

Additional assessment

Management

Nyenrode Business Universiteit

Quality Assurance Netherlands Universities (QANU)
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

Phone: 030 230 3100
E-mail: info@qanu.nl
Internet: www.qanu.nl

Project number: Q0575

© 2016 QANU

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

CONTENTS

Report on the additional assessment of the master's programme Management of Nyenrode Business Universiteit	5
Administrative data regarding the programme	5
Administrative data regarding the institution.....	5
Composition of the assessment panel.....	5
Cause for the additional assessment	6
Working method of the assessment panel.....	6
Summary judgement	8
Assessment of Standard 16 of the Assessment Framework for Extensive Programme Assessments	11
Appendices	17
Appendix 1: Curricula Vitae of the members of the assessment panel.....	19
Appendix 2: Theses and documents studied by the assessment panel	21
Appendix 3: Schedule meetings with representatives of the programme.....	23

This report was finalised on 19 May 2016.

Report on the additional assessment of the master's programme Management of Nyenrode Business Universiteit

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Extensive Programme Assessments as its starting point, in addition to the NVAO Points of departure for the assessment of programmes granted an improvement period.

Administrative data regarding the programme

Master's programme Management

Name of the programme:	Management
CROHO number:	66420
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	77 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	- International management - Financial management - Marketing management
Location:	Breukelen
Mode of study:	full-time, part-time
Expiration of accreditation:	27-11-2016

Administrative data regarding the institution

Name of the institution:	Nyenrode Business Universiteit
Status of the institution:	legal body providing higher education
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	not applied

Composition of the assessment panel

The panel that assessed the master's programme Management consisted of:

- Prof. B.I.J.M. (Beatrice) van der Heijden (chair), full professor of strategic HRM and head of the Department Strategic HRM at the Radboud University Nijmegen, the Netherlands, and affiliated with the Open University of the Netherlands, and Kingston University, London, UK.
- Prof. P.C. (Peter) van der Sijde, professor of organisation science at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands;
- Prof. J. (Jeltje) van der Meer-Kooistra, professor of financial management at the University of Groningen, the Netherlands.

The panel was supported by dr. F. (Floor) Meijer, who acted as secretary.

Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.

Cause for the additional assessment

The master's programme Management was assessed in 2013 by an assessment panel chaired by professor Beatrice van der Heijden. After the site visit on 4 and 5 November 2013, the panel presented its final report on 2 March 2014. In its report the panel concluded that the programme complied with the criteria for standards 1 to 15 of the applicable assessment framework (the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Extensive Programme Assessments, dated 22 November 2011). However, standard 16 (assessment and achieved learning outcomes) was assessed as unsatisfactory. In accordance with the NVAO's decision rules, the overall conclusion was that the programme did not (yet) meet the criteria for reaccreditation.

The unsatisfactory assessment of standard 16 was based on the conclusion that too many of the theses in the considerable sample that the panel studied did not meet the requirements for a thesis at the academic level. According to the panel, the lack of academic rigour observed in a number of the sample theses could emanate from the orientation of the programme, which was heavily geared towards professional practice. The panel made several recommendations that concerned both the (quality assurance of the) thesis process and the curriculum of the programme.

The programme drew up an improvement plan in response to the assessment report, and presented it to the panel for approval. In this plan, the programme reflected on foreseen and already implemented remedial actions in response to the observed shortcomings concerning the academic content of the programme and the achieved level as demonstrated by the theses. On 29 August 2014 the approved improvement plan was submitted to the NVAO. Based on the positive advice by the panel, the NVAO decided on 28 November 2014 to grant the programme a two-year recovery period and to extend its accreditation until 27 November 2016.

Working method of the assessment panel

Preparation

The panel that was asked to assess the improvement of the programme consisted of two members of the original panel, Prof. Beatrice van der Heijden (chair) and Prof. Peter van der Sijde, and one new member, Prof. Jeltje van der Meer-Kooistra.

In accordance with the NVAO guideline, the panel was asked to focus on the standard that was originally assessed as unsatisfactory, standard 16. As this report will show, aspects of other standards were involved in the assessment in cases in which they were directly linked to the shortcomings observed in standard 16.

