

Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

Master Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences

VU Amsterdam

Contents of the report

1. Executive summary	2
2. Assessment process	5
3. Programme administrative information.....	8
4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard	9
4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	9
4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	11
4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment.....	14
4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	16
5. Overview of assessments.....	17
6. Recommendations	18

1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Master Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences programme of VU Amsterdam. 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 regards the organisation of the programme to be fully appropriate.

The programme objectives are sound and relevant. The panel acknowledges that the programme has a clear profile, training students to bridge and integrate life and health sciences and social sciences disciplines, to analyse policies in this field, to study the complexities in these policies and to analyse these complexities. The programme is regarded by the panel to be unique in its focus on integration of social and natural sciences and on the transdisciplinary dimensions. The programme fully meets the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework for the Science and Technology Studies domain. The programme could proceed to excellence, continuing along this path. The panel advises the Faculty to provide the institutional and financial support to achieve this.

The programme objectives have been translated well into the programme intended learning outcomes. The intended learning outcomes include, among others, knowledge and understanding of theories and strategies in this domain, research skills and a number of relevant academic skills. The panel feels the intended learning outcomes are comprehensive and have been well-articulated. The intended learning outcomes conform to the master level.

The panel appreciates the programme objectives to train students for both PhD positions and positions in the professional field within this domain.

The number of incoming students is (more than) adequate. Given the funding available, taking in more students would be a challenge.

The curriculum meets the programme intended learning outcomes and is coherent. The courses are very well-designed and cutting-edge with respect to contents. The panel applauds the programme managing to lead students through the transformation process from their natural sciences backgrounds to the societal perspective understanding of this domain. Students are thoroughly educated in both theory and practice. The panel welcomes students being allowed to draft their own personal business plans and being prepared for the labour market. Students are trained in both qualitative and quantitative research methods, but the panel recommends to include a statistics course in the curriculum, preparing students for quantitative methods. The panel considers the research internships to be very valuable for the students' education.

The panel noted that the lecturers in the programme are very motivated and dedicated. The lecturers are experienced researchers, all of them having PhDs. The Athena Institute is considered by the panel to be a very strong research institute, ensuring the research qualities of the lecturers. The lecturers' educational capabilities are up to standard, as the proportions of BKO- and SKO-certified lecturers show. The panel is pleased to see lecturers from other universities and from the professional field are being invited to lecture. The balance of experienced lecturers and junior lecturers is fine, although the panel advises to bring in more permanent staff members. The panel noted the appreciation of students for their lecturers.

The panel approves of the admission requirements of the programme, especially the required natural sciences backgrounds of incoming students, and the admission procedures.

The educational concept of inquiry-based learning is suitable for the programme. As not all lecturers seem to grasp the concept, the panel suggests to train them in this respect. The study methods of the programme are solid and innovative, supporting the course contents. The number of hours of face-to-face education is adequate. The supervision in the internships is appropriate, as the on-site supervision is intensive. The study guidance is appropriate. The student success rates after three years are favourable.

The examinations and assessment rules and regulations of the programme are adequate, being in line with University and Faculty guidelines. The panel is positive about the responsibilities and activities of the Examination Board and the Examination Subcommittee for this programme.

The examination methods are appropriately diversified and correspond to the course contents and course objectives. The panel is positive about the assessment procedures for the research internships. The scoring forms are filled out conscientiously, but more extensive written comments could be added.

The panel is positive about the measures programme management and the Examination Board have taken to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments. Although fraud and plagiarism procedures are in place, the panel advises to standardise fraud and plagiarism checks for all written assignments.

The course examinations are up to standard. The research internship reports the panel studied, definitely match the intended learning outcomes. The internships fully meet academic standards. The panel was pleased to note a number of reports to have been turned into publications. Not all internship reports were precisely transdisciplinary, but this does not conflict with the academic level of the reports.

The panel applauds the programme adequately preparing students for the professional field. Graduates managed to find very appropriate positions in the professional field and felt to be well-prepared for these positions. Graduates of the programme have indeed the capacities to analyse policies and complexities in this field, as is one of the main objectives of the programme.

