

**Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment**

Master in Urban Management and Development

Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam

K.P. van der Mandelelaan 41a
Postbus 701, 3000 AS Rotterdam
T 010 - 201 42 43
E info@certiked-vbi.nl
www.certiked-vbi.nl

Contents of the report

1. Executive summary	2
2. Assessment process	4
3. Programme administrative information	6
4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard.....	7
4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes.....	7
4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment.....	9
4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment	12
4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	14
5. Overview of assessments.....	15

1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Master in Urban Management and Development programme of Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies of Erasmus University Rotterdam. The programme was assessed according to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, as published on 20 December 2016 (Staatscourant nr. 69458).

The panel considers the objectives of the programme to be sound, the programme meant to educate students to academic understanding of complex urban subjects and problems. The panel is convinced the programme trains students to address complex, multidisciplinary problems in this field, using academic knowledge and skills.

The profile and objectives of the programme meet the domain-specific framework of reference, drafted by the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes, and therefore match the international requirements for the development studies domain. The panel recommends to strengthen the critical perspective on development studies in the programme objectives.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme meet the programme objectives and exhibit relevant knowledge of urban subjects and problems, knowledge and understanding of theories in this field, skills to analyse subjects and problems, and general academic and professional skills. The intended learning outcomes conform to the master level, and are also up to date.

The programme management's goal to allow early-career and mid-career professionals to advance their careers is supported by the panel. The panel appreciates the intensive contacts of the programme with well-established academic institutes and with well-known organisations in the professional field.

The panel considers the programme to be managed appropriately.

The curriculum of the programme complies with the intended learning outcomes and is regarded by the panel to be coherent and up to date. The course materials are very much up to standard. The panel found the critical perspective on development studies to be adequately introduced in the curriculum, although there were some differences in this respect between the specialisations.

The panel regards both the academic qualities and professional expertise of the lecturers to be strongly developed. Their educational skills are very appropriate as well, as may be gathered from the proportion of UTQ-certified lecturers. The lecturers come from a wide range of countries. The panel considers them to be very dedicated to the programme and the students expressed being very satisfied about them.

The programme admission prerequisites and procedures are regarded by the panel to be up to standard, being strict in allowing only students in, who show strong academic records. This certainly applies to students with Bachelor degrees. Students are offered opportunities to apply for scholarships. The programme exemptions policy and regulations are adequate.

The study methods meet the contents of the programme. Students are encouraged to participate actively in class. The programme is quite challenging, especially the first weeks. The panel proposes to balance the

study load in these weeks. The panel regards the students-to-staff ratio to be appropriate. The number of hours of face-to-face contact between students and staff are adequate as well. The panel appreciates the study guidance by the mentors and thesis supervisors, being intensive and tailored to the heterogeneous group of students. The panel is very positive about the student success rates. The panel noted the students to be very pleased with the programme.

The panel regards the examination and assessment policies for the programme to be appropriate. The same applies to the position and the authority of the Examination Committee, this Committee being in control of the examination and assessment processes in the programme.

The examination methods adopted in the programme are well selected, as these methods comply with the course goals and course contents. The measures taken by programme management to ensure the transparency, validity and reliability of examinations and assessments are appropriate. The students are informed about the examinations. The examinations are peer-reviewed and are assessed, using answer models or rubrics. The examiners are appointed by the Examination Committee. The fraud and plagiarism formalities are up to standard. The assessment procedures of the theses are very adequate, involving two examiners who use rubrics to assess the theses. The panel is very positive about the involvement of external supervisors and second readers and about the regular external reviews of the theses. The panel welcomes the system with flexible dates for students to complete the programme.

The panel assesses the course examinations to be relevant for the programme and to be very much up to standard in terms of quality and level. None of the theses reviewed by the panel were assessed to be unsatisfactory and some were assessed to be good or very good. The grades of the theses were generally found to be consistent with the grades the panel would have given. Regarding the theses the panel advises to limit the word length, as some are very extensive, to address the research ethics more elaborately, to have the students reflect more critically on the research methodology and to raise the level of critical engagement with the literature.