In preparation for the reassessment in the spring of 2016, the programme drew up a brief report ('Master of Science in Management Nyenrode Business Universiteit Status Report'), which was made available to the panel members on 14 March 2016. In addition to the status report, the panel studied a sample of 13 theses that were completed in 2015 and 2016 by students of both the part-time programme (the cohorts 'PT MSc17' and 'PT MSc18') and the full-time programme (the cohorts 'MSc22' and 'MSc23'). All panel members sent their feedback on the status report and sample theses to the panel and secretary.

The panel identified problems with the weaker sample theses, all of them from the cohorts that graduated in 2015. The 'four eyes principle' was carried out on three theses that received

the minimal passing grade (6). The panel concluded that these theses should not have been graded as sufficient. To discuss this issue, the panel decided to conduct interviews with representatives of Nyenrode Business Universiteit, notably with the programme management, supervisors of the disputed theses and the Board of Examiners.

Panel meeting, interviews and reporting process

On 15 April 2016, the panel discussed its preliminary findings during an internal panel meeting. Subsequently, it conducted interviews with representatives of the programme, with whom it discussed thesis supervision and assessment in general, as well as the individual cases in which the panel did not agree with the grade given by the first and second reader. In the week following the interviews, the panel read 3 additional theses, all of them completed in 2016. As these theses were completed more recently, they gave more insight into the full effects of the remedial measures. After reaching a conclusion on the improvement that was realised, the secretary drafted an assessment report. The report was submitted to the panel for approval and afterwards sent to the programme for a check on factual inaccuracies. The panel finalised its report after discussing the programme's comments.

Decision rules

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Extensive Programme Assessments (as of 22 November 2011), the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the standard under evaluation and the programme as a whole.

Generic quality

The quality that can reasonably be expected in an international perspective from a higher education bachelor's or master's programme.

Unsatisfactory

The programme does not meet the current generic quality standards and shows serious shortcomings in several areas.

Satisfactory

The programme meets the current generic quality standards and shows an acceptable level across its entire spectrum.

Good

The programme systematically surpasses the current generic quality standards across its entire spectrum.

Excellent

The programme systematically well surpasses the current generic quality standards across its entire spectrum and is regarded as an (inter)national example.

Summary judgement of the panel

This report reflects the panel's findings and considerations with regard to the additional assessment of the master's programme Management at Nyenrode Business Universiteit. During the initial assessment that took place in 2013, the panel assessed standard 16 of the NVAO Assessment Framework for Extensive Programme Assessments – and as a result the programme as a whole – as unsatisfactory. Following the assessment, the programme was granted a recovery period of two years, in which it had to improve standard 16 on the basis of an improvement plan that was approved by the NVAO. The current panel maintains the previous – satisfactory/good – assessment on Standard 1-15 and limits itself to a (partial) reassessment of standard 16.

Standard 16: assessment and achieved learning outcomes

In 2013, a sample of theses showed that too many students of the master's programme Management did not achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel believed that this was partially caused by shortcomings in the curriculum that emphasised professional skills over academic skills, and partially by the way in which theses were supervised and assessed.

The improvement plan that was put forward by the programme consists of ten measures to improve the academic content of the curriculum. These can be divided into (1) measures to strengthen the academic content of the curriculum and (2) measures designed to improve the thesis (assessment) process. Measures that fall into the first category include the strengthening of academic core courses in which students practice academic and methodological skills. The panel was pleased to learn that the number of EC's dedicated to such courses has doubled and that the content was revised where necessary. Another significant process was the strengthening of the academic culture amongst the teaching staff. Staff members were actively involved in the discussion on the development of academic competencies, both in individual courses and in the curriculum as a whole.

The panel was also generally positive about the measures to improve the thesis process, several of which target the quality of supervision. The panel agreed that methodology workshops and calibration sessions are an effective way to improve inter-rater reliability, and was pleased to learn that staff members are now actively held accountable for the quality of thesis supervision. The abandonment of cohort graduation is also an important measure, as it means that there is time to do more work on a thesis when the quality is not yet sufficient on the verge of graduation day. A measure that has only partially succeeded is the effort to link thesis projects to ongoing research projects of Nyenrode faculty. To increase the exposure of students to research, in 2016/2017, the programme will introduce three parallel 'research courses'. Another measure that needs more attention is the, as yet incomplete, revision of the thesis assessment form. Although compensation between different categories on the form is no longer possible, the panel established that the form still does not contain a qualitative substantiation of the grades given by the supervisors.

