

Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

Research Master Child Development and Education

University of Amsterdam

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
6. Recommendations	16

1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Research Master Child Development and Education programme of University of Amsterdam. The programme has been 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 NVAO Specification of additional criteria for research master programmes of 30 May 2016 has been taken into account as well.

The panel supports the objectives of the programme to prepare students to become researchers in the domain of child development and education. The panel considers the programme to have a broad research profile, being directed to the research of child development and the research of education. The panel welcomes the programme objectives not only to educate students for academic careers, but also for society at large, training students to become clinical researchers in the Dutch clinical practice. As evidence-based clinical practice is much needed, the panel applauds the programme management's intentions to help to fill this gap and to add to the clinical practice advancement in The Netherlands.

The panel regards the programme to be clearly distinct from regular master programmes in this domain and acknowledges the programme to have a number of distinguishing objectives, separating it from research master programmes in this domain in The Netherlands and abroad.

The intended learning outcomes correspond to the programme objectives and meet the master level, as identified by the Dublin descriptors. The panel suggests, however, to formulate the intended learning outcomes more domain-specifically. The panel also advises to address the clinical route goals more clearly in the intended learning outcomes.

The organisation of the programme is solid and involves the main stakeholders.

All of the intended learning outcomes of the programme are covered in the curriculum, both for the regular routes and for the clinical route. The panel appreciates the curriculum, the courses exhibiting strong and relevant contents and addressing research methods in-depth. The panel encourages programme management to include qualitative research methods and N=1 studies in the curriculum. Specifically for the clinical route, the panel advises to reverse the order of the clinical internship and the research master thesis, scheduling the clinical internship in the first year and the research master thesis in the second year. The order now seems to be at odds with the curriculum coherence. Although the research assignment has been added, the panel recommends to make the clinical internship more challenging. The panel advises to broaden the opportunities for students to go abroad.

The panel regards the lecturers in the programme to be experts in their fields and to be very good researchers. The panel is convinced the lecturers have the skills to educate students well, being capable of transferring their own research into the lectures. The high proportion of lecturers having teaching qualifications is considered by the panel to be very positive. The panel advises to promote more interaction among lecturers, strengthening the curriculum coherence.

The admission requirements are appropriate for this research master programme, being very selective. The admission procedures are elaborate and strict, allowing only motivated and very good students in.

The panel feels the student success rates are somewhat disappointing and encourages programme management to try and foster the study pace of the students, stimulating them to finish their studies in nominal time. The panel regards the study load of the programme to be doable. The study methods and study guidance meet the research master requirements, especially allowing students to engage in research-based teaching and learning. The panel welcomes the intensive contacts between lecturers and students and applauds the responsiveness on the part of programme management to the students' questions.

The panel regards the examination and assessment policies of the programme adequate. The Examination Board for the programme has been given the appropriate authority to ensure the processes of examination and assessment and the students' products.

The examination methods in the courses meet the course goals and course contents. The panel suggests, however, to bring more variation in the examination methods in order to test the students' knowledge and skills in more varied ways.

The assessment procedures for the internships and research master theses are appropriate. The panel advises, however, to phrase the internship assessment criteria more clearly, to reflect the goals of the internships more strictly. The assessment process for the research master thesis with three examiners approving the thesis proposals and three examiners assessing the final products is welcomed by the panel, as this procedure ensures reliable assessments.

The Examination Board monitors the examination and assessment processes very conscientiously and reviews students' products, including the research master theses appropriately. The panel is positive about the constructive alignment analysis and the recommendations to programme management following this analysis, such as increasing the variety of examination methods in the courses and using different scoring models for the internships and the research master theses.

Having studied the examinations of a number of courses of the programme, the panel assessed all of these examinations to be up to standard for this research master programme.

None of the theses the panel reviewed were assessed to be unsatisfactory. The panel considers the theses generally to be very good and to be in line with the grades actually given. A number of theses are in the opinion of the panel suitable to be submitted for publication in academic scientific journals. The panel noted a substantial number of theses having actually been submitted to academic scientific journals.

The panel appreciates the labour market chances of the graduates of the programme and considers their careers to give evidence of the level achieved by them.

The panel which conducted the assessment of the Research Master Child Development and Education programme of University of Amsterdam 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, 12 March 2018,

Prof. dr. J.M. Bensing
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren
(panel secretary)

2. Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by University of Amsterdam to conduct the limited framework programme assessment process for the Research Master Child Development and Education 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). The NVAO Specification of additional criteria for research master programmes of 30 May 2016 has been taken into account as well.