The programme succeeds in preparing the programme's graduates for appropriate positions in the professional field and in allowing them to advance their careers.

Having conducted the assessment of the Master in Urban Management and Development programme of Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies of Erasmus University Rotterdam, the assessment panel assesses this programme to meet the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, judging the programme to be satisfactory. Therefore, the panel recommends NVAO to accredit this programme.

Rotterdam, 18 April 2018

Prof. dr. D.A.N.M. Kruijt
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren
(panel secretary)

2. Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies, Erasmus University Rotterdam to support the limited framework programme assessment process for the Master in Urban Management and Development programme of this University. The objective of the programme assessment process was to assess whether the programme would conform to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, published on 20 December 2016 (Staatscourant nr. 69458).

Management of the programmes in the assessment cluster Development Studies convened to discuss the composition of the assessment panel and to draft the list of candidates.

The panel composition was as follows:

- Prof. dr. D.A.N.M. Kruijt, emeritus professor Development Studies, Utrecht University, Netherlands (panel chair);
- Prof. dr. M.J. Spierenburg, professor Development Studies, Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands (panel member);
- Prof. dr. D.C. Mitlin, professor Global Urbanism, Manchester University, United Kingdom (panel member);
- Prof. dr. B. Kebede, professor Behavioural Development Economics, University of East Anglia, United Kingdom (panel member);
- C.J. Stam MSc, student Master Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, Netherlands (student member).

On behalf of Certiked, drs. W. Vercouteren served as the process coordinator and secretary in the assessment process.

All panel members and the secretary confirmed in writing being impartial with regard to the programme to be assessed and observing the rules of confidentiality.

To prepare the assessment process, the process coordinator convened with management of the programme to discuss the outline of the self-assessment report, the subjects to be addressed in this report and the site visit schedule. In addition, the planning of the activities in preparation of the site visit were discussed. In the course of the process preparing for the site visit, programme management and the process coordinator regularly had contact to fine-tune the process. The activities prior to the site visit have been performed as planned. Programme management approved of the site visit schedule.

Well in advance of the site visit date, programme management sent the list of final projects of graduates of the programme of the two most recent years. Acting on behalf of the assessment panel, the process coordinator selected 15 final projects. The grade distribution in the selection was ensured to conform to the grade distribution in the list, sent by programme management. The specialisations of the students have been taken into account.

The panel chair and the panel members were sent the self-assessment report of the programme, including appendices. In the self-assessment report, the student chapter was included. In addition, the expert panel

members were forwarded a number of final projects of the programme graduates, these final projects being part of the selection made by the process coordinator.

A number of weeks before the site visit date, the assessment panel chair and the process coordinator met to discuss the self-assessment report provided by programme management, the procedures regarding the assessment process and the site visit schedule. The meeting between the panel chair and the process coordinator served as the briefing for panel chairs, as meant in the NVAO profile of panel chairs.

Prior to the date of the site visit, all panel members sent in their preliminary findings, based on the self-assessment report and the final projects studied, and a number of questions to be put to the programme representatives on the day of the site visit. The panel secretary summarised this information, compiling a list of questions, which served as a starting point for the discussions with the programme representatives during the site visit.

Shortly before the site visit date, the panel met to speak about the preliminary findings on the quality of the programme. During this meeting, the preliminary findings of panel members, including those about the final projects were discussed. The procedures to be adopted during the site visit, including the questions to be put to the programme representatives on the basis of the list compiled, were discussed as well.

On 12 January 2018, the panel conducted the site visit on the Erasmus University Rotterdam campus. The site visit schedule was in accordance with the schedule as planned. In a number of separate sessions, panel members were given the opportunity to meet with the Faculty and Institute Boards representatives, programme management, Examination Committee representatives, lecturers and final projects examiners, and students and alumni.

In a closed session at the end of the site visit, the panel considered in detail every one of the findings, weighed the considerations and arrived at conclusions with regard to the quality of the programme. At the end of the site visit, the panel chair presented a broad outline of the considerations and conclusions to programme representatives.

