

## **Christelijke Hogeschool Windesheim**

### **B Global Project and Change Management**

#### **Limited Study Programme Assessment**



## Summary

In December 2019 the bachelor's hbo-programme Global Project and Change Management (GPCM) at the University of Applied Sciences Windesheim was visited by a NQA audit panel. This is a four year fulltime programme, taught in English at Windesheim's main location in Zwolle. The audit panel assesses the quality of the study programme as positive. In addition to the assessment for reaccreditation of the GPCM programme the panel assessed the programme on two special features: *Sustainable Higher Education* and *Small-scale and Intensive Education*. The panel assesses both special features as positive.

With a strong community this programme manages to educate students in Global Project and Change Management with a specific focus on the SDG's and global challenges. Students develop their individual programme based on motivation and talent. With support of the dedicated staff they manage to achieve the learning outcomes. The panel was specifically impressed by the positive and hopeful attitude of the students in their ability to create change. Sustainability is incorporated in nearly all parts of the programme as well as in many extracurricular initiatives. Students are guided and supervised in a personal way to find their way through the curriculum and develop their own talent and interests. The value of this unique programme was well articulated by students, the focus on project management & change making in combination with focus on SDG's and global challenges. The panel advises to further interweave these different sides of the programme with each other and to present this as a strength of the programme.

### *Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes*

The programme receives the assessment **meets** the generic quality on standard 1. Students are developed to become competent and proactive project managers and change makers who contribute to sustainable solutions. The six learning outcomes adhere to the BBA standards and to demands concerning sustainability and project management. The learning outcomes are operationalised into three levels and comply to the requirements for a professional bachelor programme. There is explicit attention to the connection with the professional field, to developments in the field of project and change management as well as in sustainability. The global perspective and interconnectedness of local change and global challenges is impressive.

### *Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment*

The programme receives the assessment **meets** the generic quality on standard 2. Constructivist pedagogy lies at the basis of the educational vision and is consistent throughout the curriculum. This is, for example, reflected in the fact that the student as a professional is leading and not the product. The curriculum consists of two foundational years and two comprehensive years, with five learning lines running through the entire curriculum. SDGs are structurally embedded in the curriculum, students can choose their own context and work on real life issues in direct contact with clients. Attention to skills, content and research is good. The 'wicked' problems of the future could be included even more strongly, specifically with respect to the role of politics and power. The student selection process is good and focuses on motivation, social involvement and talent. The increasingly international group of students forms a very close learning community that is vibrant and actively involved in extracurricular activities. The foundation for the sense of community lies in the first year, when students jointly live in student dorms. Staff is also actively involved in many activities and provides high quality education and guidance to students.

### *Standard 3: Assessment*

The programme receives the assessment **meets** the generic quality on standard 3. Assessment is an integral part of the education process, including student self-assessment and peer assessment. The system of assessment is thorough, elaborate and transparent with a focus on formative feedback and real-life assignments. The panel is positive about the assessment of the bachelor level. The independence of both examiners is a clear plus, and the calibration sessions should continue in the future. Transparency of the assessment process could improve and the panel recommends to further incorporate the assessment of professional skills.

### *Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes*

The programme receives the assessment **meets** the generic quality on standard 4. Based on a selection of graduation products the panel concludes that the learning outcomes are achieved. The panel read a number of comprehensive and well written reports, but also noticed that some projects had a very broad scope and could have profited from more focus prior to the internship. The alumni were impressive, both their positions in the professional field and their successful continuation with master's programme without the requirement of a premaster. Alumni were clearly trained to contribute to inclusiveness and sustainable solutions for a better future.

## **Special feature Small-scale and Intensive Education**

The panel **grants** the GPCM programme the special feature. All eight criteria defined by the NVAO are met. Particularly the sense of community, which the panel felt overwhelmingly, contributed to its recommendation to grant this feature. In addition to findings described in the four standards for re-accreditation, the findings on the eight criteria are the following:

### *A. Intended learning outcomes*

Using the BBA standards and including the IPMA and ICB4 demands, the programme sets a standard for a 'professional college' that focuses on small-scale and intensive education. The learning outcomes are formulated on three levels, the highest being the honours level. Specific focus on soft skills without neglecting the required knowledge and general skills results in socially skilled graduates with initiative and a wide interest, specifically with respect to sustainability. The mixture of personal interest, use of SDG's and the learning outcomes allows students and graduates to work on real-life issues and challenges as well as on their personal development.

### *B. Relationship between the goals and content of the programme*

Both students and staff are highly committed to global challenges and sustainability issues. This is reflected in curricular and extracurricular activities that are closely connected to the curriculum, often in relation to one or more of the SDGs.

### *C. Structure and didactic concept*

The programme supports students in becoming an open, caring and supportive community. The basis lies in the first year, when students jointly live in student dorms and continues in the following years in which the community provides support, is cosy and a learning experience. Intensive teaching is achieved by a one course a day principle, students focus strongly on this course during this day which allows them to go into depth. In addition to three hour classes students are supported in smaller groups twice a week. Individual counselling is given based on the students' demands. Extracurricular activities, like the Green Hub, are led and initiated by students. All are connected to the SDG's and involve participation of staff and are an imminent part of the concept.

#### *D. Intake*

Students are selected by way of a sound procedure that includes background and motivation. An interview by a lecturer and a student includes keywords and involve clear criteria that are discussed. The programme seems successful in its selection process, illustrated by the low dropout rate in the first year and nominal study of 4,2 years.

#### *E. Quality of staff*

Consistent to students, faculty is engaged with the SDG's and global challenges. Qualifications of faculty are high: all have at least a master's degree and over a third have a PhD or are pursuing one. Together, the staff has a broad expertise that fits in well with the programme. They are also involved in counselling students, which supports the creation of a community and small-scale programme. Many professionalisation opportunities guarantee the continuation of high quality of staff.

#### *F. Number of staff*

The student-staff ratio is more profitable compared to regular bachelor programmes at Windesheim. Intensive education is achieved by the one course per day policy and close involvement of the professional field as clients in projects. Students are very positive about the number of staff and consider them to be approachable.

#### *G. Available facilities*

The housing is adequate for small-scale and intensive teaching, with plenty of space for both educational and extracurricular activities. Specifically the common room is an asset, it allows the students, staff and clients to meet and is appropriate for the organisation of many activities.

#### *H. Level realised*

In the graduation project, the individual student can further develop his/her talents and interest while showing that they achieve the intended learning outcomes. After graduation students find challenging jobs that reflect their personal interests and often involve working with SDG's. Many students continue with a master's programme, mostly without having to do a pre-master.

### **Special feature Sustainable Higher Education**

The panel **grants** the GPCM programme this special feature. The criteria are convincingly met. In nearly all parts of the curriculum and the discussions during the site visit sustainability was referred to. According to the panel, sustainability is at the core of the programme.

#### *Criterion 1: Distinguishing nature*

The GPCM programme is one of the driving programmes at Windesheim with regard to sustainability. The programme uses the People, Planet and Prosperity perspectives and the SDG agenda as a common framework, education students for sustainability. This own, distinct vision on sustainability is recognisable throughout the entire programme, with a far-reaching and integrated focus and holistic manner in all parts of the programme.

#### *Criterion 2: Concretisation*

Continuous and comprehensive attention to sustainability is visible throughout the curriculum and in the four standards of the NVAO framework. It starts with the principle that the programme educates FOR sustainability, making it holistically integrated in the curriculum and part of the learning outcomes. In year 1 and 2 of the curriculum SDG's are addressed in courses and in each

project students have to choose at least one SDG to work on. In year 3 and 4 this continues, students have to connect a challenge they are passionate about to one or more SDG's. All courses have a link to sustainability, some more explicit than others. Staff has specific expertise on global challenges and SDG's which is kept up to date through professionalisation. There are close connections between the programme and networks specialised in sustainability. Finally, the programme is doing excellent in its exemplary function, it consciously and extensively considers sustainability in all its facets. Sustainability is continuously recurring in assessment criteria as the theme is interwoven in all project and many courses. A vast majority of graduates continues with a master's programme, often connected to sustainability. Jobs held by alumni also often include sustainability aspects, or the SDGs.

*Criterion 3: Relevance*

Sustainability is a precondition for the objectives and profile of the programme, student selection is partly based on their vision and passion with regard to developments in this field.

## **Contents**

<b>Short outline of the study programme</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Standard 1 Intended learning outcomes</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Standard 2 Teaching-learning environment</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Standard 3 Student assessment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Standard 4 Achieved learning outcomes</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Special feature Small-Scale and Intensive Education</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>General conclusion of the study programme</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Appendix 1: Programme for the site visit</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Documents examined</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>In addition to the graduation products of a selection of fifteen graduates, the panel received the following documentation:</b>	<b>43</b>





## Introduction

This is the assessment report of the Global Project and Change Management bachelor's programme offered by the University of Applied Science Windesheim. The assessment was conducted by an audit panel compiled by NQA, commissioned by Windesheim UAS and in consultation with the programme. Prior to the assessment process the audit panel was approved by NVAO.

In this report NQA gives account of its findings, considerations and conclusions. The assessment was undertaken according to the *Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands* of NVAO (2018) and the *NQA Guideline 2019 for limited programme assessment*. In a separate chapter the panel reports about the special feature small-scale and intensive education, which the panel awards to the programme. This chapter is written according to the *Framework for small-scale, intensive and residential programmes* (November 2011). The programme also applied for the special feature on sustainable higher education, which the panel likewise awards. In a separate chapter the panel reports about the special feature Sustainable Higher Education. This chapter is written according to *Framework for special features* (July 2017).

