

Assessment report
Limited Framework Programme Assessment

Research Master Global Health

VU Amsterdam

Contents of the report

1. Executive summary	2
2. Assessment process	4
3. Programme administrative information.....	7
4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard	8
4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	8
4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	10
4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment.....	13
4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	15
5. Overview of assessments.....	16
6. Recommendations	17

1. Executive summary

In this executive summary, the panel presents the main considerations which led to the assessment of the quality of the Research Master Global Health programme of VU Amsterdam. The programme was assessed according to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, as published on 20 December 2016 (Staatscourant nr. 69458).

The programme organisation is adequate, solidly resting on a number of well-reputed research institutes.

The programme objectives are sound and relevant. The panel considers the programme to have a clear and focused profile, educating students to analyse complex health challenges, to articulate and evaluate intervention strategies and to be able to use and critically evaluate a wide range of research methods, including interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research approaches. The programme meets the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework for the Global Health domain. The programme is linked to debates in society about global health. The programme is distinct from international programmes in tropical medicine and epidemiology and distinguishes itself clearly from regular master programmes in this domain. The panel advises to look for institutes and programmes to collaborate with.

The programme objectives have been translated well into the programme's intended learning outcomes, these being comprehensive, having been well-articulated and conforming to the master level.

The panel appreciates the programme objectives to train students for PhD positions and positions in non-academic research in this domain.

The number of incoming students is adequate for this small-scale programme.

The panel is very positive about the curriculum. The courses exhibit strong and challenging contents. The curriculum is coherent, also across the two years. Students are educated in theoretical and methodological dimensions of the domain, in theory and practice and in a wide range of research methods. The panel strongly proposes to continue developing the transdisciplinary research methods and techniques. In addition, the panel suggests to reinforce the application of quantitative research methods and techniques in practice. The research project and the master thesis project are very valuable for the students' education. The panel appreciates students being prepared for the labour market.

The panel considers the lecturers in the programme as highly motivated and dedicated. The lecturers are experienced researchers, all of them having PhDs. The publications records of the lecturers are very good. The lecturers' educational capabilities are up to standard, as the proportions of BKO-certified and SKO-certified lecturers show. The panel noted the appreciation of the students for their lecturers. To strengthen the programme further, the panel would advise the Faculty to recruit more staff.

The research institutes taking part in the programme are well-reputed research entities, reporting strong scores in recent research evaluations. Therefore, the panel is confident the research components in the programme are appropriate for this research master programme.

The panel approves of the admission requirements and procedures of the programme, being very strict and selective.

The educational concept of the programme is a solid concept, suitable for the programme. As not all of the lecturers seem to fully grasp the concept, the panel suggests to train them in this respect. The study methods of the programme are well-adapted to the course contents. The number of hours of face-to-face education is adequate. The supervision in the internships is well-organized and the panel has noted that the on-site supervision is often quite intensive. The study guidance in the cursory part of the curriculum is appropriate. The student success rates after three years are favourable compared to other programmes.

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

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

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

The course examinations are very demanding. The research internship reports the panel studied very clearly meet the academic standards of this programme. In addition, the panel noted that a substantial number of reports have been turned into publications. The research efforts demanded of the students, especially in the master thesis projects, are quite challenging. Students, however, manage to obtain very high grades. A substantial proportion of the students achieves graduation with distinction. Given the high standards set for the students, the accomplishments are very good.

The panel applauds the programme for preparing students very well for the professional field. Graduates manage to find adequate positions as PhD students and as researchers in non-academic research institutes.

The panel that conducted the assessment of the Research Master Global Health programme of VU Amsterdam assesses this programme to meet the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, judging the programme to be good. Therefore, the panel recommends NVAO to accredit this programme.

Rotterdam, 19 October 2018

Prof. dr. W. Stark
(panel chair)

drs. W. Vercouteren
(panel secretary)

2. Assessment process

The evaluation agency Certiked VBI received the request by VU Amsterdam to support the limited framework programme assessment process for the Research Master Global Health programme of this University. The objective of the programme assessment process was to assess whether the programme would conform to the standards of the limited framework, as laid down in the NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands, published on 20 December 2016 (Staatscourant nr. 69458).

Management of the programmes in the assessment cluster Transdisciplinary Problem Solving in the Health and Life Sciences convened to discuss the assessment panel composition and to draft the list of candidates. Certiked invited candidate panel members to sit on the assessment panel. The panel members agreed to do so. The panel composition was as follows:

- Prof. dr. W. Stark, Professor in Organisational Psychology/Development and Community Psychology, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany (panel chair);
- Prof. dr. S. Parasuraman, Director and vice-Chancellor, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Mumbai, India (served to February, 2018) (panel member);
- Prof. dr. D.C. Henderson M.D., Professor and Chair of Psychiatry, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, United States of America (panel member);
- Prof. dr. M.B.H. Everaert, Professor of Linguistics, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics, Utrecht University (panel member);
- Dr. M.C.P.J. Knippels, Assistant Professor in Biology Education, Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University (panel member);
- C.J. Stam MSc, student Master Sustainable Development (graduated in 2018), Utrecht University (student member).