Clearly separated from the process of the programme assessment, the assessment panel members and programme representatives met to conduct the development dialogue, with the objective to discuss future developments of the programme.

The assessment draft report was finalised by the secretary, having taken into account the findings and considerations of the panel. The draft report was sent to the panel members, who studied it and made a number of changes. Thereupon, the secretary edited the final report. This report was presented to programme management to be corrected for factual inaccuracies. Programme management were given two weeks to respond. Having been corrected for these factual inaccuracies, the Certiked bureau sent the report to the University Board to accompany their request for re-accreditation of this programme.

3. Programme administrative information

Name programme in CROHO: M Urban Management and Development
Orientation, level programme: Academic Master (post-initial)
Grade: MSc
Number of credits: 68 EC (71 EC up to and including 2016/2017)
Specialisations: Urban Land Governance
Urban Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change
Urban Competiveness and Resilience
Managing and Financing Urban Infrastructure
Urban Strategies and Planning
Urban Housing, Equity and Social Justice
Location: Rotterdam
Mode of study: Full-time (language of instruction: English)
Registration in CROHO: 75011
Name of institution: Erasmus University Rotterdam
Status of institution: Government-funded University
Institution's quality assurance: Approved

4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard

4.1 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

The objectives of the Master in Urban Management and Development programme are to offer students academic understanding, knowledge and skills related to the field of urban management and development and to educate them to become competent urban managers, capable of working in complex, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary, multi-actor and international environments. Competent urban managers are, in the programme management words, urban professionals able to understand cities in all their complexity and to develop policies and plans to intervene in these complex urban arenas.

Programme management showed the programme objectives to meet the domain-specific framework of reference, being the international Revised Definition of the field of Development Studies of October 2015 of the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI). This international framework defines development studies as the multi- or interdisciplinary field of study, seeking to understand social, economic, political, technological, ecological, gender and cultural aspects of societal change at local, national, regional and global levels and their interplay, the field being context-sensitive and being characterised by normative and policy concerns. Within this framework, the programme takes on a specific profile, being geared to the study of urban development theory and practices, urban management, governance and interventions and social and economic aspects of urban development.

Students are given the opportunity to specialise in one of the six specialisations, which are offered in the programme. These specialisations are Urban Land Governance, Urban Environment, Sustainability and Climate Change, Urban Competiveness and Resilience, Managing and Financing Urban Infrastructure, Urban Strategies and Planning and Urban Housing, Equity and Social Justice.

Programme management translated the objectives into a series of intended learning outcomes. These specify students being able to analyse local and international trends and theories in urban development, evaluate local and international theories and approaches in urban management, analyse worldwide urban problems using applied research, assess development potential and propose strategies and policies based on applied research and apply skills to function as urban managers in multidisciplinary, multi-actor and international environments. These intended learning outcomes have been subdivided in a number of specifications, detailing and operationalising them further.

Programme management demonstrated the intended learning outcomes to correspond to the master level programmes Dublin descriptors, describing in detail the correspondence between the intended learning outcomes and these descriptors.

Students entering the programme are early-career or mid-career professionals already working in this urban field, coming from all of the world. The programme is meant to train these students to advance their careers. Programme management seeks to remain in contact with current academic and professional trends in this field. To that end, programme management partners with academic institutions, such as Erasmus Schools of Economics and Social and Behavioural Sciences, Radboud University and Delft

University of Technology, and organisations in the field, such as the municipalities of Rotterdam, Almere, Dordrecht and Amsterdam. Representatives of these institutions and organisations are involved in the programme as guest lecturers, thesis supervisors and thesis second readers. Programme lecturers work in the professional field and are well-informed about trends. The programme intended learning outcomes are aligned with relevant academic and professional trends and are updated regularly.

Considerations

The panel considers the objectives of the programme to be sound, the programme meant to educate students to academic understanding of complex urban subjects and problems. The panel is convinced the programme trains students to address complex, multidisciplinary problems in this field, using academic knowledge and skills.