The site visit took place on 3 December 2019. The audit panel consisted of:

- Mrs. P.H.J. van Schijndel MA MSc, (chair), Innovation and Research Manager at Hogeschool Inholland;
- Mr. ing. J.C. de Jong, Senior Adjunct Professorial Lecturer at the American University (Washington, US) and freelance lecturer Change Management at the Hotelschool in The Hague;
- Mr. C.E. Weerheijm, Manager of the Honours Programme HR at Hogeschool Rotterdam;
- Mr. drs. F. Bons, Senior Program Manager at KWD Resultaatmanagement;
- Mrs. Ir. M. Oosterman, Director SDG Charter;
- Mrs. D.R. Kuseyri, student BA Liberal Arts & Sciences, Leiden University College the Hague.

Mrs. dr. M.J.V. Van Bogaert acted as secretary of the panel. The programme for the site visit is provided in Appendix 1.

## Procedures

The programme is not part of a visitation group but was reviewed as a stand-alone programme. The programme offered a self-evaluation report and appendices for the programme assessment. For the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes, the panel studied fifteen graduation dossiers of recent graduates. These fifteen dossiers were selected on the basis of a group list of alumni from the last two years.

The panel's site visit, consisting of expert peers, was central to the assessment. In preparation for the site visit, a preliminary meeting was held. During this meeting, the panel members received instructions on the working methods of NQA and the NVAO framework and they discussed their preliminary findings. Both during the preliminary meeting and the site visit, the findings were continuously shared among panel members. During the site visit, the panel met with various stakeholders of the programme, including students, lecturers (examiners) and representatives of the professional field and studied the material made available for inspection (see appendix 2). At the end of the site visit, the information obtained by the panel was processed into an overall picture and a preliminary assessment with arguments. During a concluding oral feedback, the

chair of the panel communicated its assessment and important findings to the programme. Employees and students of the study programme were given the opportunity to approach the panel (via e-mail) outside the site visit (walk-in consultation hours). No use was made of this possibility.

After the site visit, a draft report was drawn up by the secretary and submitted to the panel. With the input of the panel members, a second draft was drawn up, which was submitted to the programme for verification of factual inaccuracies. The panel members took note of the reaction of the programme and made adjustments where necessary. The report was then finalised. With all the information provided (both verbally and in writing), the panel was able to arrive at a well-considered opinion.

The panel declares the assessment of the programme was carried out independently.

Utrecht, 4 February 2020

Panel chair



P.H.J. van Schijndel MA MSc

Panel secretary



dr. M.J.V. Van Bogaert

## Short outline of the study programme

Windesheim Honours College (WHC) offers an honours BBA programme in Global Project and Change Management (GPCM). WHC is an intensive, small-scale, international learning community with students and staff who want to make a positive difference in the world by striving for a balance between the interests of people, planet and prosperity. In addition to applying for reaccreditation, WHC asked to renew the special feature small-scale and intensive education and obtain the special feature on sustainable higher education. WHC believes that both features are at the core of who they are and what they do. In this report the panel provides its perspective and assessment on both special features.

The programme started in 2009 as the first professional bachelors programme taught in English at Windesheim University of Applied Science (hereafter: Windesheim). The programme has a strong international orientation, is situated in a residential college setting and is focused on intercultural diversity and sustainability. In 2014, at the same time as receiving the special feature on small-scale and intensive education, the name of the programme changed to what it is now: GPCM. The name WHC continues to exist for the institute, because it fits in well with the educational concept and the innovative, small-scale and intensive character of the programme. With the feature small-scale and intensive education, the programme is now permitted to select a maximum of 80 students per year (started in 2016). Although it is allowed to install higher tuition fees for the programme, the Board of Windesheim decided to finance the extra costs of intensive and small-scale education from central resources.

The previous accreditation had a very positive outcome. Based on a limited number of graduates at that time (five), the previous panel made some recommendations. These were to execute a practice-based assessment, including a close look at the effect of selection on drop-out and success rates of the programme. Both in the assessment according to the NVAO framework and that of the special feature on small-scale and intensive education the present panel will reflect on these issues. Another recommendation by the previous panel was to put more attention to the broad scope of topics in the research questions within the internships. The programme has introduced several activities to improve this aspect. The present panel will reflect on this in standard 4.

## Administrative data

Name study programme as in CROHO	B Global Project and Change Management
Orientation and level study programme	hbo; bachelor
Grade	BBA
Number of study credits	240 EC
Graduation courses / 'tracks'	-
Location(s)	Zwolle
Variant(s)	Fulltime
Language used	English
Registration number in CROHO	30017



## 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*

### Conclusion

The Global Project and Change Management (GPCM) programme of Windesheim Honours College (WHC) aims at the integral development of students to become competent and pro-active project managers and change makers who contribute to inclusive and sustainable solutions. The panel is of the opinion that the focus and profile is clear but recommends the programme to work on a narrative to make the link between project and change management and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and global challenges more explicit. Specifically, specification of how project and change management serves as an appropriate tool for achieving the SDGs. The six learning outcomes (LO's) adhere to the BBA standard as well as the IPMA (International Project Management Association) and ICB4 (International Competence Baseline) demands, are operationalised into three levels and comply to the requirements for a professional bachelor programme. There is explicit and extensive attention for the connection with the professional field and the panel observed that trends and developments in education, project and change management, and sustainable development are reflected in the programme. The panel compliments the programme on embracing the 'global' perspective, and the interconnectedness of local change and global challenges. Based on these considerations the panel assesses that the programme GPCM **meets** the generic quality for standard 1.

### Substantiation

#### *Profile and learning outcomes*

The GPCM bachelor programme of WHC educates students to become competent and pro-active project managers and change makers who contribute to inclusive and sustainable solutions for our common future and who are equipped to operate in different fields of expertise. Graduates will operate in increasingly volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous environments and their work areas will be subjected to fundamental changes and challenges. During the site visit, the panel understood that WHC has a vision on integral development of students that is translated in this honours programme. Students are educated into a role rather than into a profession and, as such, there is strong focus on soft skills, personal development and leadership development. The panel understands and follows the reasoning that the programme educates for complex and ambiguous challenges, and focuses on training students as change makers and who are able to face the 'wickedness' of the challenges at hand. The programme orientation is on project management & change making on the one hand and on SDG's and global challenges on the other hand. The panel considers both dimensions to be important, but also observes a tension between the two. It advises the programme to interweave these two points without detracting from the value of either point, but rather focusing on the strength of combining the two.

#### *Learning outcomes*

WHC formulated two competences to safeguard the special characteristics of the programme. The first is the *Global competence* on application of the professional competencies with a global perspective through a focus on: social and global engagement, sustainability, diversity and change, and awareness that choices affect the future. The second is the *Honours competence* on

the power to act in a professional context of ambiguity and complexity with a critical and reflective attitude based on state-of-the-art knowledge and applied and evidence-based research. At the time of the introduction of the programme, the BBA framework was considered to be the most appropriate for this programme with a broad professional profile. Combined with the two competences formulated by the programme, the BBA standard forms the basis for the six intended learning outcomes (LO's) of the programme. It is considered important that the project management is also adequately covered, which is why the LO's are secured by the professional orientation and are attuned to IPMA and ICB4 demands. The six LO's are connected to five learning lines in the curriculum, which are operationalised into three levels of complexity (basic, advanced and honours). Initially the panel was wondering why the fairly traditional BBA framework was chosen for a programme that trains students for the dynamic world of project and change management. During the site visit, it was established that, unlike the university colleges at WO-level, there is no broad label in higher professional education to which the WHC could adhere. The panel therefore concludes that GPCM and Windesheim made an appropriate and logical decision by choosing the BBA label, which offers the most flexibility. Compliance with the IPMA requirements ensures that the project management is sufficiently covered in the LO's. Methods and skills in project and change management need to continuously adapt to an increasingly vuca (volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous) world. The panel compliments the programme for the attention it has for these developments, and recommends it to keep monitoring trends, and updating the content of the programme according to changes in the work field. In addition, the panel recommends to keep monitoring the fit with the BBA level.

#### *Connection to the professional field*

At WHC a number of activities are undertaken to make sure that the programme and curriculum are well connected to the requirements and expectations of the international professional field. As mentioned before, GPCM has attuned its LO's to the ICB4 demands, a global standard that defines the competences required to work in the field of project-, programme- or portfolio-management. To make sure that trends and developments in both education, project and change management, and sustainability are reflected in the programme, GPCM actively participates in a number of networks, such as IPMA and SDG related networks and is member of (inter)national educational networks, like the European Association for International Education (EAIE). The programme has an active advisory board on both educational affairs and content. In 2018-19 a change in the setup of this advisory board was made to better reflect the international and sustainability focus of the programme. In addition to providing recommendations, the advisory board is involved in the assessment of the final presentations of the bachelor's theses. The panel has talked to a number of clients involved in projects in the curriculum, and to a representative of the advisory board and read the documentation provided by the programme. It is of the opinion that WHC is very much aware of the importance of its connection and interaction with the professional field, both regarding the variety and breadth of subjects in the curriculum and the rapid developments in the field. The panel assesses the orientation towards the professional field as very positive. It sees close collaboration with many partners and clients. The panel also appreciates the language used within the programme, like PMEL, and Theory of Change. This reflects the language used in the professional field.