The panel concluded that the programme has taken adequate remedial measures, which are in line with the findings and recommendations of the original panel and the improvement plan approved by the NVAO. It was impressed with the number of measures that have been implemented, even though the progress and success of some of the individual measures are as yet incomplete or hard to assess. The panel also concluded that the remedial measures fit well within a broader shift towards a more academic culture that is currently taking place at Nyenrode.

When studying the sample of theses, the panel found 3 theses that unjustly received passing grades. These theses suffered from many of the same problems that were observed in the weaker sample theses during the initial assessment of 2013. However, the panel concluded that these theses were all written by students who had enrolled in the programme *before* the original site visit of November 2013 and had only partially benefited from the remedial measures. Their results can therefore not be considered exemplary for the improvement that was achieved. After careful consideration of a number of additional theses from the lower end of the grade spectrum that were completed by the cohort that started in September 2014 and did benefit from the full width of the remedial measures, the panel concluded that *at present* all students achieve the desired level. The remedial measures can therefore be considered successful.

The panel assessed the standards from the Assessment Framework for Extensive Programme Assessments in the following way:

Intended learning outcomes

Standard 1 satisfactory

Curriculum

Standard 2 satisfactory

Standard 3 satisfactory

Standard 4 satisfactory

Standard 5 good

Standard 6 satisfactory

Standard 7 satisfactory

Staff

Standard 8 satisfactory

Standard 9 satisfactory

Standard 10 satisfactory

Services and facilities

Standard 11 good

Standard 12 satisfactory

Quality assurance

Standard 13 satisfactory

Standard 14 satisfactory

Standard 15 satisfactory

Assessment and achieved learning outcomes

Standard 16 satisfactory

General conclusion satisfactory

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

Date: 19 May 2016

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the left.

Prof. Beatrice van der Heijden

dr. Floor Meijer

Assessment of Standard 16 from the Assessment Framework for Extensive Programme Assessments

Standard 16

The programme has an adequate assessment system in place and demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Explanation:

The level achieved is demonstrated by interim and final tests, final projects and the performance of graduates in actual practice or in post-graduate programmes. The tests and assessments are valid, reliable and transparent to the students.

Findings and considerations 2014

During the initial assessment in 2014, the panel read a sample of 25 recently completed theses. Generally it found the grading of these theses too high. In 8 cases (32%), the panel established that a passing grade should not have been given. A number of specific problems were identified that included a lack of testable hypotheses, inadequate sample sizes, an unsatisfactory description of the analysis of the data and a lack of critical reflection. Furthermore, the list of references was often too short and APA citation rules were not always used.

The panel linked these conclusions to its observations about the curriculum of the programme, which emphasised professional skills over academic skills. In the opinion of the panel, the development of academic research and writing skills should receive more attention in order to adequately prepare students for their final research project. To safeguard the quality of the theses, the panel urged supervisors to be very strict on methodological rigour from the start of the research project.

The panel was also critical about aspects of the (quality assurance of the) thesis process. It established that the 2008 assessment panel had advised the introduction of an individualised thesis process, but implementation of this advice had been postponed until 2013/2014. At the time of the site visit, theses were still written in pairs, making it very difficult to guarantee that all students achieved the intended learning outcomes. The panel was pleased about the use of 'score cards' for the assessment of theses, but found that they lacked qualitative comments by the supervisors, making it difficult to validate the final grade. Furthermore, the score cards allowed for compensation of an insufficient score on one or more of the five assessment categories by higher scores on other categories. This meant that crucial parts of the thesis could show serious defects without necessarily leading to an insufficient final grade.

The panel's recommendations to strengthen the academic content of the curriculum and tighten thesis supervision and assessment were addressed in an improvement plan written by the programme. The programme proposed a set of ten remedial measures, which ranged from adjusting the curriculum to professionalising the staff and introducing annual external assessment of the thesis quality.

Findings and considerations 2016

In its status report of March 2016, the programme describes its progress with regard to the ten remedial actions listed in the improvement plan. The measures can be broadly divided into two categories. The first half fall into the category of curriculum improvements intended to strengthen the academic content of the curriculum, while the final half target the (quality assurance of the) thesis process. Below, the panel's findings with regard to the sample theses will be taken as a starting point for a discussion of the remedial measures. In its conclusion

the panel will assess whether the measures have been successful and the programme therefore meets the standards for reaccreditation.