The profile and objectives of the programme meet the domain-specific framework of reference, drafted by the European Association of Development Research and Training Institutes (EADI), and therefore match the international requirements for the development studies domain. The panel recommends however to strengthen the critical perspective on development studies in the programme objectives.

The intended learning outcomes of the programme meet the programme objectives and exhibit relevant knowledge of urban subjects and problems, knowledge and understanding of theories in this field, skills to analyse subjects and problems and general academic and professional skills. The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be up to date.

The intended learning outcomes conform to the master level, as exemplified by the Dublin descriptors.

The panel supports the programme management's goal to allow early-career and mid-career professionals to advance their careers. The panel appreciates the intensive contacts of the programme with well-established academic institutes and with well-known organisations in the professional field.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 1, Intended learning outcomes, to be satisfactory.

4.2 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

The Master in Urban Management and Development programme is a programme of Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies, which became part of Erasmus University Rotterdam in 2004. The Academic Board of the Institute, being composed of the scientific director, the programme manager and the specialisation coordinators monitors the programme quality. The programme manager and the programme administrator are responsible for the day-to-day management of the programme. Course coordinators have the responsibility for the quality of the core courses and specialisation courses. Two male and two female students are chosen by the student group of each year to represent them and to voice the students' opinions to programme management. The Examination Committee of the Institute has been given the authority to monitor the examination processes and to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments of this programme.

Programme management presented a detailed table to demonstrate the curriculum meeting the intended learning outcomes of the programme. The curriculum has a total study load of 68 EC and takes 12 months or 47 weeks to complete. Students start with the Core period (11.5 weeks), continue in the Specialisation period (10 weeks) and complete the curriculum in the Thesis period (25.5 weeks).

- In the Core period, core courses about urban theory, urban governance, policy, planning and public-private partnerships, local government finance and investments and action planning are scheduled (16.5 EC). The Core period provides students with the academic foundation of the programme and is meant to bring all students, who come from different backgrounds, on the same level of understanding of urban management and development issues. In addition, students are offered the mandatory Academic English course and the course on literature searching.
- In the Specialisation period, students select one of the abovementioned specialisations (15.0 EC). In this period, external lecturers from a range of academic institutions and organisations from the professional field give guest lectures. In addition, public lectures are scheduled. In these lectures, open to all students, international experts from the professional field address specific subjects.
- In the Thesis period, students take the *Research Methods and Techniques* course (8.0 EC), select one of the *Research Workshops* offered (10.0 EC), and complete their thesis (18.5 EC). The first mentioned course introduces students to phases in the research cycle, such as research questions, research design, conceptual framework and research techniques. In the workshops which are scheduled in parallel, students work together with students of their specialisation on the conceptual framework of the thesis and on the thesis methodology. In the Research Workshop colloquia, students meet with fellow students, supervisors and research workshop lecturers to discuss the thesis components. Students present their work and are given feedback by students and staff. At the end of the Thesis period, students do fieldwork or collect secondary data and write the thesis.
- Students are offered extra-curricular activities, including workshops on skills development and personal development and training, focused on career development.

About 28 lecturers are involved in the programme as permanent staff. In addition, about 70 external or associate academics participate in the programme as lecturers, thesis supervisors or thesis second readers. Lecturers in the programme are required to be involved in research, advisory activities and education in their field of expertise, being able to address in the classroom both the academic and practical dimensions of the subjects they teach. As has been indicated, all courses are coordinated by course coordinators, who

are experienced researchers in their fields and who all have PhDs. The proportion of all permanent and external lecturers in the programme with PhDs is 64 %. The proportion of lecturers being UTQ-certified is 89 % for the permanent staff (UTQ means Dutch University Teaching Qualification). The main course examiners are BKE-certified (BKE is Dutch University Examination Qualification). Lecturers come from 14 different countries. Lecturers meet regularly to discuss the programme.