#### *Specific profile Internationalisation*

GPCM has an international perspective. This can be seen in the international student population (40% non-Dutch students) and teacher population (45% international) as well as in the approach to the subjects and problems dealt with. GPCM explicitly trains students for the international professional field as the global challenges and SDGs are also not restricted to the Netherlands.

The panel compliments the programme on embracing the 'glocal' perspective (global + local), many students, alumni and clients voice the interconnectedness of local change and global challenges.

## 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.*

### Conclusion

The educational vision is based on a constructivist pedagogy and is consistent and well-integrated in the programme. Not the final professional product, but the development of the student as a professional as a whole is leading. The curriculum consists of five learning lines, has two foundational years, two comprehensive years and leads to an internship and capstone in the final semester in which students demonstrate that they achieved the LO's at bachelor's level. The SDGs are structurally embedded in the curriculum. Each semester students work on real life issues in direct contact with clients from the professional field. The core of the programme is global project and change management and students can choose the context themselves. Attention to the development of research skills and obtaining the bachelor level on skills, content and research is good. The panel is of the opinion that this is a unique programme in its focus and approach. To further improve the panel recommends to more strongly include the 'wicked' problems of the future, how to deal with them with specific attention to the role of politics and power.

GPCM is allowed to select its students, the panel is appreciative of the selection process that focuses on motivation, social involvement and talent. The group of students is increasingly international, and the panel stimulates the programme to continue working on increasing the cultural diversity of the student cohorts. The panel was very impressed by the close and vibrant community it met during the site visit. Contributing to the community are curricular and extracurricular activities, first year students jointly living in student dorms and the attitude of teaching staff and students. Guidance of students is well-organised; a career counsellor who coaches on the development of personal and professional identity is appointed to each student. Students' feedback is listened to, acted upon and feedback on actions is given. Staff is highly trained, and expertise is available on a wide range of subjects in the core team. Lecturers are knowledgeable and approachable for students. Professionalization of staff is clearly on the agenda of WHC. Based on above mentioned considerations the audit panel assesses that the GPCM programme **meets** the generic quality for standard 2.

### Substantiation

#### *Educational vision and didactic concept*

The educational vision is strongly based on a constructivist pedagogy: students gain knowledge and skills and construct their own vision of the professional world in interaction with their environment during the learning process. Experiential learning is crucial in the process as students become part of an international and intercultural community of learners. The Windesheim Honours Learning Environment contains eight characteristics that form the fundament of the educational concept: Multidisciplinary connections, Creative productivity, Authentic assignments, Personal learning journey, Social responsibility, Concept of giftedness,



Learning communities, Personal leadership. These characteristics become visible in several ways:

1. Socially engaged and motivated students on a personal learning journey;
2. Small-scale, intensive and international learning community;
3. Working on real-life issues;
4. Educating for sustainability.

The panel is very impressed by the way this educational vision has been shaped into the curriculum. A high degree of consistency in the discussions with different stakeholders makes it clear to the panel that within the programme the product is not so much leading, but the development of the student as a professional. This is an important aspect of the profile that has been well worked out. The elaboration of the characteristics and the panel's findings in this respect are presented in various places of this report.

#### *Content and structure of the curriculum*

The GPCM curriculum consists of five learning lines: The *Project and Change Management* learning line familiarises students with the technical and behavioural aspects of project and change management and students work in project teams for real life clients. The *Research* learning line teaches students that good project managers substantiate their plans and decisions with relevant data. Students are also trained to perform applied research and to critically evaluate research from others. The *Global challenges* learning line focuses on the macro-environment of projects. In the *Business skills* learning line students focus on the environment of projects and the relationship between project and the standing organisation(s) around it. In the final learning line, *Personal and Professional development*, students personalise their education.

The curriculum is built up of two foundational years in which students take a set of courses and two comprehensive years in which the learning lines are integrated into semester modules. An overview of the curriculum is provided in appendix C. During year one and two the development of project management skills, research skills and knowledge related to global challenges and business topics are central components of the curriculum. Each semester students work on a large, real-life project. During the first two years these are pre-defined problems, with intensive guidance from lecturers and the external clients in the region of Zwolle. In year three and the first semester of year four students do a group internship *Managing Projects in a Globalized World*, participate in the *Value Creators* semester and take elective courses at another (accredited) university. In the last semester students do the *Bachelor Internship and capstone*. The primary focus is to allow students to demonstrate what they have learnt, and that they have achieved all the LO's at bachelor's level. In an internship setting students develop a research-based professional product. At a personal level they demonstrate how they developed themselves into an international project and change manager. The panel appreciates the opportunities of direct client contact, already starting in the first semester of the first year. The clients who participate in projects of the first and second year consider themselves well-informed on what is expected, feel supported by the programme in case they have questions or if problems arise. They are furthermore very positive about the quality of the work by students and of the products.

The structure of the curriculum is clear to the panel, throughout the years students deal with more complex and larger projects that require increased skills, knowledge and flexibility. In the first year they learn the basics of project management, and in the second year they build on this. In year three they go one step further in *Value Creation* and in the fourth year they start working with

'wicked' challenges. The panel observes that there is quite a transition between the structured years one and two and the subsequent period in which students seek their own path and gain international experience. However, students and alumni indicated that the foundation of the first two years is solid and after it they are not only ready to enter the world but are also eager to do so.

The panel is of the opinion that the programme is unique in its focus and approach. The panel sees a programme with global project and change management at its core and the students can choose the context themselves. This can lead to a clear specialisation, but also to a broad perspective. The social aspects and sustainability really matter, students are engaged, and commitment is high. Moreover, the SDG's are structurally embedded in the curriculum. Students are also clearly trained and stimulated to develop flexibility. The curriculum not only focuses on knowledge and hard skills, but also on the development of soft skills, reflection and adaptability. The panel concludes that modern perspectives in change management and project management are used, this is secured by the connection of the curriculum to IPMA and the input by the Advisory Board. The panel was also very impressed with the way students were able to communicate what they were learning and how that contributes to their education. There are a number of aspects in the programme for which the panel believes that extra attention will lead to an even better curriculum. First, the panel stimulates the programme to consider which skills and facilities are required for students to be able to deal with the 'wicked' problems of the future (e.g. cultured meat) that are currently not all known. The second point of attention relates to the awareness to politics and power. The curriculum pays extensive attention to (gender) diversity and cultural awareness, which is very good. The panel is of the opinion, however, that the political aspects cannot be ignored. The panel recommends to investigate in what way understanding and awareness of the underlying power structures can better integrated in the programme.

#### *Honours level and research*

In a competence matrix the programme provides an overview of the way that the LO's are covered in the curriculum and at what level. The matrix shows that all LO's in the first year are covered at basic level, students reach the advanced level in the second and third year. By the end of the fourth year, in the internship and capstone, students reach the honours level in all LO's. In this final semester the bachelor level of the programme is assessed. WHC offers three different internship tracks that are designed to support the next step in the student's career and to facilitate their different interests: an academic track, a professional track and a social entrepreneurial track. Each has a particular emphasis and type of professional product that students need to develop. For example, the academic track product can be a (potentially) publishable academic paper, while the professional track product is an advisory report and the social entrepreneurial track product a plan. According to the panel, this fits in well with a programme that aims to develop and stimulate a student's own strength and interest. Products of both tracks comply to the intended learning outcomes as described in standard 1.

WHC collaborates closely with a number of research groups (lectoraten) within Windesheim. One of the lecturers is senior researcher and leads the research programme on Wicked Challenges of the Lectoraat Social Innovation. Within this research programme other staff members and students conduct research. The *Research* learning line gradually builds up from an introduction in the first semester to the level required to perform research during the internship. Students are very positive about this learning line; they feel well prepared to work on a research proposal. This was confirmed by alumni, who told the panel that when starting a master programme, no

premaster is required. The panel is of the opinion that the programme has a clear research learning line in which a meta-perspective on methods is taught.

#### *Community and admissions*

Due to its special feature small-scale and intensive education, GPCM is allowed to select students. The selection process focuses on talented, social involvement and highly motivated students. The selection procedure includes an essay written by the student, and two letters of recommendation. During a selection day, an interview is held with a lecturer and a student. Students are passionate about sustainability and want to go the extra mile. They feel the responsibility for the future of the planet. The panel is impressed by the procedure, which is clearly aimed at admitting students who fit in with a programme that wants to train future leaders. The prospective students must demonstrate a specific mindset, flexibility, innovativeness and internal motivation. The programme does not consider the marks obtained in previous programmes to be important, as long as they have successfully completed a fitting education.

Each year a maximum of 80 students is selected out of approximately 200 applications. The percentage of international students is increasing, at the time of the site visit 60% of the students was Dutch. Of the non-Dutch students, the vast majority is German. The panel stimulates the programme in its ambition to increase the percentage of non-German international students. The panel compliments the programme on embracing the 'global' perspective, and heard many of the students, alumni and clients voice the interconnectedness of local change and global challenges. To add to that, the panel thinks it would be an asset to enhance the global/worldwide scope of the community, both by intensifying influx from a greater variety of international background; and by embracing multiple intercultural perspectives from year one.