Achieved learning outcomes

The panel studied a sample of 13 theses that were defended in 2015 and 2016 by the full-time cohorts MSc22 and MSc23, and the part-time cohorts PT MSc17 and PT MSc18. Because of the duration of the programme (1.5 years for the full-time programme including the pre-master's programme, 2.5 years for the part-time programme including the pre-master's programme) most of these cohorts had already started the programme before the initial site visit at the end of 2013. Only the MSc23 cohort started after the assessment, in September 2014.

With regard to the 10 sample theses that received a grade of 6.5 or higher, the panel was pleased with the thesis content and the grades given by the supervisors. It established that the theses were much more academically and methodologically sound than the theses that the original panel studied in 2013, and that the grading was at the right level. The panel did notice that in many cases the sub-questions of the central research question were not actual research questions, but referred to definitions of concepts. The observed practice seems to originate from the thesis manual, which states that 'sub-questions pertain to the concepts and their measurement, and the manner in which these concepts are interrelated' (Nyenrode Guidelines for Master's Thesis Writing, p. 11). The panel advises to change the manual in this respect.

The sample of 13 theses included 3 theses from the MSc22 and PT MSc17 cohort that the panel considered very weak. These theses, which were all graded as a 6, should not have received a passing grade. As before, the disputed theses suffered from inadequately phrased hypotheses, flaws in choices regarding the use of methodology, shaky and/or irrelevant or even lacking theoretical underpinning and very limited sample sizes. Furthermore, they were often sloppy in the sense that they contained spelling and grammatical errors. In one case, a suggestion made by the second reader to adjust the research methodology in the second version of a thesis that was rejected earlier on had not led to a rephrasing of the research question and rewriting of the first half of the thesis, which severely affected the comprehensibility of the thesis.

In its meeting with thesis supervisors and second readers, the panel established that second readers generally become involved in the thesis process once the supervisor believes that the thesis is admissible to the thesis defence. In the cases that were discussed, the second readers had initially rejected the theses and suggested improvements. After the students in question had made changes, the second readers accepted the theses. The supervisors and second readers indicated that for the students in question 'the learning curve was complete' and that their progress was deemed sufficient for a pass grade. They also pointed at mitigating factors, such as the fact that these students had started their studies in the old system in which fewer credits were dedicated to academic skills. Moreover, they were part of the first cohort to write individual theses. Both students and supervisors still had to get used to this more work-intensive practice, which caused major delays for a substantial part of the students and added to the workload of staff.

To establish whether progress with regard to thesis supervision and assessment has been made in the second year of the two-year recovery period, the panel decided to study a number of additional theses completed by the MSc23 cohort. Contrary to the (full-time) MSc22 and (part-time) PT MSc17 cohorts, this cohort did benefit from the full width of the remedial measures. As none of the theses defended in early 2016 had received a grade of 6, the panel

selected three theses that were awarded a 6.5, setting the total sample size at 16 theses. Careful examination of these additional theses pointed out that they are solid products, worthy of a pass grade. This strengthened the panel in its positive impression of the improvements that were made to the curriculum and thesis process.

The main aspects of the remedial measures will be outlined below.

Strengthening of the academic content of the curriculum

After the assessment in 2013, the programme took measures to ensure that students acquire the necessary academic skills to write a thesis at the proper academic level. The panel learned that all faculty members teaching in the programme discussed the significance of academic competencies to ensure that the necessary adjustments to (the assessment of) the courses could be made in accordance with the intended learning outcomes. Since the start of the academic year 2014/2015, all course outlines explicitly refer to academic competencies. The Programme Committee reviews the academic content of the curriculum as a whole annually to ensure that all intended learning outcomes are sufficiently addressed.

The development of academic competencies is now a regular topic in staff meetings, which, according to the panel, is very helpful in introducing a more academically oriented culture amongst the staff. Faculty are encouraged to build on academic skills that students have acquired in previous courses and to use academic articles in addition to other materials. The panel could not determine how widespread the practice of using state-of-the-art academic literature alongside textbooks currently is. From the sample theses the success of this measure was not yet evident, as these often made use of somewhat out-dated literature.