Having conferred with management of the University of Amsterdam programme, Certiked invited candidate panel members to sit on the assessment panel. The panel members agreed to do so.

The panel composition was as follows:

- Prof. dr. J.M. Bensing, full professor emeritus of Health Psychology and Faculty Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University (panel chair);
- Prof. dr. N. Ellemers, Distinguished University Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, Utrecht University (panel member);
- Prof. dr. L. Verschaffel, full professor, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven (panel member);
- Dr. D.J. Jansma, PhD student until recently, Groningen Institute of Educational Research, University of Groningen (student member).

On behalf of Certiked, drs. W. Vercooteren was the process coordinator and secretary in the assessment process.

Drs. M. Pol of the Netherlands Inspectorate of Education took part as an observer in the preliminary assessment process of the panel and was present as an observer during the site visit.

All panel members and the secretary confirmed in writing to be impartial with regard to the programme to be assessed and the institution concerned and to observe the rules of confidentiality. Having obtained the authorisation by the University, Certiked requested the approval of NVAO of the proposed panel to conduct the assessment. NVAO have given their approval.

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 Certiked 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 three most recent years. Acting on behalf of the assessment panel, the process coordinator selected 15 final projects. The grade distribution in the selection conformed to the grade distribution in the list, sent by programme management. Additional criteria concerning the programme specialisations were taken into account.

The panel chair and the panel members were sent the self-assessment report of the programme, including a number of appendices, relevant for the panel's understanding of the programme. In the self-assessment report, the student chapter was included. In addition, the 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 had a telephone conversation to discuss the self-assessment report provided by programme management, the procedures regarding the assessment process and the site visit schedule. In this meeting, the profile of panel chairs of NVAO was discussed as well. The panel chair was informed about the competencies, listed in the profile. Documents pertaining to a number of these competencies were presented to the panel chair. 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 complete panel met to go over the preliminary findings concerning the quality of the programme. During this meeting, the preliminary findings of the 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 were discussed as well.

On 8 February 2018, the panel conducted a site visit on the University of Amsterdam 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 Faculty Board representatives, programme management, Examination Board representatives, lecturers and final projects examiners, and students and alumni. The panel was given the opportunity to study, among other things, course materials, course examinations, Examination Board annual reports and Programme Committee annual reports.

In a closed session at the end of the site visit, the panel considered 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 Child Development and Education (Research)
Orientation, level programme: Academic Master
Grade: MSc
Number of credits: 120 EC
Specialisations: Education route, Child Development route, Clinical route
Location: Amsterdam
Mode of study: Full-time (language of instruction: English)
Registration in CROHO: 60212

Name of institution: University of Amsterdam
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 Research Master Child Development and Education programme is a programme of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of University of Amsterdam. The name of the programme has been changed from Research Master Educational Sciences to the current name Research Master Child Development and Education in order to, among others, better reflect the subjects addressed in the programme.

The programme objectives are to qualify students to conduct scientific research in the domain of child development and education. The programme offers three distinct tracks or routes. Students are educated either in the field of child development or in the field of education or as clinical researchers. The first two tracks or routes mentioned are meant to train students primarily for fundamental research in this domain. The latter track or route is called the clinical route and is meant to prepare students to become science-practitioners in the Dutch clinical practice and to conduct research in this professional field. Students taking the clinical route are entitled to work as clinical professionals, this route having been accredited by the Dutch organisation of clinical professionals NVO.

Whereas the child development and education routes are fully English-taught, the clinical skills course in the clinical route or science-practitioner track is Dutch-taught. This route specifically prepares for the clinical practice in The Netherlands, which is not accessible for non-Dutch speaking students from abroad.

The programme objectives have been translated into a series of intended learning outcomes. The intended learning outcomes specify knowledge of the discipline and of research methods and techniques, skills to design, execute, report and evaluate research, ethical awareness and considerations regarding research in this domain, oral and written communication skills and willingness to reconsider scientific considerations or results.

In a diagram drafted to that effect, programme management showed the intended learning outcomes to meet the Dublin descriptors for the master level.

Programme management compared the programme to regular master programmes in this domain in the Netherlands and abroad and to research programmes in this domain in The Netherlands. This programme is distinct from regular master programmes to the extent that students in this programme are educated to conduct research on their own and are trained to contribute to the advancement of research in the domain. In addition, the programme has a distinct international orientation, preparing students for international research. Having compared the programme to programmes in this domain abroad, it may be said this programme unites the sub-disciplines developmental psychology, school psychology, parenting, and education, whereas institutions abroad tend to have separate programmes for developmental psychology on the one hand and education on the other hand. In the comparison with the four other research master programmes in this domain in the Netherlands, both similarities and differences were noted.