During the site visit, the panel met with a vibrant and engaged community. This fits in with an honours college and the panel was very impressed by the atmosphere and the initiatives that are taken. Alumni are also important for the community and they feel the same way. Although they are spread out all over the world, they feel WHC as an important part of their network. In the first year of the programme students live together in the Hive (student dorms). This year is crucial in group formation process, specifically as the students all come from different regions and countries. Students indicated to the panel to highly appreciate this year that is considered supportive, homely and important in their development. They also indicate that it is good that after this year they all move to their own place near the school. The connection that was established in the first year at the Hive is strong and students find it important that they, besides the WHC community, increasingly involve the outside world in their development. The community is an important part of the programme, including curricular and extracurricular activities in which both staff and students participate.

The extracurricular activities include organising and attending guest lectures, workshops and conferences, but also participation in networks. A nice example of an activity in which students and staff collaborate is *Glocality*, an open access academic journal that offers a platform to students to share their work with the external world. The panel was also introduced to a number of student-led bodies, for example the Green Hub, The Future for Nature Academy and the WeAll Youth Main Hub. There are furthermore informal events, such as end-of-the-year BBQ and graduation ceremonies.

### *International perspective and language.*

The international perspective of GPCM is reflected in both the community (the international student and staff population) and the content of the programme. With 40% international students and 45% international staff the programme is well able to organise an international classroom. Not only international staff and students are important, GPCM explicitly trains students for the international professional field, by teaching them according to international standards for project and change management. Moreover, global challenges and SDGs are not restricted to the Netherlands, nor are the solutions. The panel notes that the community has an international perspective and propagates it in this way. Students indicate that the level of English is sufficient and in practice not only the lessons are taught in English, but the entire community speaks English. In this way, students are able to prepare themselves for an international professional career. According to the panel, this is a good foundation for the choice of English as the language of instruction and to the panel it is only logical that name of the programme is also in English.

### *Student coaching, community, study ability*

The courses are offered in a one-course-per-day format, in which students typically have three contact hours and use the rest of the day to study or work on (group) assignments. Students enjoy the one-course-per day format, they informed the panel that it allows them to really focus on that course and go into more depth during that day. Career counselling and professional profiling play an important role in the programme. In the first year of the programme, students are assigned to a career counsellor with whom they can discuss their personal and professional development. The career counsellors also coach them in both study skills related topics and career development. The first year focuses predominantly on students developing their personal identity, in the second-year attention shifts to the development of the students' professional identity. Students informed the panel that they feel well guided in making choices regarding their individual study path. The first two years prepare them very well for the final two years in which they develop their own, unique profile. Students indicate that feedback by students to teaching staff and management are adequately and swiftly taken up. It is made clear to all students what is done with feedback.

### *Staff*

The self-evaluation report characterises the lecturers by their autonomy-supportive teaching approach, which fits the characteristics of the students and the objective of the programme. All lecturers hold a master's degree, 25% has a PhD and three more lecturers are in the process of obtaining a PhD. About 45% of teaching staff is international. The core team has a variety in disciplinary backgrounds and (professional) expertise, but the breadth of the programme requires involvement of guest lecturers from other degree programmes and the professional field. The expertise of staff members on the SDG's is also provided, teaching staff attends conferences and workshop and present papers or facilitate workshops at events on topics related to the core themes of the programme: project management, value creation/change making and the SDG's. Students informed the panel that they consider their teachers to be knowledgeable as well as approachable when they have questions. The students also told the panel that skills regarding teaching in English of the staff is good. From the self-evaluation report it becomes clear that in general students are positive about the didactic qualities of the teaching staff. In individual cases improvement is required, in these cases action is taken by the programme. The panel is of the opinion that the programme and its teaching staff are specialised in educating for sustainability. The panel is pleased to see that GPCM is acting as a knowledge partner in this field within Windesheim and is sharing knowledge and experiences with other higher education programmes that want to take steps in this direction.

## Standard 3

## Student assessment

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

### Conclusion

Assessment is considered an integral part of the education process and is strongly linked to the vision on education. The assessment system is thorough, elaborate and transparent. Focus lies on formative feedback and real-life assignments. Similarly, to the assessment of the entire curriculum, the assessment of the bachelor level in the final semester is sturdy and suits students who know what is expected of them as project manager and change maker. The independence of both examiners is a clear plus. It is recommended to further incorporate the assessment of professional skills in addition to the assessment of academic and soft skills. The calibration sessions are a good initiative and should continue in the future. Attention is required to the transparency of the assessment process of the bachelor's thesis. The panel is positive about the way the Examination Board is in control of the quality of assessment. Based on above mentioned considerations the audit panel assesses that the bachelor's programme GPCM **meets** the generic quality for standard 3.

### Substantiation

#### *Assessment of the GPCM programme*

The GPCM programme has put into place an assessment system that adheres to the Windesheim assessment policy. Lecturers (examiners) are responsible for the development and assessment of exams, and for peer reviewing the exams of other lecturers. For the assessment of the internship affiliate examiners are appointed who provide four-eyes assessment for the bachelor's level internship. An important role in assessment is also given to students, who are actively involved in providing peer feedback, peer and self-assessment. This adds to their development as professionals. Assessment is considered an integral part of the educational process and - if well-designed and implemented –contributes substantially to the quality of the programme as a whole. The vision on education is strongly linked to the vision on assessment, the constructivist pedagogy requires 'assessment for learning' rather than 'assessment of learning'. Thus, the programme considers formative feedback and transparency on assessment to be crucial factors. Furthermore, assessment focuses on authentic, real-life assignments, that challenge students to incorporate information available, and to select, interpret and apply knowledge in order to solve complex problems. Here the programme meets the recommendation of the previous panel. The structure of the assessment follows the build-up of the programme: increasing independence and peer feedback. In year one and two students are provided with a solid foundation in knowledge and skills in project management, research, business skills and global challenges. A mix of assessment methods is used to assess the foundation of knowledge and skills in the first two years, e.g. written exams, oral exams, individual and group assignments and reflections. In the third- and fourth-year assessment is more holistically, and students are given an even bigger role in the feedback and assessment process. The panel observed a thorough and elaborate assessment system. It is transparent to both students and assessors and makes use of – for example – rubrics and criteria for assessment.

### *Assessment of bachelor level*

The bachelor's level is assessed in the final semester in the Internship and capstone. Students have to deliver four products. The first is an Internship Project Plan, outlining the background of the issue at hand, including a personal development plan and research plan for the internship. The second product is the Bachelor thesis, consisting of a concise research report (CRR), a professional product and an oral defence. Thirdly, students deliver a reflection report and the WHC learning journey presentation. The final product is an assessment of their professional competencies as evaluated by their in-company mentor (*Working as a Professional*). Students work independently in an internship organisation of their choice and develop a research-based professional product in order to demonstrate that they developed themselves into international project manager and change makers. Guidance during the internship is done by an in-company mentor and a WHC internship counsellor who guides them during the research process. Assessment is separate and is done by an examiner and affiliated examiner who independently assess the work of the students, all examiners are PhDs or PhD candidates. The panel is of the opinion that the programme has a sturdy assessment system at graduation, it suits students who know what is expected of them as a project manager and change maker. The panel is positive about the independence of both examiners of the bachelor thesis products.

During the site visit, the panel discussed at length the design, assessment and weighting of the various components of the graduation project. Initially, the panel questioned the relatively high value attributed to *Working as a professional* and the *Reflection report* (both 20%). However, during the day it became clear that the programme values soft skills and reflection and makes a strong commitment to them throughout the programme. The panel therefore concludes that the weighting chosen reflects the balance in the curriculum and the LO's. It does recommend to the programme to include professional skills more explicitly in the reflection report as well, making it a reflection on personal growth as well as on their role as a professional project manager and change maker. The current set-up for the final semester started in February 2018 and was evaluated in the spring of 2019 by a calibration exercise. The conclusion was that differences in grading exist but are not very high and that the assessment criteria for the professional product needed to be sharpened. A follow-up calibration meeting was planned for autumn 2019. The panel is satisfied with this repeated attention to the assessment of the thesis and encourages the programme to use the calibration on a structural basis. The cesura for each the sub-products is furthermore raised to a 5,5 and the total score has to be a 6,0. The panel is of the opinion that this is an important improvement in the assessment process, making even more clear that all graduates achieve all LO's at the honours level.

The panel appreciates the close connection between the Concise Research Report (CRR) and the professional product in the bachelor's thesis. The CRR provides the foundation for the professional product and consequently the quality of both products is related. In the assessment process both products and the oral defence combined lead to one sub-score on the bachelor thesis. The panel understands this reasoning but wonders whether the method chosen is the most appropriate one. The use of two rubrics for the two products currently leads to two grades that are averaged to the sub-score for the bachelor's thesis. The panel believes that it would be more transparent to have the assessment of both products leading to one single grade that is also the sub-score for the final assessment, or to include both grades as sub-scores in the final assessment.

### *Quality assurance*

The Examination Board (EB) is responsible for guaranteeing the quality of assessment independent of the Executive Board. It advises the management of the programme on assessment policy and the execution of it. One EB member is coordinating the assessment of the bachelor level and verifies that the process is according to the rules and regulations. From the interview the panel is confident that the EB is in control of the quality of the assessment and aware of any issues that affect this quality. Issues raised by the panel were also identified by the EB and acted upon, e.g. the caesura in the assessment of the bachelor's level. The Curriculum Committee (CC) is also involved in the quality assurance of assessment. The quality of tests and evaluation of assessment lies with the examiner. To safeguard the quality of assessment, WHC uses a number of instruments like the training of examiners, four eyes policy, calibration sessions and screening of internship organisations. The panel is of the opinion that the Examination Board is in control over the quality of assessment, is aware of issues that play a role and is proactive in picking them up, for example dealing with group assignments and how to include an individual assessment.