To strengthen the academic foundations of the programme extra credits were dedicated to academic competencies in the so-called 'Academic Foundation Courses'. The panel was informed that whereas the full-time cohort MSc22 that started the programme in September 2013 followed just 9 EC worth of academic foundation courses, for the MSc23 cohort that started a year later this had doubled to 18 EC. Changes have primarily been implemented in the three 'Tools and Methods for Empirical Research'-courses (TAMER I-III), the first of which now also includes specific topics from philosophy of science. The foundations of academic reading and writing skills are taught in the pre-master's phase: in the revised Academic Reading and Writing course in the full-time programme and in TAMER I for the part-time programme. During these courses students read academic articles and synthesize information in academic papers, in which they apply the APA-referencing rules. Written assignments are also part of business-related courses. In some cases, individual papers replaced group papers, so that students get extra practice in academic writing and receive feedback on their individual work more frequently. A further change – the introduction of three parallel thematic 'research courses' in the part-time programme – is scheduled for the academic year 2016/2017.

The panel established that many of the measures intended to strengthen the academic content of the curriculum fit within a broader shift towards a more academic culture that is currently taking place at Nyenrode. Over the past five years, the university has taken Faculty-wide measures to ensure the academic quality of its degree programmes. These include stricter selection procedures for students and staff, the introduction of performance indicators for academic research, mandatory BKO-trajectories for teaching staff (currently 85% of the staff has a basic teaching qualification) and the establishment of a Programme Committee (which is not obligatory by law for private universities such as Nyenrode). The panel strongly

supports this university-wide reconsideration process and believes that it will promote the success of programme specific remedial actions.

Strengthening of the (quality assurance of the) thesis process

In line with the improvement plan, the programme has also taken measures to strengthen the (quality assurance of the) thesis process. Several of these measures target the quality of supervision. The panel was informed that the programme management has compiled a list of staff members who are eligible to act as thesis supervisors. Faculty are classified according to their abilities, and based on (1) thesis level (bachelor's, master's, MBA) and (2) research type (qualitative, quantitative). During the interviews, it was mentioned that staff members with less successful track records in supervision have been excluded from the list. The programme is also working on a list of qualified external supervisors who can step in when more supervisors are needed than can be found amongst the Nyenrode faculty. Furthermore, there are continuous efforts to professionalise thesis supervision and assessment, for example by organising an annual methodology workshop and calibration sessions, in which staff members discuss quality standards using cases from daily practice. Only supervisors that have successfully completed the methodology workshop are eligible for thesis supervision. The quality of thesis supervision is now also an explicit part of the annual appraisal process of faculty. The panel fully supports these measures and believes that they can make a good contribution to improving inter-rater reliability and thesis supervision in general.

In its improvement plan, the programme also expressed the intention to align the thesis research of students with research projects of Nyenrode faculty by requiring students to choose a topic that is related to the ongoing research of potential supervisors. This, however, has proven difficult to achieve, as there are not enough research projects available which are also suitable for thesis research. The introduction of three research courses in 2016/2017 (cf. p. 12) is intended as an alternative solution to guarantee that students pick suitable research topics. Students who wish to pursue a thesis topic that is useful for their employer are allowed to do so, but only if a staff member is willing to 'take ownership' of the subject and guarantee the academic character of the project. The panel is positive about the intention to link thesis projects to ongoing research of faculty. Something that should, however, be avoided is that students blindly copy the theoretical framework developed by staff. At the master's level, students should demonstrate that they themselves are able to develop a theoretical framework based on the relevant literature.

The programme has also implemented measures to improve the thesis procedures. In response to the recommendation made by the 2014 panel, the thesis score card was adjusted in the summer of 2014 so that an insufficient score in one or more of the three categories that concern the content of the thesis (1: Introduction Problem and Theoretical Framework, 2: Methodology and Research, 3: Outcomes Analyses and Recommendations) cannot be compensated by higher scores in other categories. Although this is indeed an improvement, the panel established that the scorecard, that contains the joint assessment of the supervisor and second reader, still lacks qualitative remarks by the supervisors. This means that external assessors have no way of establishing why a certain grade was given. Students appear to receive comments on their work either orally or by email, which is an informal feedback system. The programme would do well to formalise this system, both for the benefit of students and that of external auditors. Also, the panel suggests involving the second reader earlier on in the process. The feedback loop would be more efficient if both first and second reader have to validate the first part of the thesis (introduction, theoretical framework, methodology section) before the student is allowed to continue with the research project.

As part of the effort to improve the thesis procedures, the Master's Thesis Regulations were rewritten in 2014 to provide more clarity about the thesis process and responsibilities of all those involved. The Nyenrode Guidelines for Master's Thesis Writing were introduced in September 2015 to help students with the set-up of their quantitative or qualitative research and academic reporting.

