



Research Master
Social and Behavioral Sciences

Tilburg University



De Onderzoekerij
Vondellaan 58
2332 AH Leiden
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 6 24 81 21 76
E-mail: info@onderzoekerij.nl
Internet: www.onderzoekerij.nl

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 SCOPE OF THE ASSESSMENT	6
1.2 THE REVIEW PANEL	6
1.3 ASSESSMENT PROCESS	6
2. ADMINISTRATIVE DATA	8
3. ASSESSMENT	9
3.1 STANDARD 1 INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	9
3.2 STANDARD 2 TEACHING LEARNING ENVIRONMENT	10
3.3 STANDARD 3 ASSESSMENT	13
3.4 STANDARD 4: ACHIEVED LEARNING OUTCOMES	15
3.5 GENERAL CONCLUSION	16
APPENDIX A: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE COMMITTEE MEMBERS	17
APPENDIX B: PROGRAM OF THE SITE VISIT	19
APPENDIX C: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	21
APPENDIX D: CURRICULUM	22
APPENDIX E: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	24
APPENDIX F: ABBREVIATIONS	25

Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which have led to the external assessment of the quality of the research master's program in Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) of Tilburg University (TiU). The program has been assessed according to the NVAO Assessment Framework.

The program's aim is to train students who can conduct high quality research on the basis of which insights, knowledge, and understanding of individual behaviors in different contexts and at different levels, is enlarged. This aim is considered by the panel to be valid. The intended learning outcomes reflect the program's aim adequately and meet the master's requirements. In addition, the outcomes reflect the graduates' capabilities to enter PhD programs. In the panel's view the intended learning outcomes are particularly academically oriented. The panel suggests evaluating and eventually rephrasing its intended learning outcomes to better reflect non-academic research.

The SBS research master's program is composed of common courses, minor specific courses and a research-oriented part which are divided over the two-year curriculum. The focus of the program is on individual behavior from three social science perspectives: social psychology, sociology, and organization studies.

The curriculum reflects all of the intended learning outcomes of the program adequately and evenly. The level of the courses is consistent with what can be expected of a research master's program, and the research orientation of the program is evident. The panel considers the curriculum to be particularly focused on conducting scientific research. As the program's aim also is to deliver researchers ready for a position at a non-academic institute, the panel suggests to better incorporate this aim in the curriculum, for example by offering courses about data analysis techniques for applied research settings.

The panel is impressed with the well-designed admission procedure, which carefully looks for a good match between prospective students and the program. Admission to the SBS master's program is granted only if applicants' grades, motivation and recommendation letters suggest that they possess the capabilities to successfully complete the program. Between the academic year 2011/12 and 2016/17, an annual average of thirteen students enrolled in the program of which roughly one third were of foreign origin. This small cohort size may negatively affect the viability and, in tandem, the quality of the program. The panel urges the program to more proactively stimulate the inflow students, both nationally and internationally.

Almost all lecturers involved in the programs have a PhD degree and engage in current research activities of the departments. Approximately 76% of the lecturers have a UTQ. The panel is positive about the lecturers' research track records as well as about their educational track records. It highly appreciates the commitment and the availability of staff members.

The panel established that the program has an adequate assessment system in place. In the panel's view, the program provides a balanced set of assessments, such as written exams, assignments, papers (review, essay, reflection report), discussions and presentations.

The panel concludes that the Examination Board (EB) has established adequate procedures that safeguard the quality of testing. The EB operates at a faculty level and therefore seems to have limited direct contact or involvement with specific issues relating to the SBS program. The panel suggests a more proactive role of the EB in this research master.

Based on the theses that were reviewed by the panel, the panel feels that the average grade of the theses and the percentage of cum laude are not fully justified by the quality of the student output. The panel recommends re-evaluating the assessment criteria that are used, to ensure that cum laude truly reflects an extra-ordinary contribution to science.

In order to assess whether the intended learning outcomes are achieved, the panel has studied a sample of recent theses and has examined the graduates' success in a research career. The panel established that all students demonstrate the ability to conduct research at a research master's level. Although the panel would have awarded lower grades in a number of cases, all theses are sound pieces of research with especially strong methodology sections.

The high level of SBS graduates is also demonstrated by the fact that many of them find a job within a few months. Almost fifty percent of the graduates of the last two years start a PhD position after graduation, five of them at Tilburg University and eight at other (international) universities. Most other graduates also find jobs within their field of study as a data analyst or project manager at private research organizations.

The panel concludes that SBS is a research-driven program. It is positive about the way scientific training is implemented in the program. Students acquire hands-on experience with various methods prepares students for the various facets of an academic career.