The panel that did the assessment of the Master Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences programme of VU 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 good. Therefore, the panel recommends NVAO to accredit this programme.

Rotterdam, 22 October 2018

Prof. dr. W. Stark
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren
(panel secretary)

2. Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by VU Amsterdam to support the limited framework programme assessment process for the Master Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences 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 Transdisciplinary Problem Solving in the Health and Life Sciences convened to discuss the assessment panel composition and to draft the list of candidates. 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. W. Stark, Professor in Organisational Psychology/Development and Community Psychology, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany (panel chair);
- Prof. dr. S. Parasuraman, Director and vice-Chancellor, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India (served to February, 2018) (panel member);
- Prof. dr. D.C. Henderson M.D., Professor and Chair of Psychiatry, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, United States of America (panel member);
- Prof. dr. M.B.H. Everaert, Professor of Linguistics, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics, Utrecht University (panel member);
- Dr. M.C.P.J. Knippels, Assistant Professor in Biology Education, Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University (panel member);
- C.J. Stam MSc, student Master Sustainable Development (graduated in 2018), Utrecht University (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. 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 last two complete years. Acting on behalf of the assessment panel, the process coordinator selected 15 final projects from this list. The grade distribution in the selection was ensured to conform to the grade distribution in the list, sent by programme management.

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. 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 preliminary 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, based on the list compiled, were discussed.

On 12 and 13 July 2018, the panel conducted the site visit on the VU Amsterdam campus. The site visit schedule was in accordance with the schedule as planned. In a number of separate sessions, the panel was given the opportunity to meet with Faculty Board representatives, programme management, Examination Board representatives, lecturers and final projects examiners, and students and alumni.

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 Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences
Orientation, level programme: Academic Master
Grade: MSc
Number of credits: 120 EC
Specialisations: Health and Life Sciences Based Policy
Health and Life Sciences Based Management and Entrepreneurship
International Public Health
Communication in the Health and Life Sciences
Location: Amsterdam
Mode of study: Full-time (language of instruction: English)
Registration in CROHO: 21PL-60803
Name of institution: VU 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 Master Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences is one of six master programmes of the Graduate School Health and Life Sciences of the Faculty of Science of VU Amsterdam. The vice-Dean of Education and the educational director of the Faculty have the responsibility for the quality of this and the other programmes of the Faculty. The programme director is responsible for the quality, contents and implementation of the programme on the day-to-day basis. She is assisted by the programme coordinator and the specialisation coordinators. The Programme Committee, being composed of lecturers and students, advises programme management on the quality of the programme. The Faculty Examination Board has the authority to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments of this programme and the other programmes of the Faculty. On behalf of the Board, the Examination Subcommittee in effect monitors the examination and assessment processes of the programme. The programme is closely related to the Athena Institute of VU Amsterdam and the research programmes in science and technology studies and transdisciplinary research in the health and life sciences of this institute.

The Master Management, Policy Analysis and Entrepreneurship in the Health and Life Sciences of VU Amsterdam is a two-year (120 EC), research-based master programme in the Science and Technology Studies domain. This domain is geared towards the study of complex interactions between scientific and technological developments and societal developments. In the context of this programme, the scientific and technological developments studied are developments in health and life sciences.

The programme objectives are to educate students to analyse complex societal subjects and problems, related to the health and life sciences, to design and implement strategies to address these complex societal subjects and problems through interdisciplinary research and to communicate and cooperate with researchers from scientific disciplines other than the health and life sciences and with societal actors to try and solve these problems. Students are trained in transdisciplinary approaches to problems, which means involving social actors in the research process. The programme offers four specialisations, educating students in either theories and strategies of government policy in this domain (Health and Life Sciences Based policy), management and innovation theories and strategies in the domain (Health and Life Sciences Based management and Entrepreneurship), international public health issues (International Public Health) or communication theories and strategies in the domain (Communication in the Health and Life Sciences).

The programme aims to prepare students for PhD positions in their specialisation fields, but also for positions in industry, academia, government organisations, advisory bodies or consultancies.

The programme objectives have been translated into the programme intended learning outcomes. These specify theoretical and practical knowledge in the programme domain and especially in the field of specialisation, research knowledge and skills in this domain, application of scientific knowledge to address societal problems, critical thinking, communication skills to inform others about issues in this field, and self-directed learning skills.

