NVAO □ NETHERLANDS

INITIAL ACCREDITATION
MASTER'S PROGRAMME
SCALING UP
Global School for Entrepreneurship

FULL REPORT
12 July 2021

Content

1   Peer Review

The Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) determines the quality of a new programme on the basis of a peer review. This initial accreditation procedure is required when an institution wishes to award a recognised degree after the successful completion of a study programme.

The procedure for new programmes differs slightly from the approach to existing programmes that have already been accredited. Initial accreditation is in fact an ex ante assessment of a programme. Once accredited the new programme becomes subject to the regular review process.

The quality of a new programme is assessed by means of peer review. A panel of independent peers reviews the plans during a site visit to the institution. A discussion amongst peer experts is the basis for the panel's final judgement and the advisory report. The agenda for the panel visit and the documents reviewed are available from the NVAO office, upon request.

The outcome of this peer review is based on the standards described and published in the extensive NVAO Assessment framework for the higher education accreditation system of the Netherlands (Stcrt. 2019, nr. 3198). Each standard is judged on a three-point scale: meets, does not meet or partially meets the standard. The panel will reach a conclusion about the quality of the programme, also on a three-point scale: positive, conditionally positive or negative.

This report contains the findings, analysis and judgements of the panel resulting from the peer review. It also details the commendations as well as recommendations for follow-up actions. A summary report with the main outcomes of the peer review is also available.

NVAO takes its accreditation decision on the basis of a full report. The NVAO decision can be positive, conditionally positive or negative. Following a positive NVAO decision with or without conditions the institution can proceed to offer the new programme.

Both the full and summary reports of each peer review are published on NVAO's website www.nvao.net. There you can also find more information on NVAO and peer reviews of new programmes.

Because of COVID-19 temporary measures apply for this peer review.

2   New Programme

2.1   General data

Institution   : Global School for Entrepreneurship
Programme   : Scaling up
Mode of study   : Full Time or Part Time
Grade   : Master of Science in Scaling up
Tracks   : Not applicable
Location   : Amsterdam
Study load   : 60 EC[1]
Field of study   : Business

2.2   Profile

The Master in Scaling up allows students to develop their own business venture while getting acquainted with relevant theory and practice-oriented knowledge about business development. The curriculum is designed for entrepreneurs in such a way that all modules are relevant to, and facilitate the scaling up of, the (social) business initiative of the student. The aim of the master is to turn a scalable start-up into a high growth, profitable company. The focus on the students' own business venture means that every student has to be active in a start-up that is ready to scale.

The curriculum consists of six modules of 7 EC each, an incubator (a tailor-made part of the programme aimed at developing a scale-up, 8 EC) and a master project (10 EC). Theory and practice are balanced, not only in the curriculum but also in the staff, which consists of learning coaches, field experts and subject experts. The programme is accessible for both full-time and part-time students; the full-time programme is mainly aimed at international students that wish to study a year abroad.

2.3   Panel

Peer experts
1. Jacqueline Cramer (*chair*): professor in sustainable innovation at Utrecht University, strategic advisor of the Utrecht Sustainability Institute;
2. Nies Rijnders (*panel member*): senior project manager at Avans;
3. Wouter Josso (*panel member*): Educational manager International Business at Fontys Hogescholen;
4. Hessel Prins (*student member*), student MBA at LOI, instructor professional education at De Haagse Hogeschool.

Assisting staff
– Erik van der Spek, secretary
– Jona Rovers, NVAO policy advisor and process coordinator

Site visit
Online visit, July 2nd, 2021

---

[1] European Credits

3   Outcome

The NVAO panel reaches the conclusion *conditionally positive* about the quality of the Master Scaling up offered by the Global School for Entrepreneurship. The programme complies with seven standards of the extensive NVAO framework and partially complies with three standards.

The panel is charmed by the main asset of the master's programme Scaling Up: the idea of scaling up a start-up while studying relevant business theory is very appealing. This central idea is developed further in the curriculum, which combines theory, research and real-life cases from the working field. Also in the composition of the staff the panel encountered a healthy balance of academic knowledge and professional experience. An interesting feature is the incubator, an individual part of the programme that is tailor-made to fit the needs of each students' business initiative.

On the other hand, the panel saw room for improvement in quite a few areas. For instance, the panel feels that the programme should clarify the research component and the role of methodology within the programme. The same goes for the learning outcomes: in the current set-up, it is not always clear how they can be assessed. Another recommendation concerns the international component of the programme: both the ambitions of the programme and the way the students are prepared for an international playing field need clarification.

A general point of improvement concerns the documentation. The panel established that a substantial number of plans and initiatives were present, but mainly were to be found in the heads of developers and staff. Therefore this report contains several recommendations to describe or elaborate parts of the curriculum, formal requirements and procedures. The panel also stresses the importance of sufficient and full student information on these topics.