Prof. Marjolein Caniels
Chair of the panel



Dr. Annemarie Venemans
secretary of the panel

Overview of the assessments:

Standard	Explanation	Assessment
1	The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the program; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.	Satisfactory
2	The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.	Satisfactory
3	The program has an adequate system of student assessment in place.	Satisfactory
4	The program demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.	Satisfactory

1. Introduction

1.1 Scope of the assessment

This panel report describes the limited program assessment for the re-accreditation of the research master of Social and Behavioral Sciences of the Tilburg University. The program assessment revolves around four standards. The assessment procedure of this research master is described in the September 2016 document “Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands”, and in the May 2016 document “Specification of additional criteria for research master’s Programmes”, both issued by NVAO.

1.2 The review panel

The Board of the university has appointed the following members of the panel for the assessment:

Prof. dr. M.C.J. (Marjolein) Caniëls (chair);
Prof. dr. I. (Ive) Marx;
Dr. Y. (Yves) Rosseel;
Prof. dr. R. (Reinout) de Vries;
M. (Maaïke) Hornstra, MSc (student member);

The NVAO has approved the proposed panel. On behalf of De Onderzoekerij, Dr. Annemarie Venemans was responsible for the process coordination and for drafting the panel’s report. All members of the panel signed a declaration and disclosure form to safeguard that the panel members judge without bias, personal preference or personal interest, and the judgment is made without undue influence from the institute, the programs or other stakeholders. Any existing professional relationships between panel members and programs under review were reported. The panel concluded that there was no risk in terms of bias or undue influence.

More detailed information about the members of the panel can be found in Appendix A.

1.3 Assessment process

De Onderzoekerij received the self-evaluation report on December 19, 2017. The project coordinator distributed the report to the panel members. They read the report and prepared questions and comments prior to the site visit. In addition, the panel members received a total of sixteen recent theses (four per panel member), selected from a list in the self-evaluation report of all theses from students who graduated during the last two years. This selection was done by the secretary on behalf of the chairperson of the panel. The theses were selected proportional to the distribution of grades and the three minors of the program. Student numbers of the selected theses are provided in appendix E.

During the meeting on February 22, 2018, the findings of the panel members, including those concerning the theses, were discussed. On the basis of the input of the panel, the secretary summarized the questions, which served as a starting point for the discussions with the program representatives during the site visit. On February 23, 2018, the panel conducted the site visit at the Tilburg University campus. The site visit was conducted in accordance with the schedule drawn up beforehand (see appendix B). The panel interviewed the faculty and program management, students, staff members, alumni and Examination Board. In addition, the panel members studied program documents provided by the institute, such as course manuals and assessments (see appendix E). Due to illness, Yves Rosseel was not able to attend the site visit. However, he assessed theses, participated in discussions prior to the site visit and commented on the report.

After the site visit, the project coordinator wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings. The draft version was presented to the panel members. The panel members corrected and amended the report. Finally, the secretary drew up the final report. On March 20, this report was sent to the program management to check for factual irregularities. After having been corrected for the irregularities, the report was then sent to the program management to accompany their request for re-accreditation.

2. Administrative data

Institution	Tilburg University
Status:	Government funded
Institutional audit:	positive decision (April 3, 2013)

Program	Social and Behavioral Sciences
CROHO number	60394
Level	research master
Orientation	academic
Specialisation	n.a.
Degree	Master of Science
Location	Tilburg
Study load	120 EC

3. Assessment

3.1 Standard 1 Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the program; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.

Findings

The program Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) aims to train students in conducting high quality research on the basis of which insights, knowledge, and understanding of individual behaviors in different contexts and at different levels, is enlarged. According to the self-evaluation report, SBS is an integrated and multidisciplinary program in which three related social contexts are addressed and methodological tools are offered to analyze these contexts. The social contexts that are studied are (a) inter-personal context, (b) organization and groups and (c) networks and cohesion. Students are to become T-shape graduates: in-depth specialists in one (vertical) discipline with some knowledge of the broader (horizontal) domain.

The objective of the program has been translated into nineteen intended learning outcomes, as listed in appendix C. According to the management, graduates are trained to become high quality researchers in academia, business or government.

The panel verified the relationship between the intended learning outcomes and the Dublin descriptors. It observed that all Dublin descriptors are evident in the intended learning outcomes.

In the self-evaluation report, the program was compared to other research master programs in the Netherlands, as well as, to international PhD programs that include course work in the first two years. According to the self-evaluation, the unique focus of the program is studying individual behavior from multiple perspectives using advanced methodological approaches and statistical techniques. The only other Dutch program that includes social and behavioral sciences is offered by the University of Groningen.

Considerations

The learning outcomes confirm the descriptions of SBS as an academic, research-oriented master's program. The panel concluded that the intended learning outcomes are clearly of an academic nature and level, corresponding with general, internationally accepted descriptions of a master's program with an academic research orientation.