The differences are not fundamental, although the University of Amsterdam programme is distinct in adopting the bioecological process model to study the domain and in strongly emphasising quantitative empirical research.

Considerations

The panel has noted the programme to prepare students to become researchers in the domain of education and child development. The panel supports these objectives of the programme and is convinced students are meant to be thoroughly trained to conduct research in this domain. The panel regards the programme to have a broad research profile, being directed to the research of child development and education.

The panel welcomes the programme objectives not only to educate students for academic careers, but also for society at large, training students to become clinical researchers and to do research for the Dutch clinical practice. As evidence-based clinical practice is much needed, the panel applauds the intentions of programme management to help to fill this gap and to add to the advancement of the clinical practice in the Netherlands.

The panel approves of the intended learning outcomes, these adequately corresponding to the programme objectives. The panel suggests, however, to formulate the intended learning outcomes in less general and in more domain-specific terms. The panel noted the clinical route goals to be less clearly addressed in the intended learning outcomes and advises to rephrase them in this sense.

In the panel's view, the intended learning outcomes meet the master level, as identified by the Dublin descriptors.

The comparison with other programmes in the Netherlands and abroad is appreciated by the panel. The panel regards the programme to be clearly distinct from regular master programmes in this domain and acknowledges the programme to have a number of distinguishing objectives, separating it from research master programmes in this domain in the Netherlands and abroad.

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 Research Master Child Development and Education programme is organised by the Graduate School of Child Development and Education of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, in collaboration with the Research Institute of Child Development and Education. The Graduate School organises the other master programmes in this domain as well. The College of Child Development and Education offers the bachelor programmes of the Faculty in this domain. The responsibility for the quality of the Research Master Child Development and Education programme rests with the Dean of the Faculty and, on behalf of him, with the director of the Graduate School. The programme director, assisted by the programme manager, takes care of programme management on a day-to-day basis. For this programme as well as for the other programmes of the College and Graduate School of Child Development and Education, the Programme Committee, which consists of staff members and students, advises the Graduate School director on the quality of the programme. The Examination Board is responsible for ensuring the quality of examinations and assessments of all programmes of the College and Graduate School.

The number of students enrolling in the programme are on average about 15 students per year, counting on the basis of the last six years, 2012 – 2017. The number of students admitted is restricted to about 15 to 20 students. The number of applicants for the programme tends to be greater than the number of places available in the programme. On average, about 2/3 of the applicants are admitted. About 40 % of the incoming students take the clinical route, about 20 % take the child development route, another 20 % take the education route and still another 20 % combine the latter two routes.

In a table, programme management presented the relations between the intended learning outcomes and the courses of the curriculum. The curriculum of the programme has a study load of 120 EC, takes two years and is composed of an introductory course (6 EC) courses on disciplinary knowledge (30 EC), courses on methodological or statistical skills (33 EC) and curriculum components on the practice of research (research internship of 18 EC in the first year and research master thesis of 30 EC in the second year). Disciplinary courses either focus on child development or education and may be taken in each of the two years. The methodological and statistical courses should be taken in the prescribed order. In addition, students are trained in critical thinking and reflection in both the courses mentioned and in the academic skills course (3 EC) in the first year. Research ethics are addressed in the latter course. To that effect, students write papers, critical reviews and research proposals and reflect upon and discuss about research in the courses. The students taking the clinical route, take two courses in Dutch of the regular master programme in this field (total of 12 EC, counting for 6 EC for these research master students), start their research master thesis in the first year and take a clinical internship in the second year, combining this with the research assignment (together 24 EC). Except for the two courses mentioned above, all of the courses in the curriculum are especially designed and developed for this research master programme. Students may take courses outside of this curriculum (maximally 12 EC), but these courses need approval by the Examination Board. Students are given the opportunity to spend part of the curriculum abroad. This is not compulsory. For various reasons, only few students actually go abroad. Students of this programme have to attend the Graduate School Colloquium meetings, organised monthly, in which research master students and PhD students present their research to an audience of staff and students.