Every year, about 1,000 students apply to enter the programme. About 25 % of them are admitted and about 120 to 130 students are actually enrolled. Incoming students come from about 40 different countries, mainly countries in the southern hemisphere. Scholarships are offered. As has been said, most students are early-career or mid-career professionals in this field. Over the years, the admission prerequisites to enter the programme were tightened. These prerequisites concern previous academic performance and proficiency in English on the part of the applicants. Applicants are to submit an essay on urban development challenges in their country of origin. About 20 Bachelor students are admitted, being mainly from excellent partner universities and reporting high average grades. Students who do not meet the entry prerequisites are not admitted. They may be referred to remedial courses, being offered by other institutions. Students are encouraged to take the MOOC course on research methods and techniques, before entering the programme.

Students may apply for exemptions. Requests for exemptions are handled by the Examination Committee.

The educational concept of the programme is primarily meant to promote the combination of academic theory and professional practice. Study methods adopted in the programme are lectures, case studies, debates, participatory learning, study trips, excursions and pedagogical games. Especially in the Core period, supervised working groups of about 25 students are scheduled, allowing student to do classwork and group exercises. In addition, supervised study groups of about five students are scheduled to enable students to study and discuss academic literature. In these groups, multidisciplinary and international perspectives are promoted. The student-to-staff ratio is 16 : 1. Academic mentors are available to guide students in the programme. In the beginning, this guidance is intensive. Academic mentors supervise the working groups and study groups in the Core period. Students are falling behind in the programme, are interviewed, trying to solve any problems. Later in the programme, guidance is less intensive. In the Thesis period, students are guided by the supervisor. There is a maximum of five students per supervisor. Students are given three deadlines to complete the programme. The student success rates are about 75 % for students completing the programme after 12 months, about 86 % for students completing the programme after 15 months and about 93 % for all students graduating (average figures for cohorts 2012 to 2014).

Considerations

The panel considers the programme to be managed appropriately.

The curriculum of the programme complies with the intended learning outcomes and is regarded by the panel to be coherent and up to date. The course materials are very much up to standard in the panel's view. The panel found the critical perspective on development studies to be adequately introduced in the curriculum, although there were some differences in this respect between the specialisations.

The panel regards both the academic qualities and professional expertise of the lecturers to be strongly developed. Their educational skills are very appropriate as well, as may be gathered from the proportion of UTQ-certified lecturers. The lecturers come from a wide range of countries. The panel considers the lecturers to be very dedicated to the programme. The students expressed being very satisfied about them.

The programme admission prerequisites and procedures are regarded by the panel to be up to standard, being strict in allowing only students in, showing strong academic records. This certainly applies to students with Bachelor degrees. Students are offered opportunities to apply for scholarships. The programme exemptions policy and regulations are adequate.

The study methods meet the contents of the programme. Students are encouraged to participate actively in class. The programme is quite challenging, especially the first weeks. The panel proposes to balance the study load in these weeks. The panel regards the students-to-staff ratio to be appropriate. The number of hours of face-to-face contact between students and staff are adequate as well. The panel appreciates the study guidance by the mentors and thesis supervisors, being intensive and tailored to the heterogeneous group of students. The panel is very positive about the student success rates. The panel noted the students to be very pleased with the programme.

Assessment of this standard

These considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 2, Teaching-learning environment, to be good.

4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

The examinations and assessments in the programme are governed by the Admission and Examination Regulations of the programme. The Examination Committee of the programme has the authority to monitor and ensure the quality of examinations and assessments and the corresponding processes. The Examination Committee consists of three staff members and one external member. The Examination Committee meets with the Boards of other Faculties and institutes of Erasmus University to align procedures.

Examination methods in the programme are multiple-choice and open questions written examinations, individual essays and papers and group work. Examination methods are selected to conform to the course goals. In courses, multiple examinations are scheduled. Group work in courses is limited to 40 % of the final course grade to avoid students passing courses on free-riding. The number of graded courses in the programme per student are six courses, including the final thesis examination. In the Core period, students are allowed to compensate one insufficient grade of the three courses graded of at least 4.5. Not many students need compensation.