During the site visit, the management of the program explained that the program's objective is to deliver researchers ready to embark on either a PhD position or a research position at a non-academic institute. Although it is acknowledged that the research focus is covered in the intended learning outcomes, the panel feels that the program is predominantly academically oriented. The panel is of the opinion that the program's aim fits with the needs of the work field in which more functions have become data driven. However, it suggests evaluating and eventually rephrasing its intended learning outcomes to better reflect non-academic research.

The panel is positive about the T-shaped profile of the program, whereby students are not solely educated to become specialists, but also to become more multidisciplinary oriented. However, providing such a distinctive approach does not guarantee that more students are attracted to the

program. The panel therefore urges the SBS management to invest in enhancing the visibility of all strong points.

Assessment

The panel assesses standard 1 as 'satisfactory'.

3.2 Standard 2 Teaching learning environment

The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Findings

Curriculum

The two-year research master's program in Social and Behavioral Sciences is composed of common courses, minor specific courses and a research part divided over the curriculum (see appendix D). The focus of the program is on individual behavior from three social science perspectives: social psychology, sociology, and organization studies.

The common courses (42 EC) comprise three different content courses, each of which takes one context as its focus and relates it to the other two. Furthermore, there are two methodology courses, which connect the three contexts and study them from both a content perspective and a methodological perspective. In addition, there is a common statistics course, a common programming course, and a common course on writing scientific articles and presenting research. The panel observed that the methodological courses are mostly quantitatively oriented. During the site visit, alumni indicated that they missed some knowledge of applied (e.g. qualitative) methods in the courses, such as interview techniques and ethnographic research.

The minor specific courses (24 EC) consist of four content courses of which students need to follow three. Every minor has a specialized statistics course that teaches advanced statistical techniques related to the specific field of research covered by the minor.

The research part of the program takes up the largest part of the curriculum (54 EC). The specific activities are: an international traineeship, internal traineeships, visiting seminars and colloquia, learning about ethics, writing a first-year paper and the master's thesis. In close consultation with dedicated minor coordinators, students select a topic and a supervisor for their internships, first-year paper, and master's thesis. The four internal internships have a logical built-up running from acquiring research skills to applying these skills and judging other scholars' research output. Although the program offers non-academic internships, students and alumni feel that non-academic internship opportunities are limited and not particularly encouraged by the program. This becomes especially evident in the division between internal traineeships (which are intended to be performed within TiU, but can be performed elsewhere on the student's initiative), and an international traineeship (which is strictly academic in nature). For the first-year paper and master's thesis, students conduct supervised academic research, which covers the entire research cycle.

Writing and developing the master's thesis is the major integrating activity in the second year of the program. Under supervision, students conduct all aspects of the research process. In comparison to the first-year paper, the master's thesis focuses on original content and new, creative research. Students write their theses in the subject of the minor they have selected and they are supervised by

staff from that minor. The students and their supervisor discuss the topics, issues, and progress of the master's thesis, typically on a bi-weekly basis. Students have one opportunity to send a first draft of the master's thesis to their supervisor. The supervisor reviews the first draft and gives recommendations. Based on these recommendations, students may decide to hand in the final version. This version must be written in a format in which it could be submitted to a peer-reviewed academic journal

The curriculum uses a variety of teaching methods, including lectures, seminars, lab work, programming classes, and writing and presenting papers. Each individual course has a mix of teaching methods.

Admission, student intake and feasibility

The SBS program is primarily designed for talented students with a strong motivation for scientific research. Minimal requirements for admission are the following:

- A Bachelor's or Master's degree in a relevant discipline (Psychology, Sociology, Organization Science, Human Resources);
- An average score of 7.5 (75%) for the courses in the second and third year of a (Dutch) Bachelor's program or an equivalent score in a Master's program;
- Sufficient academic background in research methodology and statistics;
- Sufficient English language proficiency;
- A strong motivation, excellent skills, and sufficient talent for doing scientific research.

The Examination Board (EB) decides, on the basis of the applicant's file and advice of the Program Director whether the student has the right attitude, motivation and talent to follow the master's program.

According to the program management, SBS aims an intake of twenty to twenty-five students per year. Between the academic year 2011/12 and 2016/17, an annual average of thirteen students enrolled in the study of which roughly one third was of foreign origin.

To assess the feasibility of the program, the panel examined the distribution of the study load over the curriculum, the number of contact hours, the group size in classes and the availability of study guidance. Over a two-year period, SBS requires its students to develop into researchers at a PhD entry level. They are to acquire thorough knowledge of the field, advanced research skills and an academic attitude. As a consequence, the program is demanding. During the site visit, students explained that they experience a heavy workload, especially in the first year. However, during the program, when students are getting more used in dealing with strict deadlines, they consider the workload acceptable. In addition, students appreciate that they are intellectually challenged.

