to establishing an academic community. The panel found both the students and the staff clearly committed to this community (Standard C).

EUC has a good admissions procedure in place. As a result, the programme succeeds in attracting motivated and talented students. The panel commends EUC on its efforts to create a truly international and diverse classroom, and encourages further initiatives to support this goal (Standard D).

The panel concludes that the lecturers have the required academic knowledge and didactic skills to deliver the programme. Staff members are committed to the programme, its didactical format, the LAS approach and the students (Standard E).

The staff to student ratio at EUC is very low. This fits the didactical approach and enables a good execution of the programme (Standard F).

The panel concludes that the facilities in the EUC's faculty building are well suited to the programme's didactical format. Students start their first year at EUC by living together in the Lucia building, which has state-of-the-art student rooms and common rooms for social activities. EUC's infrastructure helps to establish an academic and social community (Standard F).

The panel considered the level of the theses appropriate for academic bachelor's level. The panel was impressed with the quality of a few theses, which it considered exceptionally good pieces of work for an undergraduate programme. While noting that the graduation rates of the programme remain higher than those of bachelor programmes offered at Erasmus University, the panel felt compelled to raise the question of the unusual drop in the 2015-16 rates. In depth discussion of the issue with the administration and students convinced the panel that this was a temporary aberration and accepted the possible explanations for its occurrence. More importantly, the panel is persuaded that EUC has correctly addressed the issue and that the measures it has taken to ensure significantly higher graduation rates for the future should prove successful. After EUC, students have no difficulties being accepted into high quality master's programmes at universities in the Netherlands and abroad (Standard H).

Practice-based assessment

With regard to the Distinctive Feature Small-scale and Intensive Education, the panel has verified that EUC meets all standards. In its assessment under Standard B, it paid specific attention to the number of extracurricular activities and the connection between those activities and issues that are specific for Rotterdam, as recommended by the 2012 assessment panel. This panel concludes that EUC now offers a sufficient number of relevant extracurricular activities. Some of them have a clearer connection with the Rotterdam community than others, and the panel suggests increasing the number of extracurricular activities that are aimed at a broader audience and that benefit from



EUC's urban setting. From seeing how constructively EUC has responded to suggestions and recommendations by the first assessment visit, the panel is confident that EUC will take this suggestion seriously. The improvement shown, the development plans, and the fact that all criteria meet the standard, result in a positive assessment of the Distinctive feature combined with a positive advice regarding the practice-based assessment by the panel.

The panel discussed during the site visit the evidence regarding EUC's graduation rates at length. During the full period under consideration, success rates at EUC were substantially higher than those of other relevant bachelor programmes offered at Erasmus University. The panel felt, however, compelled to raise the question of the unusual drop in the completion rates for the cohort 2015-2016. In depth discussion of the issue with the EUC management, staff and students convinced the panel that this was a temporary aberration and it accepted the possible explanations and evidence for its occurrence. More importantly, the panel is persuaded that EUC has correctly addressed the issue and that the measures it has taken to ensure significantly higher graduation rates for the future should prove successful. The panel therefore combines its positive assessment of the Distinctive Feature with 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