Programme management adopted a number of measures to ensure transparency, validity, reliability of examinations and assessments. Students are presented the examination plan of the courses and for each of the examinations, the relative weight of questions in the examination, the grading criteria and, if applicable, the rubrics. After the examinations, students are informed about the results and the mistakes, most made. The Examination Committee appoints the course examiners. For all courses, test matrices are drafted, demonstrating the alignment of course goals and examination methods and weight of examination components. Examinations, drafted by examiners are peer-reviewed by the other examiners. The reliability of multiple-choice examinations is checked by specialists. Model answers are used for written examinations and rubrics for most essays and papers. The Examination Committee monitors the average grade of the course examinations and may meet with course coordinators in case of frequent higher grades than expected. Essays, papers and theses are checked for plagiarism. The Examination Committee handles cases of plagiarism or fraud.

The thesis proposal has to be submitted to the supervisor and the second reader for approval. The thesis supervisors and second readers are appointed by the Examination Committee. About 80 % of the second readers are external examiners. Internal supervisors are trained for this position. External supervisors and second readers should have PhDs and experience with thesis supervision. Both the supervisor and second reader approve of the draft thesis and grade the final work independently. They use rubrics to assess the theses. Students are required to defend their work. If there is more than one point disparity between the examiners, a third examiner is called in. Second readers are asked to compare theses. Every three years, an external professor is invited to review the theses' quality.

Considerations

The panel considers the examination and assessment policies for the programme to be appropriate. The position and authority of the Examination Committee are appropriate as well, the Committee being in control of the examination and assessment processes in the programme. The regular meetings with other Boards of Examiners within Erasmus University Rotterdam are regarded by the panel as positive.

The panel approves of the examination methods adopted in the programme, as these methods comply with the course goals and course contents.

The measures taken by programme management to ensure the transparency, validity and reliability of examinations and assessments are appropriate. The students are informed about the examinations. The examinations are peer-reviewed and are assessed, using answer models or rubrics. The examiners are appointed by the Examination Committee. The fraud and plagiarism formalities are up to standard.

The assessment procedures of the theses are very adequate, involving two examiners who use rubrics to assess the theses. The panel is very positive about the involvement of external supervisors and second readers and about the regular external reviews of the theses.

The panel welcomes the system with flexible dates for students to complete the programme.

Assessment of this standard

The considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 3, Student assessment, to be good.

4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

The panel studied the examinations of a number of courses of the programme.

The panel reviewed a total number of fifteen theses of graduates of the programme, these exhibiting a variety of grades, ranging from satisfactory to very good. The average grade of the theses over the last two years was 7.2 for cohort 2015/2016 and 7.4 for cohort 2016/2017 (Dutch scale, going from 1.0 to 10.0).

Graduates of the programme are employed in a wide range of positions in government (53 %), academia or research institutes (15 %) and non-profit organisations (8 %). The recent survey among alumni showed over 70 % of them feeling well prepared for their current work. About 60 % of them feel the programme had a marked effect on their being promoted and about 70 % of them feel the programme improved their chances of finding a new position.

Considerations

Having studied the course examinations, the panel assesses these examinations to be relevant for the programme and to be very much up to standard in terms of quality and level.

None of the theses reviewed were assessed by the panel to be unsatisfactory. Some were assessed by the panel to be good or very good. The grades of the theses were generally found to be consistent with the grades the panel would have given. The panel advises regarding the theses to limit the word length, as some are very extensive, to address the research ethics more elaborately, to have the students reflect more critically on the research methodology and to raise the level of critical engagement with the literature.

In the panel's opinion, the programme succeeds in preparing the programme's graduates for appropriate positions in the professional field and in allowing them to advance their careers.

Assessment of this standard

The considerations have led the assessment panel to assess standard 4, Achieved learning outcomes, to be satisfactory.

5. Overview of assessments

Standard	Assessment
Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes	Satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	Good
Standard 3: Student assessment	Good
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	Satisfactory
Programme	Satisfactory