Staff and academic context

One of the appendices of the self-evaluation report contains a list of the academic staff members. Almost all staff involved in the programs have a PhD degree and are involved in current research activities of the departments. Approximately 76% of the staff have a UTQ. During the site visit the panel confirmed the extensive involvement and enthusiasm of the staff. In addition, students were very pleased about the involvement of staff members. According to the students, there is always a lot of interaction between the staff and the students. They like the open-door policy and accessibility of the staff.

The content of the program is closely connected to the research that is executed by the four participating departments, which is visible in the content of the curriculum and the possible positions to execute traineeships and theses. The main research theme of the Department of Social Psychology is

social decision-making. SBS courses building on this research area are Interpersonal Behavior (joint course) and Behavioral Decision-Making (minor course).

The focus of the Department of Methodology and Statistics is on latent variable models of individual differences, survey methodology, and meta-research. SBS students are offered a variety of courses by this department, running from joint courses, such as Multivariate Analysis, Survey Research, Experimental Research, and Meta-analysis, to minor specific courses, such as Mathematical Methods, Categorical Data Analysis, and Latent Variable models.

The research of the Department of Sociology focuses on aspects of social inequality and social cohesion from a comparative and dynamic perspective. Examples of courses building on the knowledge developed in this research program are Networks and Cohesion (joint course) and Intergenerational Relations and Reproduction (minor course).

The focus of the Department of Organization Studies is on inter-organizational relations and networks, relations and cooperation within organizations, and the relations of organizations with their institutional environment. SBS courses such as Organizations and Groups (joint course) and Social Networks (minor course) are clear educational reflections of this research program.

The research programs of the four departments that contribute to SBS were all recently assessed by international committees of senior scholars according to the guidelines of the Standard Evaluation Protocol 2009-2015 for Public Research Organizations (SEP). All programs received scores ranging from very good to excellent.

Considerations

Curriculum

The panel discussed the content and coherence of the curriculum. It examined how the various components of the program contribute to the intended learning outcomes and studied the study material of the different courses. The panel studied the content of the curriculum and concludes that it reflects the broad field of Social and Behavioral Science. It is of the opinion that the program represents the intended learning outcomes. It also considers the curriculum to evolve in a logical way. The program requires increasing autonomy of the students in doing research. During the site visit, the panel was able to look at course material, which confirmed the quality of the courses. The panel is positive about the variety of teaching methods. It understood that next year the program will introduce a mini conference in the curriculum. The panel applauds this type of peer review.

The panel got the impression that the courses particularly focus on conducting scientific research and they prepare for a position as a PhD student. As the program's aim is to also deliver researchers ready for a position at a non-academic research institute or a position in business – something that was confirmed in talks with the SBS management – the current learning environment seems not to be fully aligned with the intended learning outcomes. The panel suggests to better incorporate an applied focus in the curriculum, for example by offering courses about data analysis techniques for applied research settings, such as analyzing (panel) databases, qualitative comparative analysis and interview techniques. Also courses about consultancy, negotiation or business organization could be relevant in this respect.

The program management noted that they aim to train students in a multidisciplinary setting, which is successfully implemented. Still, the SBS master does not train (or encourage) students to perform multidisciplinary research. After the students have chosen a minor, the multidisciplinary character is solely present in students from different minors meeting each other during joint courses. This mono-disciplinarity is amplified by the fact that students from a certain bachelor background often choose the minor that is related to that bachelor. Thus, although the multidisciplinary setting is visible, it does not

seem to be explicitly implemented in the program itself. The panel advises the SBS management to have a critical look at the palette of courses that are offered and investigate opportunities for increasing a true multidisciplinary approach at program level.

Admission, student intake and feasibility

The panel is positive about the sophisticated admission procedure, which carefully looks for a good match between prospective students and program. The downside of this extensive selection is the disappointing inflow of students. Although staff and students seem confident with the small-scale education, it has become evident to the panel that a small cohort size provides challenges for the quality of the program. Students reported that they sometimes have seminars with a group of three students. In the opinion of the panel this limits the depth of discussion and the variety in arguments and discussion points that will be uttered. Some groups are larger, but still only contain 12 to 15 students. Also, presentations of group assignments will receive a limited variety of feedback in this way. According to the panel, public relations is key in ensuring the viability of the program. It urges the program to proactively stimulate the inflow of students, both nationally and internationally.

The panel established that the study load is quite demanding. However, it considers the demanding curriculum feasible due to the intimate research community into which students are introduced. The small scale of the program and informal contacts between students and staff ensure that any problems are adequately and quickly resolved.

Staff and academic context

The panel has studied the information on staff in the self-evaluation report. The overall positive impression gathered from this material was confirmed during several discussions with staff. The panel recognizes the staff's scientific quality, national and international academic reputation and teaching experience. It highly appreciates the commitment and the availability of staff members.

The panel was impressed by the quantity and quality of the research performed by the departments. Their main areas of research indicate that the scientific staff has sufficient expertise to execute the full program.