## Standard 4 Achieved learning outcomes

*The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.*

### Conclusion

The panel reviewed the graduation products of a selection of fifteen graduates and agreed with the grading and feedback provided by the examiners. One suggestion by the panel is to work on more differentiation in the assessment of *Working as a professional*. A number of project reports were impressive and to the point, while in other projects the scope seems broad and could have been focused prior to the internship. The functioning of alumni after graduation is impressive. Many continue with a master programme, often without having to do a premaster. It is clear to the panel that alumni contribute to inclusiveness and sustainable solutions for a better future and are well trained to do so. Based on above mentioned considerations the audit panel assesses that the Global Project and Change Management programme **meets** the generic quality for standard 4.

### Substantiation

#### *Level of learning outcomes in graduation products*

As mentioned in standard 3, students achieve the highest level (honours level) of all LO's in the final semester. The assessment is based on a number of products. The panel reviewed the products of a selection of fifteen graduates, which included the CRR, Professional paper (PP), Oral defence presentation, Reflection report and Learning journey poster. It also received the assessment document, which includes the assessment of all products as well as the assessment of the in-company mentor on Working as a Professional. The panel agreed with the grading and feedback given by the examiners and is of the opinion that the rubrics used lead to a valid and reliable assessment. Once students find an internship organisation and an assignment, they deliver a workspace scan in which they show to comply with the criteria. There are criteria with respect to the topic students choose, it has to be clearly linked to one or more SDGs, has to be cross-organisational (applicable by other organisations), international (potentially a global issue) and complex (multisector, involving different stakeholders etc.). The panel is of the opinion that these criteria are adequate for students to obtain the honours level. At the same time the panel noticed that the scope of a significant number of research products was too broad for a six-month project, which means that the student is actually unable to carry out the project properly. This was also an observation by the previous panel and even students notice this in the discussion paragraph of their product. The programme is aware of the issue and has been working on a solution. According to the programme it has improved in the evaluation period. However, when setting up the research plan, the supervisor gives formative feedback but the student ultimately decides for himself. The panel appreciates this emphasis on the independence of the student but is of the opinion that the programme should actively work on this issue.

The panel agrees with the choice of weighing for the four sub-scores. It noticed that many students compensate relatively low sub-scores for the Bachelor thesis (CRR and PP) with high to very high sub-scores for Working as a professional and the Reflection report. The programme rightly indicates that the clients are extremely positive about the students and have no role in the assessment of the professional product. The latter is only assessed by independent examiners



who receive two letters of recommendation from external stakeholders. This is a good explanation for the sometimes very divergent grading. Although the panel did not have qualitative feedback that substantiate the sub-scores of Working as a professional, the difference with the professional product remains striking and the panel recommends the programme to look into a way to align the assessment of Working as a professional with that of the professional product.

#### *Functioning of alumni in the field*

An alumni survey in 2019 shows that 86% of graduates successfully pursued a master's degree, with a wide variety in the programmes chosen. Impressive to the panel is that most do not have to follow a premaster to enrol in a master programme. The panel talked to a number of alumni who all feel extremely well prepared for their current position. Alumni who enrolled in a master programme told the panel that they felt well prepared to do so, both regarding content and their research skills.

Alumni told the panel that they developed good soft skills (presentations, conversations with customers and cooperation) compared to colleagues who had followed a different bachelor's programme. They are sufficiently trained in terms of content and have the advantage that they know the basics of many topics and know how to quickly get familiarised with an unfamiliar subject. Alumni of GPCM are proud of the way they distinguish themselves from their colleagues. The panel was very impressed by the conversation with alumni. They present themselves and the training in a beautiful way. Not only do they name skills and knowledge, but - just like the students - they also radiate hope and passion for the future. In the varied working environment of alumni, a central theme is clearly present: contributing to inclusiveness and sustainable solutions for a better future.

## Special feature Small-Scale and Intensive Education

The panel **grants** the GPCM programme the special feature on small-scale and intensive education. The eight criteria defined by the NVAO are clearly and convincingly met according to the panel. All criteria, but in particular the sense of community, which the panel felt overwhelmingly, convinces the panel that this programme deserves this feature. A large part of the panel's findings can be found in the assessment of the regular standards for training assessment. In this chapter, the panel highlights a number of aspects that the framework for Small-Scale and Intensive Education identifies. The findings below should therefore be read in addition to the regular programme assessment.

### A. Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes are not only aimed at achieving a high level in the relevant academic discipline and/or professional practice, but also have a broader aim: to train socially skilled and initiative-rich scholars and/or professionals with a wide interest in social developments and issues within a multidisciplinary and/or interdisciplinary context.

The panel establishes the following on the different topics: Windesheim Honours College (WHC) has formulated learning outcomes (LO's) based on the BBA and reframed these in combination with the IPMA and ICB4 demands. This is necessary due to the fact that there is no better alternative in Dutch higher education, other than the framework used at University Colleges based on Liberal Arts & Sciences. The panel is convinced WHC is setting a standard for a 'professional college' and proofs its validity with these learning outcomes and results for their students.

Concerning the high level of education: WHC formulated three levels of the LO's: basic, advanced and honours. The latter level is high according to the panel and includes a broadening with respect to a regular bachelor's programme. WHC aims to educate all students at the honours level. According to the panel, alumni show this honours level and students aim for this level. The panel noticed that students feel very much equipped for a wide variety of work places and activities after graduation: doing a master (without having to do a premaster), working as consultant, working at a university, working in IT (without having an IT background), being entrepreneur and working in the social or public sector. The panel concludes that students feel competent and confident with the (soft) skills they gained in their education and in comparison, to other (regular bachelor) colleagues they are able to perform not only better, but also in a wider variety of professional fields.

Concerning the broader scope, in addition to the information above, students develop themselves broader and feel comfortable, competent and confident in different kinds of projects and circumstances. The panel concludes that the intake process guarantees a high starting level, students who are selected are eager to learn, socially involved and motivated. The programme is capable of taking these students to an even higher level. The LO's as formulated, in combination with the use of the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) give students the opportunity to act as a professional in a great variety of work places, even when at the start the 'hard content' is out of their scope: students know how to get a grip on the subject matter quickly and effectively. The socially skilled and initiative-richness became very clear to the panel in dialogue with students. Students take initiative to actively contribute to one or more of the (currently) eight

extracurricular activities which have a clear connection to issues in society. Concerning the societal and multi/interdisciplinary approach, the presented projects and the eight extracurricular 'community activities' are closely connected to current societal issues. Students automatically engage with inter/multidisciplinary ways of working as the issues and challenges are included in their projects and internships, and the eight extracurricular activities are 'real life issues' and therefore not reduced to 'educational projects'. Networking with professionals who work with and are active in these theme's is an activity within students' awareness.

*Conclusion:*

GPCM enables the students to become socially skilled and broadly educated with a firm engagement in societal and sustainable issues. The panel experienced this in conversation with students from different years and also with the alumni. All made clear that the mixture of personal interest, the use of SDG's and the way the programme has formulated its LO's, allows them to work on solutions of real-life issues (professional development) and also work on their personal development. The focus on soft skills as well as on hard skills in project and change management is, according to alumni, an ideal mix that made it possible for them to work in a broad variety of workplaces. Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.

## **B. Relationship between the goals and content of the programme**

The content of the programme is inseparably connected to relevant extra-curricular activities, which ensures a high level and broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes.

The panel experienced a very close and at the same time broad connection between the curriculum and activities of the students, both curricular *and* extracurricular. When looking at students aiming at 'global project and change management', and at the programme and projects presented by students, the only conclusion the panel can draw is that the interaction is very close, and all activities are connected to the SDGs. The focus on SDGs not only exists in the curriculum, where it is the main starting point for students in acquiring many of the soft skills needed, but also the extracurricular activities add to this. A nice example of an extracurricular activity is the Glocality, an open access academic journal that offers a plat form to students to publish their work. In standard 2 of the main report more examples are provided. In addition, the panel experienced that the SDG's are anchored in the minds, hands and hearts of the students and faculty. The projects in the curriculum all aim at sustainability in one way or another and how to influence the subjects at hand. Students can make the connection between the programme of (mainly) year one and two and these projects, and actively refer to them. Year three and four are the more 'world-like' projects that are executed outside Windesheim for which students are clearly prepared.

*Conclusion:*

There is a strong relation between the programme and curricular and extracurricular activities. Not only in the projects during the first two years, also in internships, minors and graduation internships students are working on their professional and personal development by doing research and formulating solutions for the issues related to the SDG's. Faculty is readily available to support students, encourage and counsel them. The panel establishes in dialogue with students and alumni that the goals of GPCM are fully met and the programme as presented supports them to become the intended 'project and change managers' that is formulated as goal of this programme. Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.

### C. Structure and didactic concept

The concept of the programme is aimed at creating an academic and/or professional community. Key terms are small-scale and intensively organized education, leading to a high number of hours of face-to-face teaching, close involvement between students and teachers and between students among themselves and socially relevant extra-curricular activities.