Another important measure that the panel applauded is the partial abandonment of the Nyenrode principle of 'fixed time, fixed quality', which proved untenable after the introduction of individual thesis projects. An overwhelming majority (94%) of the first full-time cohort to individually write theses was not able to make the deadline of the joint graduation day, which meant that it had to be postponed for two months. As of MSc23 the notion of cohort graduation ('fixed time') was abolished and in the future there will be several graduation moments, which reduces the pressure that supervisors may feel to pass students in the face of graduation day; something which was described as a 'perverse incentive' during the interviews. This does not mean that deadlines are no longer taken seriously. Currently, both supervisors and programme management independently monitor thesis-related deadlines and in the future a thesis coordinator will be appointed for this purpose.

Finally, the programme has embraced annual external audits as a way to ensure the quality of the theses. In 2014 and 2015, external auditors examined the quality of sample theses and the results were used in adjusting the design of courses like TAMER (cf. p. 12). The external assessment will be repeated regularly in the future. As part of the Faculty-wide reforms, Nyenrode also intends to introduce midterm reviews of its degree programmes.

From the interviews with representatives of the programme, the panel learned that the Faculty-wide Board of Examiners has a central role in the process of strengthening the thesis process. In 2012 – the year before the initial site visit – the Board of Examiners took the initiative for the establishment of a 'second reader team'. This now fully functional team consists of the most experienced thesis supervisors, who – contrary to previous practice – only assess theses in their own field of expertise. While second readers were previously only allowed to advise on the grade, they currently provide independent judgement on a thesis and – therefore – have the option to reject theses that do not meet the academic quality standards. The panel is convinced that the establishment of the second reader team is a firm step towards better thesis supervision and thesis quality, as it has paved the way for constructive discussions between staff members. The panel was told that the rejection of theses by second readers initially caused tensions and even conflicts, but now that staff members are more used to the new system, and the fixed time principle has been abandoned, the collegial atmosphere has improved and new collaborations have emerged. The percentage of rejections has decreased from 15% in 2014-2015 to 6% in 2015-2016, which could be taken as a sign that supervisors are more in agreement about what constitutes an adequate thesis. In cases where agreement cannot be reached a third reader performs a double blind assessment of the thesis. The result of this is binding.

Conclusion

Generally speaking, the panel is impressed by the number of remedial measures that have been carried out in a relatively short period of time. Even if the individual success of some measures is (as yet) hard to measure, the combination of measures intended to emphasise the academic character of the programme and strengthen the quality of the thesis process has had a clear effect on the theses, which are much more methodologically sound than before. This is especially the case for the theses completed in late 2015/early 2016 by students of the full-time cohort MSc23, who fully benefitted from the remedial measures. With regard to this part of the sample the panel agreed with all of the grades given by the supervisors. The confidence

inspired by these theses has convinced the panel to overlook the issues that it found in the theses on the lower end of the scale produced by earlier cohorts. Most likely these should be characterised as teething problems in the transition phase to an individual and truly academic thesis project. The panel was also pleased to learn of the broader transformation process that is currently taking place at Nyenrode Business Universiteit, as this means that there is widespread support – and therefore a good chance of sustainability – for the programme-specific measures that were mentioned above.

Master's programme Management: the panel assesses Standard 16 as 'satisfactory'.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Curricula Vitae of the members of the assessment panel

Prof. B.I.J.M. (Beatrice) van der Heijden (chair) is full professor of Business Administration, in particular Strategic HRM, at the Radboud University Nijmegen. She is Head of the Department Strategic HRM. Moreover, she occupies a Chair in Strategic HRM at the Open University of the Netherlands, and at Kingston University, London, UK. . She holds a MA in Work and Organizational Psychology from the Radboud University and a PhD in Management Science from the University of Twente. In 2000, she was a visiting Professor at the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow (Scotland, UK). Her main research areas are: career development, employability and aging at work. Van der Heijden is Associate Editor of the European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, and has published, among others in Journal of Vocational Behavior, HRM, Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, and Work & Stress.