As has been noted above, the programme is embedded in the Research Institute of Child Development and Education. In the most recent research assessment of 2013, the Child Development programme within the institute obtained scores of 4.5 for quality, 5.0 for productivity, 4.5 for relevance and 4.0 for viability. The Education programme within the institute was awarded scores of 4.5 for quality, 4.5 for productivity, 4.0 for relevance and 4.0 for viability. All staff members are researchers with expertise in their field of research, reporting very good publication records. About 90 % of the lecturers have acquired the university BKO-certificate for teaching or the first-grade teaching qualification. Only lecturers, who have tenured positions and take part in the research programmes of the Research Institute are allowed to coordinate research master courses or supervise research master thesis projects. The number of lecturers in the programme has risen from 17 to 49. The programme teaching capacity is 2.49 full-time equivalents, leading to the student-to-staff ratio of 11 : 1. Staff of the teaching-learning lines of disciplinary courses or methodological courses meet on a regular basis. Individual lecturers meet with programme management.

Programme management informs prospective students about the programme through the programme website and by means of the information brochure. In addition, two master information days per year are scheduled. The admission requirements to enter the programme are a bachelor degree in pedagogical sciences, developmental psychology, educational sciences or related fields, such as psychology or sociology. Students are to report excellent study results in their prior education, are to have good writing skills, should be proficient in the English language and ought to show a strong motivation to become researchers in this field. The admissions procedures include submitting the prospective student's application file with a letter of motivation and two letters of reference. The programme Admission Committee studies the applications, conducts interviews with the applicants and decides on each of the admissions. Students may be admitted on the condition of repairing deficiencies and completing additional tests.

The programme student success rates are 28.1 % of the students graduating in two years and 87.5 % of the students graduating within three years. Students regard the programme to be doable in two years. Students report various reasons for not completing the programme in nominal time, such as improving their theses to increase the chance of publication, taking additional courses and personal circumstances. The educational concept of the programme is primarily meant to support students in their research training. Study methods include small, interactive classes, encouragement of critical thinking, community building among students and training in writing papers, reviews and research proposals. The number of hours of face-to-face education are on average 6 per week in the first year and 4 to 5 hours in the second year, not counting hours of individual supervision. In the programme, students may turn to the programme manager or one of the study counsellors for guidance or assistance. In the research master thesis process, students are guided by their supervisors (36 hours of guidance). Students also attend thesis meetings, allowing them to discuss their work with fellow-students, the thesis coordinator and programme manager or director. Students with whom the panel met, expressed programme management to be very responsive to their questions and remarks. The number of complaints and requests by students in this research master programme is very low.

Considerations

The panel considers the organisation of the programme to be solid and to involve the main stakeholders of the programme.

The panel inspected the table relating the intended learning outcomes of the programme to the courses and concludes all of the intended learning outcomes to be covered in the curriculum, both for the regular routes and for the clinical route. The panel appreciates the curriculum from the content-perspective, the courses exhibiting strong and relevant contents and addressing research methods in-depth. The panel encourages programme management to include qualitative research methods and N=1 studies in the curriculum. Specifically for the clinical route, the panel advises to reverse the order of the clinical internship and the research master thesis, scheduling the clinical internship in the first year and the research master thesis in the second year. The order now seems to be at odds with the curriculum coherence. Although the research assignment has been added, the panel recommends to make the clinical internship more challenging. The panel advises to broaden the opportunities for students to go abroad.

The panel is very appreciative of the lecturers in the programme. They are very good researchers and experts in their fields. The panel is certain the lecturers have the skills to educate students well, being capable of transferring their own research into the lectures. The high proportion of lecturers having teaching qualifications is considered by the panel to be very positive. The panel advises to promote the interaction among lecturers, strengthening the curriculum coherence.

The panel considers the admission requirements of the programme to be selective and, therefore, to be appropriate for this research master programme. The admission procedures are elaborate and strict, allowing only motivated and very good students in.

The panel feels the student success rates are somewhat disappointing and encourages programme management to try and foster the study pace of the students. The panel regards the study load of the programme to be doable. The study methods and study guidance meet the research master requirements, allowing students to engage in research-based teaching and learning. The panel welcomes the intensive contacts between lecturers and students and applauds the responsiveness of programme management to the students' questions.

Assessment of this standard

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

4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

The examination and assessment rules and regulations of the programme are in line with the University of Amsterdam Assessment Policy Framework. For this programme and the bachelor and master programmes in Child Development and Education, one Examination Board has the authority to ensure the quality of the examination and assessment processes and the quality of the examinations and assessments, including the research master theses of this programme.

Examination methods adopted in the courses, for the most part constitute papers, written assignments and research proposals. Programme management feels this method is most appropriate to test students' knowledge, insights and skills in this research master programme, as students have to demonstrate not only their knowledge, but also applying knowledge and presenting their findings. Written examinations are used only in a limited number of courses.