In summary, the panel appreciates the focus of the programme, but at the same time feels that more effort is needed to finalize it. Since the final conclusion is 'conditionally positive', the panel posed a number of conditions (see the standards 2, 3 and 5 and the summary in 6.12). The panel, however, is convinced that both management and staff will be able to fulfill these conditions within the set timeframe.

Standard	Judgement
1 Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
2 Curriculum; orientation	partially meets the standard
3 Curriculum; content	partially meets the standard
4 Curriculum; learning environment	meets the standard
5 Intake	partially meets the standard
6 Staff	meets the standard
7 Facilities	meets the standard
8 Tutoring	meets the standard
9 Quality assurance	meets the standard
10 Student assessment	meets the standard
Conclusion	**conditionally positive**

4   Commendations

The programme is commended for the following features of good practice.

1. ***Promising didactic approach*** - The programme employs the CORE-concept (Competence Oriented Research and Education), which is based on the assumption that students construct their own understanding and knowledge through experience and reflection. This is done through working in small groups combined with highly personalized guidance (staff-student-ratio of 1:10).

2. ***Incubator project*** - The incubator, with its tailor-made setup, is one of the strong points of the programme. In addition, the incubator contributes to the feasibility of the programme, since it is linked to the students' own scale-up.

3. ***Balanced staff*** – The staff consists of professionals in three different roles: learning coaches, subject experts and field experts. Within the staff, there is a healthy balance of academic knowledge and professional experience. This balance is also reflected in the Board of Inspiration and the Academic Board.

4. ***Inspiring accommodation and facilities*** - The panel feels that the location (close to the center of Amsterdam) offers an added bonus to the students of the master programme. The location and the facilities are attractive to both international and domestic students.

5. ***Reliable assessments***: The programme has taken extensive measures to safeguard the validity and reliability of the assessments.

5   Recommendations

For further improvement to the programme, the panel recommends a number of follow-up actions.

1. ***Assessable learning outcomes*** - Re-evaluate the learning outcomes and make sure they are assessable. A further option would be to reduce the number of learning outcomes to simplify the constructive alignment of the programme.

2. ***Methodology and research line*** - Elaborate the learning goals concerning research and methodology and develop a dedicated research line.

3. ***International ambitions*** - The panel advises the programme to define the ambitions in the field of internationalization in a clear and transparent way and to show how these ambitions are incorporated into the modules.

4. ***Consistent intake procedure*** - Redesign the intake procedure so that it fits each of the intended target groups.

5. ***Professionalization of staff*** – Develop and implement a professionalisation policy for working with the CORE didactic model, BKE and SKE, and introduce a minimum requirement for the level of English of the staff (for instance Cambridge C1).

6. ***Students with special needs*** – Develop and implement a policy for students with special needs.

6   Assessment

6.1   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.

Judgement
Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The Global School for Entrepreneurship (GSFE), according to the information file, aims to offer a Master's programme in Scaling up for students who aspire to scale up their (social) business initiative. The programme is designed for four types of students and business initiators:

1. Tomorrow's entrepreneurs
2. Tomorrow's intrapreneurs
3. Tomorrow's family business successors
4. Tomorrow's social entrepreneurs

The programme is based on four overall learning outcomes with the labels (1) Grit, (2) Discovery, (3) Relevance and (4) Execution. For each of these labels a number (generally eight or nine) of learning outcomes have been formulated, plus a number of key words concerning knowledge, skills and attitude. The panel feels this approach is innovative and even refreshing. In a number of cases, however, it is difficult to see how these learning outcomes can be assessed. For instance, the first label (Grit) covers learning outcomes such as: (Tomorrow's entrepreneur) "can stay focused on his/her vision and goals, despite challenges", and "can define priorities in uncertain circumstances, with partial or ambiguous information". The panel advises the programme to re-evaluate these learning outcomes and make sure they are assessable. A further option would be to reduce the number of learning outcomes to simplify the constructive alignment of the programme.

The programme developers have shown the relationship between the learning outcomes and the Dublin Descriptors. According to the information file, the profile of the programme (and the four intended learning outcomes) also match the Professional Master Standard developed by the Vereniging Hogescholen. The four pillars of this standard (Mastery, Research competence, Interprofessional collaboration, Impact) match the four categories mentioned above, according to the programme developers. However, in the self-assessment it has not been made clear in what way this matching is achieved. During the discussions, the panel became convinced that the learning outcomes are sufficiently aligned with the Professional Master Standard. In the view of the panel this alignment guarantees that the students are educated at the proper level (EQF/NLQF level 7). Nevertheless, the panel advises to describe this alignment in a more transparent way.

The panel also spoke with the management about the way the master level is safeguarded. According to the programme, the difference with the bachelor level lies mainly in the way the students apply, analyse and evaluate content. In the bachelor, a research method is prescribed when they have to conduct research, whereas in the

master programme students must choose a relevant method themselves. The students should also reflect on what works and what doesn't. Furthermore the academic level of the course content and assignment is monitored by an Academic Board. The panel is confident that the programme is able to safeguard the master level, but finds that a transparent description of this level is lacking.