EUC Academic Rules and Regulations 2016/2017	EUC Academic Rules and Regulations 2017/2018
1) Graduates of this programme will have knowledge of the most important theories, traditions, perspectives and discussions within the fields of study represented in the departments of EUC (henceforth: contributing disciplines) from an inter- and multidisciplinary viewpoint;	1) Graduates of this programme have fundamental academic knowledge of a variety of disciplines represented at the FLIR;
1) Graduates of this programme will have knowledge of the most important theories, traditions, perspectives and discussions within the fields of study represented in the departments of EUC (henceforth: contributing disciplines) from an inter- and multidisciplinary viewpoint; 4) Graduates of this programme will have knowledge of the aim, theory and application of academic research and the customary designs and methods within the contributing disciplines; 23) Graduates of this programme will be able to keep up with developments in the field and society.	2) Graduates of this programme have knowledge of the most prominent theories, methods, traditions, perspectives and discussions within one of the Majors of EUC;
3) Graduates of this programme will have knowledge of the key issues and terms in the philosophy of science in a societal context; 5) Graduates of this programme will have knowledge of the social significance of the contributing disciplines.	3) Graduates of this programme can reflect on science and the scientific practices, as well as its relation with society;
2) Graduates of this programme will have knowledge of the cultural, social, economic and political developments of the contributing disciplines, from an international perspective; 6) Graduates of this programme will be able to analyse and reflect upon issues from an inter- and multidisciplinary perspective as well as from the perspective of each of the contributing disciplines;	4) Graduates of this programme are able to analyse and critically reflect in an inter- and multidisciplinary way on social and academic issues;



	5) Graduates of this programme are able to contribute to science and society in a constructive way;
<p>7) Graduates of this programme will be able to translate scientific and social issues into relevant and academically meaningful (possibly multidisciplinary) research questions;</p> <p>8) Graduates of this programme will be able to set up and conduct academic research;</p> <p>9) Graduates of this programme will be able to make an academic contribution to policymaking and research;</p> <p>10) Graduates of this programme will be able to collect relevant and reliable sources and data independently in order to answer research questions ethically and in an academically responsible manner;</p> <p>16) Graduates of this programme will be able to report orally and in writing in an academically responsible manner;</p> <p>17) Graduates of this programme will be able to indicate orally or in writing the social relevance of academic results;</p> <p>19) Graduates of this programme will be able to (take initiatives to) work and communicate with different target groups;</p>	6) Graduates of this programme are able to perform research in an academically meaningful and ethical manner and communicate about this to peers, professionals, policymakers and the public;
10) Graduates of this programme will be able to collect relevant and reliable sources and data independently in order to answer research questions ethically and in an academically responsible manner;	7) Graduates of this programme are able to collect relevant and reliable sources and data in order to identify and analyse academic problems;
15) Graduates of this programme will be able to read critically and reflect independently upon academic literature;	8) Graduates of this programme are able to critically relate to, and independently reflect on academic discourse;
<p>14) Graduates of this programme will be able to communicate in written and spoken academic English;</p> <p>16) Graduates of this programme will be able to report orally and in writing in an academically responsible manner;</p>	9) Graduates of this programme should be able to communicate in written and spoken academic English;

<p>18) Graduates of this programme will be able to collaborate in a group with members from multiple cultural, academic or social background;</p> <p>13) Graduates of this programme will be able to acknowledge differences in cultural, ideological and philosophical backgrounds.</p> <p>20) Graduates of this programme will be able to (take initiatives to) participate actively in society (community work, associations) and live and work effectively and respectfully with people from all backgrounds (with regard to nationality, culture, socio-economic background, academic discipline);</p>	<p>10) Graduates of this programme are able to collaborate in a group with members from different backgrounds;</p>
<p>20) Graduates of this programme will be able to (take initiatives to) participate actively in society (community work, associations) and live and work effectively and respectfully with people from all backgrounds (with regard to nationality, culture, socio-economic background, academic discipline);</p>	<p>11) Graduates of this programme are able to accept social and civic responsibilities and to speak out against prejudice, injustice and the abuse of power;</p>
<p>20) Graduates of this programme will be able to (take initiatives to) participate actively in society (community work, associations) and live and work effectively and respectfully with people from all backgrounds (with regard to nationality, culture, socio-economic background, academic discipline);</p>	<p>12) Graduates of this programme can live respectfully with people from different backgrounds.</p>
<p>11) Graduates of this programme will be able to develop a critical and well-reasoned evidence-based opinion, which demonstrates that they are aware of the limitations of knowledge, and that they bear social and ethical responsibility;</p> <p>12) Graduates of this programme will be able to put their own opinions into perspective and be open to other opinions and arguments;</p> <p>13) Graduates of this programme will be able to acknowledge differences in cultural, ideological and philosophical backgrounds.</p>	<p>13) Graduates of this programme are able to formulate a critical and well-reasoned evidence-based opinion, while being prepared to engage with other opinions and arguments;.</p>
<p>2) Graduates of this programme will have knowledge of the cultural, social, economic and political developments of the contributing disciplines, from an international perspective;</p>	<p>14) Graduates of this programme are able to reflect on their role as a critical world citizen.</p>