Assessment

The panel assesses standard 2 as 'satisfactory'.

3.3 Standard 3 Assessment

The program has an adequate system of student assessment in place.
--

Findings

Assessment system

The program uses a variety of assessment methods such as written exams, assignments, papers (review, essay, reflection report), discussions and presentations. According to the self-evaluation report, the assessment procedures of individual courses are formulated in the course descriptions that are provided in the study guide each year. For a small number of courses (the internships, first-year paper and master's thesis), requirements and assessment specifications are elaborated in a separate document entitled 'Research Master Guidelines'. The panel verified that students are well informed about the type of assessment and grading criteria before the start of each course.

According to the student chapter of the self-evaluation, improvements could be made in the examination of some courses, such as the courses Survey Research and Psychometrics, Structural Equation Modeling, and Longitudinal Data Analysis. During the site visit, the students told the panel that these assignments were more or less box ticking.

The first-year paper and master's thesis are individual assignments, which are assessed by two examiners to ensure that the process of writing the thesis and the quality of the thesis manuscript are both taken in account. The supervisor and second reader make use of assessment forms with explicit criteria on which the thesis is evaluated and grade the thesis independently from one another. The coordinators of the minors of the program prevent the formation of "fixed" grading couples and promote maximal variety in the formation of couples of first and second supervisors. Implemented in 2016/2017, every two years the assessments of master's theses are evaluated. The Program Director randomly selects theses and asks academic staff members, not involved in the supervision or grading, to read and grade the theses.

The panel noted that the grades for the master theses are generally quite high; the average grade is 8.1. According to the self-evaluation report, this is not surprising given the excellence of the students that apply to and are admitted into the program. Of all students who graduated in the last two years, 30% graduated cum laude.

Examination Board

According to the self-evaluation report, the Examination Board (EB) has the task to safeguard the realization of the learning outcomes of bachelor and master programs to guarantee graduate quality. The EB responsible for SBS, also has responsibility for all other programs offered by the faculty. The EB consists of members who represent all study programs, one external member and two legal experts. The EB meets about five times a year.

To prevent the undermining of the assessment by fraud or plagiarism, the EB has a strict anti-fraud policy. According to the EB, it has never come across fraud in the assessments of the SBS program.

According to the self-evaluation report, the EB has started "an assessment of assessments" policy. For each program, the Board will set up an ad-hoc committee to screen the assessments in the program. The committee will screen five courses and the focus will be on the alignment among learning outcomes, learning goals, examination, and grading. This policy started in 2017 and will be implemented in SBS in the near future.

Considerations

Assessment system

The panel was satisfied with the assessment system. In its opinion, the program provides a balanced set of assessments. The quality of the examinations the panel inspected matches the master's level. It was pleased to see that the program did not make use of multiple choice exams. During the site visit, the panel especially studied the assignments with which students were not satisfied. In the opinion of the panel, these assessments were of adequate level and not at all box ticking.

The panel is impressed by the thorough procedure surrounding the assessment of theses. In the opinion of the panel, the thesis assessment forms are very detailed and include all necessary grading criteria. The panel concluded from the completed assessment forms it studied, that the forms include extensive written feedback of the supervisor and second assessor.

The panel has reviewed some theses that have led to publications that credit the supervisor as co-author. The panel urges the program to make sure that there is a strict separation between the roles of the thesis supervisor and co-author of the subsequent publication after graduation. The program

management explained that the second thesis supervisor cannot be a co-author of the publication afterwards. The panel applauds this.

Based on the theses that were reviewed by the panel, the panel feels that the average grade of the theses and the percentage of cum laude could be better justified by the quality of the student output. Although there is a stringent admission procedure, the program should be more demanding compared with regular master's programs, resulting in a cum laude percentage comparable with regular masters. The panel would like to emphasize that the grading process should not be influenced by the ambitions of students to graduate with a cum laude degree. The panel recommends re-evaluating the assessment criteria used, so that cum laude truly reflects an extra-ordinary contribution to science.

Examination Board

The panel reviewed the activities of the EB in monitoring the quality of examinations. It confirmed that the EB has established adequate procedures that safeguard the quality of testing. The EB has adopted a reactive approach on guarding assessment processes. It operates at a faculty level and therefore seems to have limited direct contact or involvement with specific issues relating to the SBS program. The small scale and intensive contacts between lecturers and students of the SBS program ensure that any possible issues regarding assessments are adequately addressed. However, the panel suggests a more proactive role of the EB in this research master.

The panel observed the EB being in the early stages of the process to verify the quality of examinations and assessments by performing regular quality checks on samples of examinations. The panel has a favorable opinion about the steps the EB is taking and would like to encourage this process.

Assessment

The panel assesses standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

3.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The program demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.
--

Findings

In order to assess whether the intended learning outcomes are achieved, the panel has studied a sample of recent theses and has examined the graduates' success in a research career.