Programme management drafted a table from which the matching of the intended learning outcomes to the Dublin descriptors for master programmes could be inferred.

Considerations

The panel regards the organisation of the programme to be fully appropriate.

The programme objectives are sound and relevant. The panel acknowledges that the programme has a clear profile, training students to bridge and to integrate life and health sciences and social sciences disciplines, to analyse policies in this field, to study the complexities in these policies and to analyse these complexities. The programme is regarded by the panel to be unique in its focus on integration of social and natural sciences, not studying social sciences separately, and in its focus on the transdisciplinary dimensions in this domain. Students are educated in critical and analytical thinking. They are trained to become bridge-builders between these disciplines and to know how to involve social actors in the research processes. The programme meets the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework for the Science and Technology Studies domain.

The programme could proceed to excellence, continuing along this path. The panel advises the Faculty to provide the institutional and financial support to achieve this.

The programme objectives have been concisely translated into the programme intended learning outcomes. The intended learning outcomes include, among others, knowledge and understanding of theories and strategies in this domain, research skills and a number of relevant academic skills. The panel feels the intended learning outcomes are comprehensive and have been well-articulated. The panel has established the intended learning outcomes to conform to the master level, this being exemplified by the Dublin descriptors for master level programmes.

The panel appreciates the programme objectives to train students for both PhD positions and positions in the professional field within this domain.

Assessment of this standard

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

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 number of students entering the programme remained stable over the past five years, being on average about 100 students per year, 50 % to 60 % having VU Amsterdam bachelor degrees and 30 % to 40 % coming from other Dutch universities. The proportion of foreign students is limited to about 10 % of the total influx. The proportion of students with Dutch higher vocational education bachelor degrees is no more than about 5 %. Programme management is content with the current numbers of incoming students and does not strive to increase these. About 30 % of the students opt for the policy specialisation, about 40 % opt for the management and entrepreneurship specialisation and about 30 % for the international public health specialisation. Very few students choose the communication specialisation.

Programme management presented a table to show the alignment of the intended learning outcomes and the curriculum. The curriculum takes two years and has a study load of 120 EC (EC is 28 hours of study). In the first year, students take three compulsory courses (18 EC), introducing them to research methods, government policy and management processes in the programme domain. In the first year, they also take two courses in their specialisation (12 EC) and do the first research internship (27 EC) accompanied by one 3 EC course to train their academic writing skills. In the second year, students take compulsory courses on interactions between science and technology and society and on ethics (total of 9 EC), the literature thesis (12 EC) and the second research internship (30 EC). As the literature thesis and at least one of the research internships are related to the specialisation, the number of credits for the specialisation is between 51 EC and 81 EC. The range of organisations offering internships is broad. Programme management indicated not experiencing any difficulties in finding suitable internship placements. About 20 % of the students do one of the internships abroad. In the course of both internships, students are offered science and career sessions, preparing them to enter the labour market. In one of the courses of the specialisation Management and entrepreneurship, students draft their personal business plans to give them a sense of direction for their own development and careers.

A total number of about 25 lecturers are involved in the programme. Most of the lecturers have PhDs and are active researchers in the fields, which they teach in the programme. About 60 % of the lecturers obtained the BKO-certificate, whereas 16 % of them acquired the SKO-certificate. In addition, a number of lecturers are in the process of obtaining either BKO- or SKO-certificates. Most lecturers are researchers in the Athena Institute, but lecturers from other research departments of VU Amsterdam participate as well. In addition, guest lecturers from the professional field are regularly invited. Lecturers are assisted by about 20 workgroup coaches. They are temporary junior teachers, who are supervised by staff members. Lecturers meet regularly to discuss the programme and to exchange views on the internships. Students appreciate the lecturers, as is evident from the students' survey results. The teaching workload of the lecturers is quite demanding.

Candidate students are directly admitted to the programme, if they have completed bachelor programmes with at least 120 EC in health and life sciences subjects. For candidates not meeting this requirement, the Admission Board assesses the science components in their prior education and decides on admission. In addition, students ought to be proficient in English. Incoming students tend to have diverse backgrounds. In the first courses, students are educated to come to comparable levels of knowledge and understanding.