The goal of the programme is to educate all students at the honours level of the LO's, it has three main characteristics to reach this goal. 1) WHC has a clear view on what kind of students fit the programme and has an intake process which is sufficiently effective to select these students (see part D). 2) The 'college' supports students in becoming an open, caring and supportive community. An important part in this is the obligation in the first year to live together in the Hive (student dorms). Also, after this first year, there is still a strong community. Students not only find this community cosy but also very supportive and sometimes, when conflicts occur, a learning experience. 3) The learning environment is designed based on the LO's, and the way faculty acts in daily practice in class is also based upon the LO's. Connecting with students and the way they counsel them is essential in this. From all meetings with students and faculty it is clear to the panel that they form a close community. Specifically striking is the fact that some students who take the 'fast-track', which allows them to graduate 6 months earlier, fill up this period with extra (WHC connected) activities to be able to graduate with their peers. The sense of (professional) community is felt throughout the whole four years of the programme. Students see it as an important part of their development: it helps them to feel at home and it is considered a platform of support. At the same time, they see 'gezelligheid' as an equally important part of the community.

The principle at WHC is that although multiple courses run during a semester, only one course is taught on a single day. Students have a daily study load of three hours in class and a one course per day policy. In addition to these daily classes, the project work is regularly supported in smaller groups (about four students) twice a week (three hours each). Students experience their contact hours as intensive and sufficient, most of the time left is spend on studying. In addition, students are counselled 1:1 on a regular base which can vary per student (intensive or less intensive, depending on the demands of the individual). Counselling is well available and appreciated by the students, it is given on a regular basis and if needed extra time is available.

The eight WHC extracurricular activities, like the Green Hub, Future for Nature or the Shelter City, are a cooperation between students and faculty, but led and initiated by students. There are activities which are even additional to those eight, like the 'Digital workshops' which support students in all different kinds of software programmes usable in their education, or the 'Mushroom shop' which enables students to buy and eat freshly grown mushrooms on Windesheim coffee residue's. Students take part in one or more of these activities. All activities have a clear connection with the SDG's and contribute to networking activities and extra learning moments outside class and projects. The success of the entire concept is also proven by the relative nominal study progress. Students tend to graduate in an average of 4,2 years. This duration is significantly shorter than the average bachelor on universities of applied sciences.

#### *Conclusion:*

The panel experienced a close connection between the curriculum, the student and teacher community and the educational concept. This small-scale and intensive education is realised by the combination of groupwork, smaller groups and individual counselling of the students. The one

course per day approach supports the intensity of teaching. The 'year group', formed in the first year when students are obliged to live together in the Hive, is crucial in the group formation process. Specifically, as the individual students come from different regions and countries. The educational concept of LO's in combination with individual counselling makes students aware of their own possibilities as well as their responsibilities in the entire process of 'being educated together'. The extracurricular activities in which faculty joins on a regular base, are an imminent part of this concept. Nearly all students graduate within nominal duration of the programme. Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.

#### D. Intake

The programme has a sound selection procedure in place, aimed at admitting motivated and academically and/or professionally talented students.
--

The programme is allowed to select its students (since September 2016), so any effects of the selection are only limited visible. Nevertheless, the procedure is sound according to the panel and different aspects of students-to-be are looked at. Admission is not based on GPA or grades, the programme already noticed earlier that grades do not indicate the appropriate fit between student and the WHC approach. The developed intake process therefore includes several aspects: background (limited due to privacy), a motivation statement, an essay and an interview (sometimes by skype). The interview is performed by a staff member and a student together. The design of this interview includes certain 'keywords' to use to make sure all the interviews are somewhat comparable. The criteria that are focused on in the interview, are the main characteristics of the programme: intensive, collaborative, self-driven learning, creative, innovative and open for new opportunities. Each of these criteria has its own keywords, pre-written on the report form. In this way, the programme searches the students who fit best with the character of the programme.

The effectiveness of this procedure is recognised by teachers and students, they experience working with equally motivated and dedicated students. This is also illustrated by the low dropout rate of 20% in the first year, which is less than half the dropout rate of Windesheim as a university of applied sciences. Furthermore, the dropout rate is decreased compared to before the selection procedure started. The previous panel recommended to carefully look at drop-out and success rates and the programme seems to be successful in this respect. Faculty did mention that the student population has not changed after inserting the selection process, but they appreciate the lower dropout rates. Most students who do dropout, take a step towards studying at a general university after their 'propedeuse' and use WHC as a step-up. Last year only four negative BSA's were given on a total of approximately 95 students. The effectiveness of the right fit is also proven by the nominal study of 4,2 years (average) of WHC's students.

#### *Conclusion:*

The programme has a sound and effective intake procedure which results in a minor dropout due to a 'non fit' between student and WHC. The largest part of dropouts make a step-up to continue their education at a university. Students and faculty experience that they work with likewise motivated students in the programme. This makes clear that the assessment criteria used on motivation, the essay and moreover the interview, are effective and derived from the programme: intensive, collaborative, self-driven learning, creative and innovative and open for new opportunities. Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.

## E. Quality of staff

The teachers have high-quality knowledge of the relevant subject and feel involved in the distinctive nature of the programme.

Similar to students, faculty is engaged with WHC as an institute and as an educational concept. The notion of the programme and the way it educates its students, as well as the way the SDG's are intertwined into the system, is highly consistent throughout the organisation. The panel experienced this consistency as a warm and welcoming atmosphere in the different meetings with students and faculty. All teaching staff has a master's degree and eight hold a PhD. Three more are currently pursuing their PhD. This high percentage of master's and PhDs is impressive and a clear sign of high quality of staff. The quality of teaching staff furthermore fits the concept of WHC: on the one hand they are experts in a specific field of knowledge that is connected with the objectives of the programme, like project management, research experience and knowledge of the SDG's. On the other hand, all faculty has a double role: teaching in one occasion and counselling in the other. This ensures that all teachers have at least basic knowledge on didactical as well as pedagogical qualities to have a view on how students are doing. So, when needed, they are capable of acting in certain situations. While all teaching staff is guiding students, counselling is an expertise of some of the teachers, as with the other domains of the educational concept. The quality of staff is kept up to date by way of professionalisation opportunities and by regular meetings of faculty to calibrate the education and assessment. The programme uses evaluation of projects and courses to get feedback and enhance the performance of staff.

### *Conclusion:*

The programme has faculty which is well aligned to the whole of the educational concept. This means that all aspects of this concept are met content wise (like project management), research wise (a basic skill at WHC), and on counselling (needed to reach out to all individual students). The panel is convinced of the quality of the teaching staff, based on all having a master degree and many also have a PhD. There is also a match with the aims of the entire programme. Teachers are well equipped and calibrate on a regular base their interpretation of students work to ensure the common view of what the level and quality in each of the years should be. Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.

## F. Number of staff

There is sufficient staff available to provide small-scale and intensive education and to ensure and develop individual contact between teachers and students.

WHC has a formation of approximately 13 fte, which translates into a core of 20 permanent teachers and about 20 teachers on a more or less regular base. The Windesheim Executive Board allows a more profitable student-staff ratio for this programme compared to regular bachelor programmes. Teachers are both Dutch and international and include cultural diversity. As described in criterion C the programme has a one course per day policy, in which students have three hours in class and the rest of the day for self-study and group work. This allows for intensive education and close contact between teaching staff and students. Students spend a lot of time at school and experience education as an intensive experience. There is also always a high attendance at activities that are organized. Students highly appreciate the interaction with teaching staff and informed the panel that contact is also frequent outside the scheduled classes.

Both in small groups, like project work, and on an individual basis. This latter depends on the demands of the individual student. Faculty experiences workload very doable compared to other Windesheim programmes. Students experience sufficient teaching staff and have frequent interaction both curricular and extracurricular. When asked by the panel in what they would invest - if money were available - none of the students nor teachers mentioned 'reducing workload' of 'more teachers'. Students expressed that teachers are available for questions about studying or when counselling was scheduled or additionally needed. Faculty is all at least master level and all examiners of final graduation work are PhD's.

*Conclusion:*

The panel is of the opinion that the number of teachers is sufficient to provide small-scale and intensive education without teaching staff being overloaded, this was corroborated by students and teachers. None of the participants the panel interviewed would invest in more teaching staff at this moment (although it is always convenient of course). Teachers are well trained and of appropriate level (master's and PhD's). Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.

### **G. Available facilities**

The programme has its own infrastructure with facilities for small-scale and intensive education and common extra-curricular social activities.
---

Building X in which WHC is housed at Windesheim Campus is appropriate. It facilitates meetings, teaching and the number of workplaces is adequate for coursework, project meetings and individual counselling, as well as sufficient workspace for faculty (both individual and as a team). Next to classrooms, WHC has a 'common room' in which all kinds of activities take place and in which faculty and students meet in different settings: projects, extracurricular, meetings, and so on. The usage of facilities and specifically the common room fit the programme and its small-scale and intensive educational focus. Extracurricular activities can and are taking place in the same building which is appreciated by students as this connects these activities to the programme. This makes them accessible to other students of Windesheim. The building is also used by other (regular) Windesheim programmes makes the amount of freedom somewhat limited. The former building gave students the opportunity to experiment with the SDG's in their own surroundings, while in the X building, they are more subject to 'regular' management of practical affairs. This is for example reflected in small - but for the students significant - issues, such as plastic coffee cups. The idea is to enhance the 'future proof' of the whole of Windesheim, starting with the X building. The panel was pleased to notice that this disadvantage is taken up by students and faculty and is used to disseminate WHC's work and viewpoint which is a good example of the way the community is functioning. The Hive, the dorms for first year students, is well appreciated by the students. It is a good 'landing ground' to get together as a group and start becoming a community.