As described under Standard 2, students finish the master's program with a final thesis project consisting of 24 EC. Being the final element of the program, and covering all learning outcomes, the thesis project reflects the level achieved by students. The panel studied sixteen theses and their corresponding assessment forms. Given the profile of the program, the panel would have expected at least a number of multidisciplinary theses, but this was not the case.

Another measure of the program's quality is the employment record of graduates in scientific research. Almost fifty percent of the graduates of the last two years start a PhD position after graduation, five of them at Tilburg University and eight at other (international) universities. Most other graduates also find jobs within their field of study as a data analyst or project manager at a private research organization. Information from the National Alumni Survey shows that there is a time window of two months between graduation and the first job.

During the site visit, the panel talked to alumni, who reported that they were very satisfied with their education and felt well prepared for a job as a researcher. They pointed out that the program focuses in particular on academic research and career prospects in academia.

Considerations

The panel established that the academic level of the master's thesis is adequate. All students demonstrate the ability to conduct research at a research master's level. The panel is positive about the high quality and academic level of some of the theses it examined. Especially the research methodology was presented and applied in a well-considered way. For most of the theses, however, the panel would have given lower grades than the two original assessors. The panel would have expected a stronger problem definition, a clearer theoretical framework and more consistent line of reasoning to substantiate the high grade. Although the panel would have awarded lower grades in a number of cases, all theses are sound pieces of research, both theoretically and methodologically, with the necessary carefulness for the validity of conclusions.

The panel is positive about the career chances of the graduates of the program. Although there is much competition for jobs and a restricted number of PhD positions available, most graduates find good labor market positions. As half of the students end up in non-scientific functions, the panel advises to pay more attention to career paths outside academia. The panel concludes that graduates are well prepared to find a research position, either working as a PhD student or as a researcher in other organizations.

Assessment

The panel assesses standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

3.5 General conclusion

The panel has found that the intended learning outcomes (standard 1), the teaching- learning environment (standard 2), the assessment system (standard 3) and the achieved learning outcomes (standard 4) meet the criteria.

The intended learning outcomes reflect the program's aims and vision and are in line with the expectations of the professional field, the discipline and international requirements. The curriculum, the teaching methods, the quality of the teaching staff and the assessment system enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

The panel assesses the master's program Social and Behavioral Sciences as satisfactory.

Appendix A: Curricula vitae of the committee members

Marjolein Caniëls is Full Professor Organizational Learning and program director MSc in Management at the Faculty of Management, Science and Technology at the Open University in Heerlen, the Netherlands. As program director she was responsible for the redesign of the Master program in 2014/15. The new program has been a huge success ever since and is attracting around 450 students per year. Her current research addresses various aspects of organizational learning, sustainability and technological development & economic growth. Her research aims at enhancing our understanding of knowledge management with respect to individuals, firms, supply-chains and regions. In her research she brings together different fields of study. This multidisciplinary approach brings new understanding how governmental institutions can stimulate learning within firms and regions in order to enhance social, ecological and economic development. Caniëls supervises several master students and PhD students and has published in many academic journals such as Research Policy, Technovation and Papers in Regional Science.

Maaïke Hornstra is a PhD student at the Sociology department of University of Amsterdam. Her current research interests lie in the field of family sociology with a particular focus on divorce and intergenerational relationships. Her PhD project on relationships in adult child-parent networks is embedded in the ERC advanced grant 'Family Complexity'.

Ive Marx is Professor of Socioeconomics at the University of Antwerp and Chair of the Department of Sociology there. He is a Research Fellow at the Institute for the Study of Labor IZA in Bonn. He directs research on minimum income protection and poverty, especially in relation to labor market change and migration at the Herman Deleeck Centre for Social Policy. He was joint-coordinator of the EU funded European Low Wage Research Network (LoWER) and the EU FP7 GINI Project, an international research project on the causes and consequences of inequality. He has acted as a consultant for the European Commission, the OECD and the ILO in numerous capacities and also for the World Bank, UNDP and various governments and organizations. He has published extensively in international journals and has also written or edited a number of book, including 'Minimum Income Protection in Flux' and two volumes on changing inequalities and societal impacts published with Oxford University Press. He is the editor of the Handbook of In-Work Poverty, forthcoming with Edward Elgar. Besides academia, he participates in public debates on policy issues through talks, debates and non-academic publications, including a column in Belgium's main broadsheet. As chair of the department of sociology, member of the faculty board and director of the UA Master's Program in Socio-economic Sciences he has significant experience in shaping and reforming education programs.

Yves Rosseel obtained his PhD from Ghent University, Belgium. He is now an associate professor at the Department of Data Analysis, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Ghent University. He started a faculty-wide statistical consultancy service for research staff and founded the neuroimaging data analysis research group in his department. He is the developer of an open-source software package for structural equation modeling: the R package 'lavaan' (see <http://lavaan.org>). His main research interest today is structural equation modeling.