The educational concept of the programme is inquiry-based. Students are gradually guided by lecturers towards types of open inquiry, educating students to address open-ended problems. Guidance during this process is offered more intensively in the beginning but decreases in the course of the programme. The number of hours of face-to-face education are on average about 13 hours per week in the cursory parts of the curriculum. The study methods in the courses include, among others, lectures, work groups, group projects and self-study. Lectures tend to be fairly large-scale, whereas work groups and group projects are small-scale. The typical course is composed of a theoretical part, encompassing lectures and work groups and a practical part, consisting of groups projects, for a fair deal addressing real-life problems. For the practical part, the programme has adopted Community Service Learning as the study method, combining academic learning and practical work experiences. Programme management is strongly engaged in educational innovation, adopting new, ICT-based study methods. In each of the internships, students are entitled to 20 hours of supervision by the VU supervisor. The daily supervision is in the hands of the on-site supervisor. In the first year of the curriculum, students are offered study guidance. Monthly lunch meetings are scheduled to inform students about, among others, the specialisations offered and optional courses to be selected. In addition, students may turn to the specialisation coordinator, the internship coordinator, the programme coordinator or the programme director. The student success rates for this programme are about 33 % after two years and about 85 % after three years (average figures for the last five cohorts). The drop-out rates are limited. In the student chapter and in the meeting with the panel, students expressed experiencing the curriculum to be challenging.

Considerations

The number of incoming students is (more than) adequate. Given the funding available, taking in more students would be a challenge.

The panel is very positive about the contents and the coherence of the curriculum. The curriculum meets the intended learning outcomes of the programme and is coherent. The courses are very well-designed and exhibit strong contents. The panel applauds the programme succeeding to lead students through the transformation process from their natural sciences backgrounds to the societal perspective understanding of this domain. Students are thoroughly educated in both theory and practice of the programme domain. The panel appreciates students being allowed to draft their own personal business plans and being prepared for the labour market. Students are trained in both qualitative and quantitative research methods, but the panel recommends to include a statistics course in the curriculum, preparing students for the quantitative methods. The research internships are considered by the panel to be very valuable for the students' education.

The panel noted that the lecturers in the programme are very motivated and dedicated. The lecturers are experienced researchers, all of them having PhDs. The Athena Institute is considered by the panel to be a very strong research institute, ensuring the research qualities of the lecturers. The lecturers' educational capabilities are up to standard, as the proportions of BKO-certified and SKO-certified lecturers show. The panel is pleased to see lecturers from other universities and from the professional field are being invited to lecture. The balance of experienced lecturers and junior lecturers is fine, although the panel advises to bring in more permanent staff members. The panel noted the appreciation of students for their lecturers.

The panel approves of the admission requirements of the programme, especially the required natural sciences backgrounds of incoming students, and the admission procedures.

The educational concept of inquiry-based learning is a solid concept, suitable for the programme. As not all of the lecturers seem to fully grasp the concept, the panel suggests to train them in this respect. The study methods of the programme are solid and innovative, supporting the course contents. The number of hours of face-to-face education is adequate. The supervision in the internships is appropriate, as the on-site supervision is intensive. The study guidance is appropriate. The student success rates after three years are favourable.

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 programme examination and assessment policies are aligned with the rules and regulations of VU Amsterdam and the Faculty of Science rules. Principles and procedures for the programme examinations and assessments have been laid down in the programme assessment plan. As has been indicated, the Faculty Examination Board has the authority to monitor the examination and assessment processes and products of this and all other Faculty programmes. On behalf of the Board, the Examination Subcommittee for this programme ensures the quality of the examinations and assessments of the programme.

In nearly all courses, multiple examination methods have been adopted. Examination methods include written examinations, oral examinations, take-home assignments, group assignments and presentations. The methods are selected in line with the course goals to be assessed. Individual examinations constitute at least 50 % of the total grade of the compulsory courses.