*Conclusion:*

WHC is housed properly for a small-scale and intensive programme, there is enough space for all educational and extracurricular activities. Counselling can take place in the building, as well as all faculty activities. Students can use the facilities in a fitting way and can study as wished. The Hive, student dorms, is well appreciated and makes the formation of a community possible. The housing of WHC allows the execution of extracurricular activities, like the common room, in a way

that other students can also attend these meetings. Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.

#### **H. Level realised**

The content and the level of the final projects are in line with the level and the broadening of interests as set down in the intended learning outcomes. Graduates are admitted to prestigious postgraduate programmes and/or jobs. The success rates are substantially higher than those of other relevant programmes.

The final work of the student reflects different SDG's and, of course, different levels although all students are assessed on all LO's at honours level. The level of research is high, this is corroborated by the fact that most graduates who apply for a master programme do not have to do a premaster. The graduation projects from students show a variety in topics and content. WHC has a procedure to ensure that students do not try and change the world in one day (or in one project) but start with a project assignment that fits the individual student. This procedure of making the research projects manageable is done in several rounds in which student, stakeholder and WHC counsellor discuss the project. Still, the panel thinks that some of the projects are 'too big', which is then reflected in the assessments, and even sometimes by the students themselves in their reflection report or discussion paragraph. At the same time, the panel, an external examiner (lector), the member of the advisory board and the alumni and students themselves (looking at graduation work of fellow students) recognise the high quality of the final work. This is mainly due to the comprehensive approach, the quality of research and the consistent link to the SDG's in combination with the (mostly) international context.

After graduating, many students follow a master programme in different kinds of disciplines, mostly without having to do a premaster. Other students find jobs, the panel heard of positions as consultant in IT, business consultant at RABO bank, a children's rights organisation or they start their own business. If graduates compare themselves in their workplace with other HBO-bachelor graduates, they consider themselves to be more and especially broader equipped with skills that makes it possible for them to act: communication, research skills, presentation and writing skills, the self-learning of content and other aspects. They feel, in general, more competent and better equipped for their job and feel no hesitations to take initiative or act proactively. Most graduates are able to work with, or even introduce the SDG's at their workplace. Graduates feel that their training at WHC allows them to make an impact in their jobs and the panel concurs.

#### *Conclusion:*

The panel is positive about the graduation level, which meets the honours standards of WHC's LO's and considers the level to be overall above average for an HBO-bachelor programme. The first jobs of students are challenging and reflect the broad interest of students, as well as their possibility to be successful. Students get work at places where people, planet and prosperity are of importance or feel competent and able to introduce the SDG's at their workplace and with that reflect the greater aim of the programme. Many students successfully continue with a master programme, mostly without having to do a premaster. Also, the success rate of WHC is above average when looking at the nominal study time of 4,2 years. Therefore, the panel concludes on this criterium: **satisfactory**.



## Special feature Sustainable Higher Education

The panel **grants** the GPCM programme the special feature on Sustainable Higher Education. The three criteria defined by the NVAO are clearly and convincingly met according to the panel. Not only in the documentation provided by WHC this was apparent, also in all discussions during the site visit sustainability was referred to, both explicitly and implicitly.

### Criterion 1: Distinguishing nature

The feature to be assessed is distinctive for the programme in relation to relevant study programmes in Dutch higher education.

### Conclusion

The panel is **positive** about this first criterium. The programme clearly distinguishes itself from other programmes by paying attention to sustainability in its own recognisable way. Sustainability is at the core of the programme and is recognisable at all levels.

### Substantiation

Within Windesheim sustainability is part of the mission statement. GPCM took the initiative to further the ambition and started a Windesheim broad project 'Sustainable Higher Education Windesheim', focusing on sustainability and integrating the SDG's in all educational profiles. Both GPCM and other Windesheim programmes started working with the AISHE framework. In December 2017 a baseline AISHE audit took place and the report led to several short-term and long-term actions. From interviews during the site visit, it became clear to the panel that GPCM is not merely following Windesheim wide developments but is actually a driving and guiding factor in the developments in the field of sustainability. WHC leads an initiative in advancing education for sustainability in the rest of the university through a Windesheim broad project, funded by the University Board, introducing the SDGs and AISHE framework.

The mission statement of GPCM is to *Educate students to become highly competent professionals, who are active across public and private domains, have a reflective attitude, a global mindset, and promote intercultural diversity and sustainability.* The programme uses the People, Planet and Prosperity perspectives and the SDG-agenda as a common framework for sustainability. This enables graduates to (learn how to) co-create in an environmentally, economically and socially sustainable world. Educating for sustainability is at the core of the programme and this approach is internationally recognised, for instance through the INTREPID EU COST project. The programme will also develop a training in the Earth Charter to further develop the teaching for sustainability approach to the curriculum.

The core values of GPCM are intrinsically connected to the mission statement and educational vision. These values are taken into account in all aspects of the programme, from recruitment and admissions, to the design and content of the programme, and to graduation and alumni policy. Students choose the programme because of its focus on sustainability and make an active

contribution to bringing this to life while studying. The majority of the alumni continue in a master programme or job that has a focus on making a contribution to a more just and sustainable world.

The panel is of the opinion that WHC pays attention to sustainability in a distinctive way, based on its own vision. This vision is recognisable throughout the entire programme. WHC focuses on sustainability in a far-reaching and integrated, holistic manner in all parts of the programme. The panel is particularly impressed by the integral vision on sustainability that has been developed, the way in which this has been integrated into the LO's and is integrally reflected in the entire curriculum. According to the panel WHC is unique in this approach.

## **Criterion 2: Concretisation**

The consequences of the feature to be assessed for the quality of the programme have been operationalised on the basis of the relevant standards of the Assessment Framework for the Accreditation System for Higher Education in the Netherlands.

## **Conclusion**

The panel is **positive** about this criterion. Throughout the curriculum there is continuous and comprehensive attention to sustainability, and this is visible in the four standards of the NVAO Framework. For each standard the panel provides substantiation and examples of the operationalisation.

## **Substantiation**

### *Standard 1*

The educational principle of WHC is based on the principle that they educate FOR sustainability, implicating that sustainability is holistically integrated in the curriculum and forms an integral part of the LO's of the programme. To safeguard this, the programme formulated a global competence to apply professional competencies with a global perspective through a focus on social and global engagement, sustainability, diversity and change, awareness that choices affect the future. One of the intended learning outcomes (LO4) has this as an explicit focus. The panel finds sustainability in the broadest sense of the word clearly visible in the learning outcomes and profile of the programme.

### *Standard 2*

As mentioned before, the panel concludes that sustainability is at the core of the curriculum and is basically visible in all aspects of the teaching-learning-environment. The panel identified a number of examples that were particularly impressive and exemplify the attitude and approach of WHC towards sustainability. For example, the educational concept is aimed at fostering a reflective attitude, a global mindset and promote intercultural diversity and sustainability. One of the four pillars is 'Educating for sustainability'. This means that the programme enables students to develop the 'overview effect': a global consciousness of universal responsibility. Another way of putting Educating for sustainability in practice is SILC (Sustainable International Learning Community), which connects young people from different educational levels, backgrounds and countries around an SDG programme in a certain local community.

In each first- and second-year courses it is made clear (in the course manual) which SDGs are addressed. In each project students have to choose at least one SDG to work on, in year one and two projects are performed for regional clients. In *Managing Projects in a Globalized World*, these projects become more complex, and during the *Value Creators* semester students choose a challenge they are passionate about and that is connected to one or more SDGs. In the course *Sustainable Business*, students have to find a business solution for a real-life sustainability-related global problem and write a business plan for a social enterprise. In courses with a less straightforward link with sustainability, lecturers look for ways to integrate it as well. Staff has specific expertise and professional experience on different SDGs which is kept up to date through training, attending conferences, academic literature and participating in relevant workshops. Not only does WHC make the connection between courses and the SDG framework explicit, but also the link between the lecturers' expertise and the SDGs. One staff member is a certified Earth Charter teacher and will develop a training for staff in the principles of Earth Charter.

WHC works closely with external networks specialised in sustainability, e.g. MVO International, UN Networks and internally with Lectoraten (Circular Economy, Social Innovation, Healthy Regions). Sustainability is also part of the business operations and WHC actively works on ways in which it tries to reduce the ecological footprint. This is reflected in minor and major aspects, e.g. compensation of air miles, encouragement of using public transport within Europe, students delivering products and assignments digitally and ordering vegetarian and vegan food at community gatherings. The panel is of the opinion that the exemplary function of the WHC is of great importance to sustainability in all its facets. The programme does this consciously and extensively and that deserves a compliment.

### *Standard 3*

Sustainability is also a continuously recurring assessment criterion in assessments, because the theme is interwoven in all projects and a large part of the courses. Furthermore, there is a strong link between WHC's educational vision and the assessment. The approach asks for authentic, real-life assignments that challenge students to incorporate information available and to select, interpret and apply knowledge in order to solve complex problems. Integral assessment includes the assessment of sustainability criteria.