Prof. J. (Jeltje) van der Meer-Kooistra is professor of financial management in the Faculty of Economics and Business at the University of Groningen. Her research focuses on the management control of internal transactions and the governance of strategic alliances, such as outsourcing relationships, joint ventures, and product co-development projects. She has published her work in journals such as: Accounting, Organizations and Society, Management Accounting Research, Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management, and International Transfer Pricing Journal. She co-edited the book International Management Accounting and Control (McGraw-Hill, 2010). She is a member of the editorial board of Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management, and was a guest editor of a special issue of Management Accounting Research (2006) on the theme of management control of interfirm transactional relationships. Until 2010 she was director of the Accounting & Controlling programmes, and director of the Accounting research programme. She co-ordinates the long-term relationship between the Faculty of Economics and Business and the University of Curaçao with respect to the master programme of Accountancy.

Prof. P.C. (Peter) van der Sijde is professor of organization, entrepreneurship and technology in the Faculties of Science (Science, Business & Innovation) and the Faculty of Social Science (Department of Organization Sciences) at the VU University Amsterdam. His research emphasis is on entrepreneurship, university-industry interaction and knowledge valorization. Previously, Van der Sijde was associate professor at the VU Amsterdam in the Department of Organization Sciences, and senior researcher and staff member of the Dutch Institute for Knowledge Intensive Entrepreneurship (Nikos) at the University of Twente (Enschede, NL). In the period 2002-2008 he was visiting professor of entrepreneurship at the Ulster Business School at the University of Ulster. He has also held a chair (as 'lector') in Knowledge Innovative Entrepreneurship at the Saxion University for Applied Sciences (Enschede, NL, 2003-2007). In the period July 2014 till May 2015 he acted as programme director of the BCO Master programme at VU.

Appendix 2: Theses and documents studied by the assessment panel

The panel has studied theses from students with the following student numbers:

S130261	S130250	S140344	S130024
S130286	S130288	S130033	S140372
S130315	S130317	S140343	S130440
S130059	S140338	S140396	S130003

In addition, the panel examined the following documents:

- Master of Science in Management Nyenrode Business Universiteit Status Report (including attachments, 14 March 2016);
- Assessment report master's programme Management, Nyenrode Business Universiteit (2 March 2014);
- Master of Science in Management Nyenrode Business Universiteit Improvement Plan (21 August 2014);
- Advice panel on first draft of Improvement Plan (22 April 2014);
- NVAO Besluit strekkende tot het verlengen van de geldigheidsduur van het accreditatiebesluit van 19 februari 2009 zoals bedoeld in artikel 5a12a van de Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek (WHW) van de opleiding wo-master Management van Nyenrode Business Universiteit tot en met 27 November 2016.

Appendix 3: Schedule meetings with representatives of the programme

15 April 2016, QANU, Catharijnesingel 56, Utrecht

11:00-11:15	inloop panel, koffie	
11:15-13:00	bespreking verbetermaatregelen en scripties	
13:00-13:30	lunch	
13:30-14:45	voorgespreking gesprekken met vertegenwoordigers opleiding	
14:45-15:00	pauze	
15:00-15:45	gesprek met programma-management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Dr. Ir. Jan Bots (associate dean degree programs) • Hetty van Roozendaal, LMM (Program Director FT MScM) • Maren Smulders MSc (Program Director FT MScM) • Prof. Dr. Rob Blomme (chair Program committee & Chair Second reader Team)
15:45-16:30	gesprek met scriptiebegeleiders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drs. Tom Dolkens (Supervisor of student Indy de Ridder) • Prof. Dr. Danielle Zandee (2nd Reader of student Indy de Ridder) • Prof. Dr. Venu Venugopal (Supervisor of student Twan Meulendijks) [English speaking] • Prof. Dr. Jaap Koelewijn (Supervisor Robert Schouten) • Dr. Hans ten Rouwelaar (2nd reader Robert Schouten)
16:30-17:15	gesprek met examencommissie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Dr. Bo van der Rhee (chair Exam Committee) • Prof. Dr. Venu Venugopal (member Exam Committee) [English speaking] • Prof. Dr. Rob Blomme (chair Program committee & Chair Second reader Team)
17:15-17:30	pauze, voorbereiden eindgesprek management	
17:30-18:00	eindgesprek management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prof. Dr. Ir. Jan Bots (associate dean degree programs) • Prof. Dr. Rob Blomme (chair Program committee & Chair Second reader Team) • Hetty van Roozendaal, LMM

		(Program Director FT MScM) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maren Smulders MSc (Program Director FT MScM) • Dr. Onno Mastenbroek (Head Academic Services Center) • Chantal de Wit (Quality Coordinator)
18:30-20:00	nabespreking en diner panel (De Veiling)	