Students must write a literature thesis and do two research internships. Internship placements are posted on the programme electronic learning system. Internship placements may be at VU Amsterdam, other universities or other organisations. Internships are governed by the agreement form, to be signed by the student and the VU internship supervisor. In the first six weeks, small groups of students draft their internship research proposal. The internship proposal must be approved by the supervisor, before students may start the internships. Students are entitled to supervision by the VU supervisor and, at the internship site, by the on-site supervisor. The VU supervisor and the second assessor, who has not been involved in the internship process, grade the internship report. The VU supervisor also grades the internship process, the research done and the final presentation. The on-site supervisor is not an examiner, but may give advice. For the assessment of internships, rubrics scoring forms are adopted, specifying the criteria to be assessed and assisting VU examiners in the grading process.

Programme management and the Examination Board have taken measures to promote the validity, reliability and transparency of examinations and assessments. The Examination Subcommittee appoints the examiners. The assessment plan for the programme specifies the relations between the programme intended learning outcomes, Dublin descriptors and courses. Part of the assessment plan are the assessment matrices, indicating for each of the courses the course objectives and relating the course objectives to the examination methods used. Samples of course examinations are reviewed by the Faculty Review Committee, acting on behalf of the Examination Board. The Examination Subcommittee inspects the grade distribution of examination and reviews samples of internship reports. Internship assessments are discussed among examiners in so-called calibration meetings. Fraud and plagiarism checks are standard for internship reports, but not yet for all written assignments. The Examination Subcommittee deals with individual cases about grades, fraud or plagiarism. Students are presented examples of examination questions, are informed about the grading scheme and may inspect their graded examinations.

Considerations

The panel approves of the examination and assessment rules and regulations of the programme, these being in line with VU Amsterdam and Faculty guidelines. The panel is positive about the responsibilities and activities of the Faculty Examination Board, the Examination Subcommittee for this programme and the Faculty Review Committee.

The examination methods are appropriately diversified and correspond to the course contents and course objectives.

The panel is positive about the supervision and assessment procedures for the research internships. The supervision is appropriate, and the assessments are conducted in a reliable way, involving two examiners and well-structured rubrics scoring forms with relevant assessment criteria. The scoring forms are filled out conscientiously, but more extensive written comments could be added.

The panel is positive about the measures programme management and the Examination Board have taken to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments. The measures are elaborate and definitely promote the validity, reliability and transparency of the examinations and assessments. Although fraud and plagiarism procedures are in place, the panel advises to standardise fraud and plagiarism checks for all written assignments.

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.

In addition, the panel reviewed fifteen research internship reports of programme graduates of the last two years. The average grade for the second research internship was 7.6 (both in 2015/2016 and in 2016/2017). Little over 10 % of the students graduate with distinction (cum laude). Some students co-author articles in the programme domain.

Graduates of the programme find suitable positions quite shortly after having completed the programme. The vast majority of the graduates of the last two cohorts are employed. Graduates tend to find positions at private companies, public organisations or research institutes. Graduates find diverse positions, being consultants, business advisors and project managers (about 20 % each), researchers (14 %), management trainees (8 %) or PhD students (6 %). Alumni indicated to be content to very content with the programme as preparation for the labour market.

Considerations

The course examinations, which the panel reviewed were found to be up to standard.

The research internship reports the panel studied, definitely match the intended learning outcomes. The internships clearly meet academic standards. The panel was pleased to note a number of reports to have been turned into scientific publications in peer reviewed journals. Not all of the internship reports were precisely transdisciplinary, but this does not conflict with the academic level of the reports.

The panel applauds the programme for preparing students very well for the professional field. Graduates managed to find very appropriate positions in the professional field and felt to be well-prepared for these positions. Graduates of the programme have indeed the capacities to analyse policies and complexities in this field, this being one of the main objectives of the programme.

Assessment of this standard

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

5. Overview of assessments

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

6. Recommendations

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

- To provide the institutional and financial support for the programme to allow it to proceed to excellence.
- To include a statistics course in the curriculum, preparing students for quantitative research methods.
- To increase the number of permanent staff members in the programme.
- To train all lectures in the educational concept of inquiry-based learning.
- To add more extensive written comments to the internship scoring forms.
- To standardise fraud and plagiarism checks for all written assignments.