### *Standard 4*

In the final semester of the programme, students choose an internship organisation for their project. They have to make clear at the start of the internship project how it will contribute to one or more SDGs. A vast majority of graduates continues with a master's programme after successfully finalising WHC. Most master's programmes are connected to sustainability, e.g. a master's in Global Health, or in Development Studies. Jobs that are held by alumni are often in the area of sustainability, some can be typified as ambassadors and innovators. Some alumni work in areas less closely intertwined with sustainability, e.g. at a bank or as consultant in IT, but from the interview with alumni it became clear these alumni also are able to work with or introduce the SDGs at their workplace. In the region WHC is recognised as an important partner in sustainability projects and networks. Currently, WHC is setting up an SDG Lab focussing on Health Regions (People), Climate and Energy (Planet) and Sustainable Business (Prosperity). In this Lab students, researchers, regional and (inter)national networks will be connected around structural innovation programmes for sustainability.

### Criterion 3: Relevance

The feature to be assessed is essential for the nature of the programme.
--

#### Conclusion

The panel is **positive** about this third criterion. Sustainability is a precondition for the objectives and profile of the programme and clearly contributes to the training of competent project and change managers.

#### Substantiation

Sustainability is one of the principles of the programme. Students are selected, partly on the basis of their vision and passion with regard to developments in the field of sustainability. Sustainability comes naturally to all stakeholders; it is who they are and what they do. Currently, WHC is working on making things explicit.

The 'educating for sustainability' approach means that sustainability is holistically integrated into the curriculum. WHC uses the People, Planet and Prosperity perspective and the SDG agenda as a common framework to enable students and graduates to (learn how to) co-create an environmentally, economically and socially sustainable world.

# General conclusion of the study programme

## Assessments of the standards

The audit team comes to the following judgements with regard to the standards:

Standard	Assessment Bachelor
<i>Standard 1 Intended learning outcomes</i>	Meets the criteria
<i>Standard 2 Teaching-learning environment</i>	Meets the criteria
<i>Standard 3 Assessment</i>	Meets the criteria
<i>Standard 4 Achieved learning outcomes</i>	Meets the criteria
<b>Special feature Sustainable Higher Education</b>	
<i>Criterion 1: Distinguishing nature</i>	Positive
<i>Criterion 2: Concretisation</i>	Positive
<i>Criterion 3: Relevance</i>	Positive
<b>Special feature Small-scale and Intensive Education</b>	
<i>A: Intended Learning Outcomes</i>	Satisfactory
<i>B: Relationship between goals and content of the programme</i>	Satisfactory
<i>C: Structure and didactic concept</i>	Satisfactory
<i>D: Intake</i>	Satisfactory
<i>E: Quality of staff</i>	Satisfactory
<i>F: Number of staff</i>	Satisfactory
<i>G: Level realised</i>	Satisfactory

## Considerations and conclusion

Weighing of the judgements with regard to the four standards is based on the assessment rules of NVAO:

The basis of the programme is the strong community where especially students and teachers, but also alumni and the professional field, lay a good foundation for this wonderful programme. The panel was impressed by the way students and alumni presented themselves and described the role of the programme in their development. The positive and hopeful attitude of the students gives the panel hope for the future. The programme ensures that students learn to tackle and realise their ideals in a realistic way. This unique programme with an orientation on project management & change making as well as on SDG's and global challenges can profile itself better by interweaving these to dimensions without detracting from the value of either point, but rather focusing on the strength of combining the two. The panel is convinced that the requirements for both special features the programme applies for are convincingly met. Intensive and small-scale education is facilitated by the tight community and personal approach to the talents and interest of students. Attention to sustainability is incorporated throughout the entire programme, from the profile to the achieved learning outcomes. Not only in the documents, but especially in the panel meetings, it became clear how well sustainability is embedded in the programme. The small-scale and intensive education approach is clearly visible and starts with the selection of highly motivated students. Intensive classes, many extracurricular activities and a close community of students, teaching staff and alumni result in graduates with their own specialisation. 'Education for sustainability' is interconnected to the 'small scale and intensive' approach as well as the

honours competences in the programme. Together, this creates an environment in which students can be educated as highly skilled professionals who can demonstrate leadership for global change, and create impact with project and change management for sustainable development.

The panel assesses the quality of the bachelor's programme Global Project and Change Management of Windesheim University of Applied Science as **positive**.

# Recommendations

The audit panel has the following recommendations for the study programme:

## Standard 1

- The panel recommends developing a narrative that interlocks the SDGs and global challenges with project management and change making.

## Standard 2

- The panel suggests that the programme investigates in what way it can prepare students to deal with the 'wicked' problems of the future, both known and unknown, and how it can foster understanding and awareness of underlying power structures.

## Standard 3

- The panel asks attention for the assessment process of the bachelor's thesis and capstone, specifically on the way the sub-scores are obtained. The panel also recommends to pay (more) attention to the scope of the topics students address in their thesis. The panel noticed a number of projects where the scope was too large/broad.

## Standard 4

- The panel recommends the programme to work on more differentiation in the assessment of *working as a professional*. Another point of attention in the graduation programme is the scope of the research projects, which on occasion are too broad.





# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Programme for the site visit

Time	What	Who
8.00 – 9.00	Panel meeting	Panel
9.00 – 9.30	Pitches by the management	MT member division Business Media and Law Director WHC, external relations Director WHC, internal affairs
9.30 – 10.10	Meeting our alumni (standard 4)	Alumni
10.10 – 10.30	Short break	Panel
10.30 – 12.00	Meeting the students  Meeting the clients (standard 2 & 3)	Each panel member gets a student buddy Year 1 – one team from IPM with their client Year 2 – one team from PMC with their client / Managing Diversity exhibition Year 1 & 2 – PPD weeks exhibition Year 3 and 4 – one VC team , one MPGW team with client / Learning Journey Poster exhibition Extra-curricular committees / activities
12.00 – 13.15	Break, including lunch	Panel
13.15 – 13.55	BA level and assessment (standards 3 & 4)	Coordinator BA level, internship counsellor, secretary to the EB Lector, BA level examiner Internship counsellor, BA level examiner, VC and MPGW coach Chair EB External member EB, responsible for assessment Coordinator VC and VC coach, internship counsellor
13.55 – 14.10	Short break	Panel
14.10 – 14.50	Intended Learning Outcomes and the Curriculum (and the role of the CC, the DPC and the AB) (standards 1 & 2)	Lecturer in PM LL, member CC Lecturer in GC LL, coordinator VC, member CC 3 <sup>rd</sup> year student, chair DPC Member DPC, coordinator MPGW, lecturer in business skills LL Member Advisory Board
14.50 – 15.05	Short break	Panel
15.05 – 15.55	The Personal Learning Journey (admissions, career counselling, extra-curricular, personal / leadership development in the curriculum) (Standard 2)	Coordinator career development programme, career counsellor, 7 habits trainer Admissions and student affairs, 7 habits trainer Member of the Board of Admissions, VC and MPGW (leadership) coach Students
16.00 – 16.30	Panel meeting	Panel
16.30 – 17.00	Management	See above (start of the day)
17.00 – 18.00	Panel meeting	Panel
18.00 – 19.00	Feedback from the panel	Panel and all (including food and drinks)

## Appendix 2: Documents examined

In addition to the graduation products of a selection of fifteen graduates, the panel received the following documentation:

- Information on Theory of Change
- Information on the Green Hub
- WHC Strategy
- Honours BBA in GPCM
- Information on admissions
- Information on career development
- Course manuals of year 1 and 2
- Information on the courses:
  - Managing Projects in a Globalised World
  - Value Creators
  - Bachelor Level
- Education and Examination Regulations
- EB rules and EB annual reports
- Competence matrix
- Lecturer's profile
- Overview of staff and list of publications
- Institute assessment policy
- WHC assessment policy
- Graduation policy
- Marketing Plan and alumni research
- Overview alumni

### Appendix 3 – Curriculum of GPCM (2019/2020)

	Autumn			Spring		
1	Think! (1EC)	Introduction to Project Management (5EC)		Project Management for Success (5EC)		
		Introduction to Research (5EC)		Qualitative Research (5EC)		
		Writing Lab (5EC)		Rhetoric for Persuasive Communication (3EC)	Professional Presentation & Pitching (3EC)	
		Organisational Behaviour(5EC)		International Business(5EC)		
	Global Challenges (3EC)	7 Habits of Highly Effective Students (3EC)		Managerial Accounting (3EC)	Financial Analysis (3EC)	
	Autumn			Spring		
2	Project Management for Change (5EC)		Leadership & Change (5EC)			
	Quantitative Research (5EC)		Trends and Scenario Analysis (5EC)			
	Governance & Sustainable Development (3EC)	Global Challenges (3EC)	Environmental Economics (3EC)	Social Marketing (3EC)		
	Sustainable Business (5EC)		Diversity, Social Justice & Inclusion (5EC)			
	Economics (3EC)	Marketing (3EC)	Non Profit Management (3EC)	Emergent Futures (3EC)		
	Autumn			Spring		
3	Managing Projects in a Globalized World or Value Creator (30EC)			Managing Projects in a Globalized World or Value Creator or Electives (30EC)		
	Autumn			Spring		
4	Value Creator or Electives (30EC)			Bachelor level Internship and Capstone (30EC)		

(\* ) The courses have the following full names: Professional and Personal Development (PPD) 1 = Exploring your interests 1; PPD 2 = Exploring your interests 2; PPD 3 = Professional exploration and skills development; PPD 4 = Internship and beyond