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

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

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

Well in advance of the site visit date, programme management sent the list of final projects of graduates of the programme of the last two complete years. Acting on behalf of the assessment panel, the process coordinator selected 15 final projects from this list. The grade distribution in the selection was ensured to conform to the grade distribution in the list, sent by programme management.

The panel chair and the panel members were sent the self-assessment report of the programme, including appendices. In the self-assessment report, the student chapter was included. In addition, the expert panel members were forwarded a number of final projects of the programme graduates, these final projects being part of the selection made by the process coordinator.

A number of weeks before the site visit date, the assessment panel chair and the process coordinator met to discuss the self-assessment report provided by programme management, the procedures regarding the assessment process and the site visit schedule. In this meeting, the profile of panel chairs of NVAO was discussed as well. The panel chair was informed about the competencies, listed in the profile. Documents pertaining to a number of these competencies were presented to the panel chair. The meeting between the panel chair and the process coordinator served as the briefing for panel chairs, as meant in the NVAO profile of panel chairs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Programme administrative information

Name programme in CROHO: M Global Health (Research)
Orientation, level programme: Academic Research Master
Grade: MSc
Number of credits: 120 EC
Specialisations: None
Location: Amsterdam
Mode of study: Full-time (language of instruction: English)
Registration in CROHO: 21PL-66903

Name of institution: VU Amsterdam
Status of institution: Government-funded University
Institution's quality assurance: Approved

4. Findings, considerations and assessments per standard

4.1 Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

The Research Master Global Health programme is one of six master programmes of the Graduate School Health and Life Sciences of the Faculty of Science of VU Amsterdam. The Vice-Dean of Education and the educational director of the Faculty have the responsibility for the quality of the programmes of the Faculty. The programme director is responsible for the quality, contents and implementation of the programme on a day-to-day basis. She is assisted by the programme coordinator. The Programme Committee, being composed of lecturers and students, advises programme management on the quality of the programme. The Faculty Examination Board has the authority to ensure the quality of the examinations and assessments of this programme and the other programmes of the Faculty. On behalf of the Board, the Examination Subcommittee in effect monitors the examination and assessment processes of the programme. The programme is coordinated by the Athena Institute of VU Amsterdam and is offered in collaboration with the Amsterdam Institute for Global Health and Development, the Department of Global Health of Amsterdam University Medical Centre and the Centre for Social Science and Global Health of University of Amsterdam.

The Research Master Global Health of VU Amsterdam is a two-year (120 EC), research-based master programme in the Global Health domain. This domain is a broad field of research and practice geared towards improving health and achieving equity in health.

The programme objectives are to educate students to analyse complex national and international health challenges and to articulate, implement and evaluate integral intervention strategies to contribute to solve these challenges. The programme aims to introduce students to systems thinking to address these subjects. The objectives are also to educate students in a wide range of quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods research methods, in interdisciplinary research approaches, integrating disciplinary perspectives, in transdisciplinary research approaches, involving social actors and stakeholders in the research process and in the critical assessment of research designs. Compared to other programmes in the global health domain in the Netherlands and abroad, the VU Amsterdam programme distinguishes itself by the wide range of research methods and techniques offered, by the emphasis on transdisciplinary research and by including two substantial research internships.

The programme's main goal is to prepare students for PhD positions or for other positions in research in this domain.

The programme objectives have been translated into the programme intended learning outcomes. These specify knowledge of relevant theoretical frameworks from social sciences, behavioural sciences and (bio-)medical sciences regarding the programme domain, knowledge of and insights in scientific research in this domain, including transdisciplinary research, knowledge, understanding and skills to assess strategies and interventions in this domain, academic skills, such as critical thinking and communication skills and ethical awareness.

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

Considerations

The panel regards the organisation of the programme to be fully appropriate. The panel noted the programme to rest on a number of well-reputed research institutes at VU Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam and Amsterdam University Medical Centre.

The programme objectives are sound and relevant. The panel observed the programme to have a clear and focused profile, educating students to analyse complex health challenges, to articulate and evaluate intervention strategies in this respect and to be able to use and critically apply a wide range of research methods and techniques, including interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary research approaches. The programme meets the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework for the Global Health domain. The programme is linked to debates in society about global health.