Reinout de Vries is Full Professor in Human Resource Development at the department of Educational Science, University of Twente, and Associate Professor at the department of Experimental and Applied Psychology, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam. His main research interests are in the areas of personality, communication styles, and leadership. His recent publications have involved the construction of a six-dimensional Communication Styles Inventory (CSI), a Brief HEXACO personality Inventory (BHI), the relation between Impression Management and Overclaiming and HEXACO personality, and the relation between self- and other-rated HEXACO personality on the one hand and leadership, proactivity, impression management, and overclaiming on the other. Instruments

he has constructed are used by various companies in selection and assessment procedures. Reinout de Vries is editor-in-chief of the Dutch ISI-ranked journal “Gedrag & Organisatie”

Appendix B: Program of the site visit

Thursday 22 February		
Time	Part	Collocutors
17.00 – 17.15 h	reception committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. dr. Leon Oerlemans, Program Director - Dr. Geert van Boxtel, Vice-Dean for Education
17.15 – 19.00 h	preparation meeting, studying documents	internal panel meeting
19.00 - ..	dinner	panel members

Friday 23 February		
Time	Part	Collocutors
08.30 – 08.45 h	delegation MT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. dr. Jantine Schuit, Dean - Dr. Geert van Boxtel, Vice-Dean for Education
08.45 – 09.15 h	program management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. dr. Leon Oerlemans, Program Director - Dr. Guy Moors, Department Methodology and Statistics - Dr. John Bechara, Department Organization Studies - Dr. Mark Brandt, Department Social Psychology, member Program Committee - Dr. Tim Reeskens, Department Sociology
09.15 – 10.00 h	ReMa students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anya Tonne, BSc, member Program Committee - Erwin Gielens, BSc - Ging Chuanchaiyakul, BSc, member Program Committee - Carmem Meira Cunha, BSc
10.00 – 10.30 h	break	internal meeting panel
10.30 – 11.15 h	Staff members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. dr. Marius Meeus, Department Organization Studies - Prof. dr. Ilja Van Beest, Department Social Psychology - Prof. dr. Jeroen Vermunt, Department Methodology and Statistics - Dr. Wilco Emons, Department Methodology and Statistics - Prof. dr. Peter Achterberg, Department Sociology - Dr. Yvette van Osch, Department Social Psychology - Dr. Joerg Raab, Department Organization Studies - Dr. Arjan Markus, Department Organization Studies - Dr. Katrijn van Deun, Department Methodology and Statistics, chair Program Committee
11.15 – 12.00 h	Alumni	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shuai Yuan, MSc - Tunde van Hoek, MSc - Leona Henry, MSc - Anouk Kieboom, MSc
12.00 – 12.45 h	lunch	

12.45 – 13.30 h	Examination Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr. Roel Rutten, Department Organization Studies, chair - Prof. dr. Marcel van Assen, Department Methodology and Statistics - Dr. Rob Nelissen, Department Social Psychology - Max de Bruin, LL.M, secretary
13.30 – 14.00 h	break	internal panel meeting
14.00 – 14.30 h	Program management (further questions)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Prof. dr. Leon Oerlemans, Program Director - Dr. Guy Moors, Department Methodology and Statistics - Dr. John Bechara, Department Organization Studies - Dr. Mark Brandt, Department Social Psychology, member Program Committee - Dr. Tim Reeskens, Department Sociology
14.30 – 16.00 h	preparation preliminary findings	internal panel meeting
16.00 – 16.15 h	presentation preliminary findings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - panel members - all discussion partners and other persons interested

Appendix C: Intended learning outcomes

A student:

- A.1. Has knowledge of and insight into the state-of-the-art of theory formation and scientific literature in the field of 'the individual in a social context'.
- A.2. In particular, has knowledge of and insight into psychological, sociological, and organizational scientific theories with respect to the individual in his/her social context and can place these in a multi-disciplinary perspective.
- A.3. Has knowledge of and insight into advanced methods and techniques of social scientific research.
- A.4. Has knowledge of and insight into setting up a research project with a clearly formulated problem that is innovative, and at the same time builds on the most recent insights into the psychological, sociological, and organizational sciences.
- A.5. Has knowledge and understanding of the integration of theory and quantitative empirical research and the entire process of conducting research, including the reporting of the results.

A student:

- B.1. Is able to independently apply the most recent theoretical insights and to develop theoretical models for answering research questions in the broad field of the individual in different social contexts.
- B.2. Is able to independently conduct theoretically based empirical social-scientific research and formulate research questions in such a way that they can be answered with scientific methods suitable for sociology, psychology, and organization sciences.
- B.3. Is able to make an informed choice among different research designs that are available for a particular research question and knows how to implement and execute the selected design.
- B.4. Is able, with the help of the most recent techniques of sociology, psychology, and organization sciences, to collect data with which the research questions can be answered.
- B.5. Is able to make a choice from the most recent, relevant statistical methods and to apply these when answering the research questions.