The written examinations are peer-reviewed by another examiner before being presented to the students.

The internship proposals are evaluated by one examiner. The research master thesis proposals have to be approved by three examiners. The clinical internships and research assignments in the clinical route are assessed separately, using different scoring forms.

The research master theses are assessed by three examiners, being the thesis supervisor and two external examiners, one of whom is a lecturer in this research master programme. The scoring models for the research internships and the research master theses are quite similar.

The Examination Board for the programme drafted an assessment manual to promote the quality of the examinations. On behalf of the Examination Board, the Assessment Committee, having been installed in 2016, reviews the examinations. In addition to the table with the relations between the intended learning outcomes and curriculum components, mentioned in standard 2, the Assessment Committee conducted a constructive alignment analysis and found all of the intended learning outcomes to be met in the course examinations. The Examination Board reviews all of the research master theses with grades lower than 6.5 or higher than 8.0 and a random sample of other theses. The Examination Board did not detect any major differences in quality or level between the theses of the regular routes and the clinical route.

Considerations

The panel regards the examination and assessment policies of the programme adequate. The Examination Board for the programme has been given the appropriate authority to ensure the processes of examination and assessment and the students' products.

The examination methods in the courses are regarded by the panel to meet the course goals and course contents. The panel suggests, however, to bring more variation in the examination methods adopted in order to test the students' knowledge and skills in different ways.

For the panel, the assessment procedures for the internships and research master theses are appropriate. The panel advises, however, to phrase the internship assessment criteria more clearly, to reflect the goals of the internships more strictly.

The assessment process for the research master thesis with three examiners approving the thesis proposals and three examiners assessing the final products is welcomed by the panel, as this procedure ensures reliable assessments.

In the view of the panel, the Examination Board monitors the examination and assessment processes very conscientiously and reviews students' products, including the research master theses appropriately. The panel is positive about the constructive alignment analysis and the recommendations to programme management following this analysis, such as increasing the variety of examination methods in the courses and using different scoring models for the internships and the research master theses.

Assessment of this standard

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

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.

As has been noted above, the panel also reviewed fifteen theses of graduates of the programme, these theses exhibiting a variety of grades, ranging from satisfactory to very good.

Programme management recorded the grades for the research master theses for the recent three years in order to illustrate the level achieved by the students. The average grade for the theses was 7.9 for these years. The Examination Board regards many theses to be publishable. About 70 % of the research master theses and internship reports are actually submitted to international academic scientific journals, are under review and/or are actually published.

Programme management conducted a survey among programme graduates. The outcomes of this survey (74 % of the alumni having completed it) were 53 % of the alumni having obtained PhD positions, 11 % of them working in other research positions, and 17 % of the alumni being employed in the clinical practice. The vast majority of the programme graduates (89 %) found suitable employment within three months after their graduation.

Considerations

Having studied the examinations of a number of courses of the programme, the panel assessed all of these examinations to be up to standard for this research master programme.

None of the theses the panel reviewed were assessed to be unsatisfactory. The panel considers the theses generally to be very good and to be in line with the grades actually given. Some theses were judged to be only satisfactory and some would have been given slightly lower grades by the panel. A number of theses are in the opinion of the panel to be suitable for publication. The panel noted a substantial number of theses actually having been submitted to academic scientific journals.

The panel appreciates the labour market chances of the graduates of the programme and considers their careers to give evidence of the level achieved by them.

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	Satisfactory
Standard 3: Student assessment	Satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	Satisfactory
Programme	Satisfactory

6. Recommendations

In this report, a number of suggestions and recommendations by the panel have been listed. For the sake of clarity, these have been brought together below. These panel recommendations are the following.

- To state the intended learning outcomes in less general terms and to relate them more clearly to the domain.
- To rephrase the intended learning outcomes in order to cover the clinical route objectives more adequately and more clearly.
- To include qualitative research methods and N=1 studies in the curriculum.
- To reverse the order of the clinical internship and the research master thesis, scheduling the clinical internship in the first year and the research master thesis in the second year.
- To make the clinical internship as part of the clinical route more challenging.
- To broaden the opportunities for students to go abroad.
- To promote the interaction among lecturers, strengthening the curriculum coherence.
- To try and foster the study pace of the students, stimulating them to finish their studies within two years.
- To bring more variation in the examination methods adopted, in order to test the students' knowledge and skills in various ways.
- To phrase the internship assessment criteria more clearly, in order to reflect the goals of the internships more strictly.