The programme is clearly distinct from international programmes in tropical medicine and epidemiology. The programme can also be clearly distinguished from regular master programmes in this domain in the Netherlands and abroad. The panel recommends to identify institutes and programmes in the programme's domain to work together with.

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

The panel appreciates the programme objectives to train students for PhD positions and positions in non-academic research in this domain.

Assessment of this standard

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

4.2 Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings

The number of students entering the programme increased gradually throughout the years, going from 14 students in 2012 to 28 students in 2017. The average number of students entering the programme, is about 19 students per year. The proportion of Dutch incoming students is about 50 %. The other students come from European countries (about 30 %) or from non-European countries (about 20 %). Programme management has set the target for the influx of students at about 25 to 30 students and is content with the current numbers of incoming students.

Programme management presented a table to show the alignment of the intended learning outcomes and the curriculum. The curriculum takes two years and has a study load of 120 EC (EC is 28 hours of study). In the first year, students take four compulsory courses (24 EC), one optional course (6 EC) and the research project, being the first research internship (30 EC). In the second year, six compulsory courses (30 EC) are scheduled as well as the master thesis, being the second research internship (30 EC). The courses in the first year address qualitative and quantitative research methods, global health problems and interventions in relation to government policy, the broader context of health systems, as well as comparative analysis of health systems. In the second year, students take courses on advanced quantitative research methods and transdisciplinary research approaches, are introduced to ethical dilemmas and are trained in scientific writing and writing research grant proposals. In addition, students write a literature review. In the first internship, students are encouraged to adopt mixed methods in their research. In the second internship, students are strongly advised to include transdisciplinary research methods. Programme management indicated not experiencing any difficulties in finding suitable internship placements. Internship placements are mainly in research institutes, but may also be in research departments of companies. One of the internships should preferably be abroad. On average, about 60 % of the internships are done abroad. In addition to the methodology courses, statistics classes are scheduled in the first part of the internships. Also, a learning trajectory on transdisciplinary research has been designed as part of the methodology courses. Students are offered personal development and career activities across the curriculum to prepare them for the labour market.

A total number of about 19 lecturers are involved in the programme. All of the lecturers have PhDs and are active researchers in the fields which they teach in the programme. An additional 16 staff members with PhDs are engaged in supervision of internships. About 84 % of the lecturers obtained the BKO-certificate, whereas over 20 % of them acquired the SKO-certificate. Course coordinators meet regularly with the programme director. Lecturers meet approximately four times per year to discuss the programme. Students appreciate the lecturers, as is evident from the students' survey results. The teaching workload of the lecturers is quite demanding.

Lecturers and internship supervisors are nearly all researchers at the research institutes which take part in the programme. The Athena Institute of VU Amsterdam obtained SEP scores *very good* for the viability and research quality criteria and *excellent* for relevance to society criterion in the 2018 research evaluation. The research of the Department of Global Health of Amsterdam University Medical Centre was assessed in 2017 to be qualitatively and quantitatively very substantial, the societal impact of the research to be high and the institute to be internationally competitive. The SEP results of the University of Amsterdam Centre for Social Science and Global Health in the most recent research evaluation were *excellent* for the quality and viability criteria and *very good* for the productivity and relevance criteria.

Candidate students are admitted to the programme, if they have completed bachelor programmes in basic Global Health disciplines with at least 6 EC in epidemiology subjects. Students come from a range of backgrounds, with health sciences and public health (40 % of influx), biology and biomedical sciences (19 %) and social sciences and psychology (15 %) dominating. Applicants are to report a 7.5 grade point average for courses and 8.0 for their bachelor thesis (Dutch grading system). In addition, candidates have to be proficient in English, have to submit reference letters and a motivation letter. Applicants need to pass an online examination and are interviewed by programme management. Candidates with deficiencies in epidemiology or global health may remedy their deficiencies by taking online courses. About 15 % of the candidates are not admitted.

The educational concept of the programme aims at fostering knowledge, skills and attitudes of students. A typical course is composed of a theoretical part, encompassing lectures and work groups and a practical part, consisting of groups projects, for the greater part addressing real-life problems. The number of hours of face-to-face education are on average about 13 hours per week in the cursory parts of the curriculum. For the practical part, the programme has adopted inquiry-based learning. Students are gradually guided by lecturers towards types of open inquiry, educating students to address open-ended problems. Study methods for the practical part include community service learning, combining academic learning and practical work experiences. New, ICT-based study methods are adopted. In the classroom, student groups are mixed to promote diversity. In each of the internships, students are entitled to 20 hours of supervision by the VU supervisor. The daily supervision is in the hands of the on-site supervisor. For information or guidance, students may turn to the internship coordinator, programme coordinator or programme director. The student success rates for the programme are about 39 % after two years and about 86 % after three years (average figures for the last four cohorts). The drop-out rates are limited. In the student chapter and in the meeting with the panel, students expressed experiencing the curriculum to be very challenging. When students take courses in regular master programmes, these students must do extra assignments to pass these courses.