<p>21) Graduates of this programme will be able to reflect upon their own competencies, and the development of these, and determine where their personal learning aims and interests lie;</p> <p>22) Graduates of this programme will be able to reflect upon feedback about their work, and apply that feedback to improve that work;</p> <p>23) Graduates of this programme will be able to keep up with developments in the field and society.</p>	
---	--

APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Monday 5 November EUC		Tuesday 6 November EUC	
8.45 - 9.00	<i>Arrival panel/welcome</i>	8.45 - 9.00	<i>Arrival panel</i>
9.00 - 12.00	<i>Initial panel meeting cluster</i>	9.00 - 9.15	<i>Internal panel meeting</i>
12.00 - 12.45	<i>lunch and break</i>	9.15 - 10.00	<i>Students*</i>
12.45 - 13.45	<i>Initial panel meeting EUC</i>	10.00 - 11.00	<i>Teachers and tutors*</i>
13.45 - 15.00	<i>Tour + treasure trove</i>	11.00 - 12.00	<i>Lunch and break</i>
15.00 - 15.15	<i>Break</i>	12.00 - 13.00	<i>Internal panel meeting</i>
15.15 - 16.00	<i>Development dialogue</i>	13.00 - 14.30	<i>Programme management</i>
16.00 - 16.45	<i>Programma management</i>	14.30 - 15.00	<i>Presentation findings</i>
16.45 - 17.15	<i>Boards of Examiners</i>	15.00 - 15.15	<i>Goodbye and thank you</i>
17.15 - 17.30	<i>Break</i>		
17.30 - 18.00	<i>Alumni</i>		
18.00 - 18.30	<i>Break</i>		
18.30 - 20.00	<i>Panel dinner (panel only)</i>		



APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED

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):

- Academic Rules and Regulations;
- Assessment policy (2017/2018);
- Schematic overview curriculum(2017/2018);
- Course catalogue (2017/2018);
- Key parameter tables with information on the cohort size, dropout rates and negative binding study advice (2013/2014-2016/2017); study success after 3, 4 and 5 years (2013/2014-2016/2017); and application and admission numbers ((2013/2014-2017/2018);
- Admission manual (2017/2018);
- EUC Honourcode;
- Annual report Programme Committee (2017/2018);
- Relation between ILOs and curriculum;
- Guidelines and procedures of the Examination Board (2017/2018)
- Annual report Examination Board (2016/2017);
- Capstone manual (2017/2018);
- TNO accreditation report (2013);
- DFSI accreditation report (2013);
- Responses to advice in TNO (2013) and TOE (2016);
- Various modules, including its teaching materials, including assignments and examinations:
 - o UC-17-HUM206 Early Modern Political Philosophy
 - o UC-17-HUM302 Aesthetics & Politics: a Genealogy of Social Order
 - o UC-17-INT202 Qualitative Research
 - o UC-17-SBS203 Clinical Psychology
 - o UC-17-ACC101 Big History
 - o UC-17-LSC210 Micro- & Immunobiology
 - o UC-17-ECB201 Microeconomics
 - o UC-17-ACC104 Economic Behaviour: Opportunities & Constraints.

After the site visit, the panel received upon request some additional information, including:

- Detailed information on EUCSA's extracurricular activities to confirm information presented during the site visit;
- Additional information regarding the performance of the various Spring intake cohorts.