A student:

- C.1. Is able to critically assess the arguments used in different theoretical approaches.
- C.2. Is able to critically assess the results of statistical analyses.
- C.3. Is able to reflect critically on his own and other people's research.
- C.4. Has knowledge and understanding of the social and ethical responsibilities associated with (field) research and acts accordingly.

A student:

- D.1. Is able to report and present the results of his/her own research in the (inter)national context of the field, for example, by publishing in ISI journals and presenting the results at scientific conferences.
- D.2. Is able to report and present the results of his/her own research in an understandable way for the interested layman.
- D.3. Is able to constructively comment and criticize the reports and presentations of fellow students, colleagues, and fellows.
- D.4. Is able to apply academic English in word and in writing.

A student:

- E.1. Is able to continue his or her education in the form of a PhD project.

Appendix D: Curriculum

Year 1				
	Minor MS	Minor SP	Minor SS	EC
<i>Block 1</i>				
Interpersonal Behavior	X	X	X	6
Networks & Cohesion:	X	X	X	6
Multivariate Analysis (Part I)	X	X	X	3
<i>Block 2</i>				
Organizations & Groups				6
Mathematical Methods	X			6
Behavioral Decision Making		X		6
Social Networks			X	6
Multivariate Analysis (Part II)	X	X	X	3
<i>Block 3</i>				
Survey Research & Psychometrics	X	X	X	6
Experimental Research & Meta Analysis	X	X	X	6
Programming	X	X	X	3
<i>Block 4</i>				
Intern Traineeship 1 MS	X			3
Intern Traineeship 1 SP		X		3
Intern Traineeship 1 SS			X	3
First-year paper MS	X			12
First-year paper SP		X		12
First-year paper SS			X	12
Year 2				
	Minor MS	Minor SP	Minor SS	EC
<i>Block 1</i>				
Academic writing/presenting	X	X	X	2
Structural Equation Models	X	X		6
Intergenerational Relations & Reproduction			X	6
Research integrity/ethics MS	X			1
Research integrity/ethics SP		X		1
Research integrity/ethics SS			X	1
International traineeship MS				3
International traineeship SP				3
International traineeship SS				3
Intern Traineeship 2 MS	X			3
Intern Traineeship 2 SP		X		3
Intern Traineeship 2 SS			X	3
<i>Block 2</i>				
Analysis of Multilevel and Longitudinal Data	X		X	6
Categorical Data Analysis*	X			6
Latent Variable Modelling*	X			6
Social Cognition		X		6
Emotion & Motivation*		X		6
Theory in Social Psychology*		X		6
Relations between Ethnic Groups*			X	6

Institutions and Inter-organizational Teams*			X	6
Intern Traineeship 3 MS	X			3
Intern Traineeship 3 SP		X		3
Intern Traineeship 3 SS			X	3
<i>Block 3</i>				
Academic writing/presenting	X	X	X	1
Research colloquia MS	X			2
Research colloquia SP		X		2
Research colloquia SS			X	2
<i>Block 4</i>				
Intern Traineeship 4 MS	X			3
Intern Traineeship 4 SP		X		3
Intern Traineeship 4 SS			X	3
<i>Block 3 and 4</i>				
Master's thesis MS	X			24
Master's thesis SP		X		24
Master's thesis SS			X	24

Appendix E: Documents reviewed

Program documents presented by the institution:

- Self-evaluation report
- Appendices to the self-evaluation report
 - o Learning outcomes
 - o International benchmarks
 - o Curriculum
 - o Learning outcomes in relation to the program courses
 - o Graduated students
 - o Postgraduate careers
 - o Lecturing staff
 - o Contact hours, type of instruction and exams
- Documents made available during site visit
 - o Guidelines of SBS
 - o Annual report Examination Board
 - o Minutes Examination Board
 - o Annual report course evaluations
 - o Course evaluations
 - o TSB educational annual report
 - o TSB research annual report
 - o Handbook for constructing and grading exams
 - o Minutes Program Committee
 - o Program for Academic Study Success
 - o Strategic Plan Tilburg University
 - o Course manuals
 - o Examples of exams

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied the theses of the students with the following student numbers:

1244600
1260110
1241134
1245866
0421506
1260380
1260599
1275802
1241461
1241947
1274466
1266210
0379011
1272890
1268503
1246488

Appendix F: Abbreviations

EB	Examination Board
EC	European Credit
MS	Methodology and Statistics
NVAO	Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie
SBS	Social and Behavioral Sciences
SP	Social Psychology
SS	Social Science
TiU	Tilburg University
TSB	Tilburg School of Social and Behavioral Sciences
UTQ	University Teaching Qualification