Considerations

The number of incoming students is adequate for this small-scale programme.

The panel is very positive about the curriculum. The curriculum meets the intended learning outcomes of the programme and is coherent, also across the two years of the curriculum. The courses are very well-designed and exhibit strong and challenging contents. The curriculum allows students to master both the theoretical and methodological dimensions of the Global Health domain. Students are also educated in both theory and practice of the programme domain. Students are trained in qualitative and quantitative, mixed methods and transdisciplinary research methods, being allowed to proceed from disciplinary to interdisciplinary to transdisciplinary research. The panel strongly proposes to continue developing the transdisciplinary research methods and techniques. In addition, the panel suggests to reinforce the application of quantitative research methods and techniques in practice. The research project and the master thesis project are considered by the panel to be very valuable for the students' education. The panel appreciates students being prepared for the labour market.

The lecturers in the programme are very motivated and dedicated. The lecturers are experienced researchers, all of them having PhDs. The publications records of the lecturers are very good. The lecturers' educational capabilities are up to standard, as the proportions of BKO-certified and SKO-certified lecturers show. The panel noted the appreciation of the students for their lecturers. To strengthen the programme further, the panel would advise the Faculty to recruit more staff.

The research institutes taking part in the programme are well-reputed research entities, reporting strong scores in recent research evaluations. Therefore, the panel is confident the research components in the programme are appropriate for this research master programme.

The panel approves of the admission requirements of the programme and the admission procedures, being very strict and selective.

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

Assessment of this standard

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

4.3 Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

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

In nearly all courses, multiple examination methods have been adopted. Examination methods include written examinations, oral examinations, group assignments and presentations. The methods are selected in line with the course goals to be assessed.

Students must do a research project and a master thesis project, both being research internships. Students are informed about suitable internship placements. The programme has an extensive network of Dutch and foreign research institutes for placements. Internships are governed by the internship guidelines which specify the steps to be taken and the procedures to adhere to. In the first six weeks, small groups of students draft their internship research proposal. The internship proposal must be approved by the supervisor, before students may start the internships. Students are entitled to supervision by the VU supervisor and, at the internship site, by the on-site supervisor. The on-site supervisor should be a senior scientist. The VU supervisor and the second assessor, who has not been involved in the internship process, grade the internship report. The VU supervisor also grades the research done and the final presentation. The master thesis should be presented in the form of an article. The on-site supervisor is not an examiner, but may give advice. For the assessment of internships, rubrics scoring forms are adopted, specifying the criteria to be assessed and assisting VU examiners in the grading process.

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

Considerations

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

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

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

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

Assessment of this standard

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

4.4 Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

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

In addition, the panel reviewed the reports of fifteen master thesis projects of programme graduates of the last two years. The average grade for the research project was 7.8 and for the master thesis project it was 7.9. About 25 % of the students graduate with distinction (cum laude). Quite a number of students have their articles published in international peer-reviewed scientific journals.

Graduates of the programme find suitable positions very shortly after having completed the programme or before graduating. About 32 % of the graduates find PhD positions and another 40 % are researchers other than PhDs. More than 40 % of the graduates is employed at universities or research institutes. The other graduates have found employment in the private sector, at NGOs and in the government sector. Alumni indicated to be generally content to very content with the programme as the preparation for their current position.

Considerations

The course examinations, which the panel reviewed were found to be very demanding.

The research internship reports the panel studied fully meet the academic standards of this programme. In addition, the panel noted that a substantial number of reports have been turned into publications. The research efforts demanded of the students, especially in the master thesis projects, are quite challenging. Students, however, manage to obtain very high grades. A substantial proportion of the students achieves graduation with distinction. Given the high standards set, the accomplishments of the students are very good.

The panel applauds the programme for preparing students very well for the professional field. Graduates managed to find very appropriate positions as PhD students and as researchers in non-academic research institutes.

Assessment of this standard

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

5. Overview of assessments

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

6. Recommendations

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

- To look for institutes and programmes to work together with in the programme domain.
- To proceed developing the transdisciplinary research methods and techniques.
- To reinforce the application of quantitative research methods and techniques in practice.
- To increase the number of staff members in the programme.
- To train all lecturers in the educational concept of inquiry-based learning.
- To draft a separate rubrics scoring form for the master thesis project
- To add more extensive written comments to the internship scoring forms.
- To standardise fraud and plagiarism checks for all written assignments.