The panel also spoke with the programme representatives about the involvement of the professional field in the development of the programme. During these conversations, the panel learned that representatives of the professional field have discussed the aims of the programme, its profile and curriculum in a number of cases with the programme developers. The representatives the panel spoke with are enthusiastic about the programme and feel that their suggestions have been incorporated into the curriculum.

Finally, the panel discussed the views on internationalization with the staff and management. From this discussions, the panel learned that the programme wants its students to have an international orientation, since growth and scaling up implies a European or even global perspective. The programme wants to turn their students into global citizens and aims to bring in the relevant knowledge and skills to achieve that ambition. The panel agrees with these views on internationalization.

In summary, the panel established that the intended learning outcomes tie in sufficiently with the level of the programme and that the expectations of the professional field have been taken into account. The programme has shown that the learning outcomes tie in with the Dublin Descriptors. The main point of attention is to formulate the learning outcomes in a way that guarantees they are assessable.

6.2   Standard 2: Curriculum; orientation

The curriculum enables the students to master appropriate (professional or academic) research and professional skills.

Judgement
Partially meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The curriculum of the Master in Scaling up is designed to combine theory and practice. Most of the modules, according to the information file, have been co-created with experts from both the academic and professional field. The focus is on the development of professional skills; students have to apply their knowledge and skills in practical assignments, which form a substantial part of the curriculum. The field experts have a strong connection with the working field as well.

According to the staff, students are also trained in several research and methodological skills. One of the intended learning outcomes, *Discovery*, is largely dedicated to research. In the first module students have to do research on other scale-ups; in doing so, they get acquainted with various research methods and have to analyze both primary and secondary sources.

The panel has discussed the place of research and methodology with the staff. During this discussion, the panel learned that the views on methodology are largely derived

from the Entrepreneurship Competence Framework (EntreComp). According to the staff, an entrepreneur is constantly validating needs and opportunities; this implies a need for research and research skills. In the modules, students first have to explore a number of cases. The staff then offers chapters on methodology, shows how to set up online surveys and set up experiments in a new market. The approach is inductive, the students' own start-up forms the starting point. The focus is on action research methodology that aides the students in improving their enterprise.

The panel concludes that the research in the master programme is application oriented, which fits the orientation of the programme. Although the practical orientation is laudable, the scientific basis is less clear. The panel found that a well-defined research line is lacking. The panel therefore advises the staff to elaborate the learning goals concerning research and methodology and to develop a dedicated research line.

In summary, the panel concludes that the programme partly meets standard 2. Based on the interviews during the visitation the panel got the positive impression that the curriculum enables the students to master the appropriate professional skills and that the practical and theoretical parts of the programme are in balance. The panel feels that both the view on research and the translation of this view into methodology and content need clarification.

Condition
Since the panel concluded that the programme partially meets this standard, the following condition will be added:

Within six months, the programme should further elaborate its learning goals concerning research and methodology. Furthermore, the programme should deliver a plan to show how these learning goals are implemented into the various modules.

6.3   Standard 3: Curriculum; content

The contents of the curriculum enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Judgement
Partially meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The programme consists of six modules of 6 EC:
1. Glocal Scaling
2. Strategy Mapping
3. Deep Dive
4. Value Maximalization
5. Financing the Future
6. Leading the Future

The programme developers have defined four focus areas, which these modules cover: strategy (module 2), people (module 6), finance (module 5) and execution (module 4). For each module, learning goals have been developed. The connection, however, between the overall intended learning outcomes (Grit, Discovery, Relevance, Execution) and the more detailed learning goals of the modules has not been specified. Therefore the panel hasn't been able to determine how exactly the module learning

goals contribute to the overall learning outcomes. The panel advises the programme to develop a competence matrix to make sure there is constructive alignment between the general learning objectives, the modules and the assessment.

Apart from the six modules mentioned above, the students also partake in an incubator project (8 EC; see standard 4) and a Master project (10 EC). During the Master project, the students develop a scaling plan. This plan contains the strategy mapping, a root cause analysis, a Pitch deck to Investors, a Two-pager, an Information memorandum and an HR plan. Together with a reflection these documents are combined into a portfolio for assessment. Students have to defend their Scaling plan during a criterion-based interview. The panel concludes that the way the master project is set up fits the professional orientation of the master programme.

The panel gained the impression that, although the programme aims to educate tomorrow's entrepreneurs, the focus of the programme is somewhat traditional. The panel discussed the way the programme incorporates important current trends, such as sustainability and digitalization. The programme representatives acknowledge that trends are not included into the module guides, but they affirm that such trends are prominent in the cases covered. This includes issues such as sustainability, ethics and diversity. According to the staff, sustainable business models are essential for growth opportunities; also the use of data is essential. The panel agrees, but is also convinced that these trends should be included into the module descriptions. The same applies to the systemic context in which scale-ups often have to operate; this implies knowledge about how scale-ups can be successful in system innovations.

As mentioned above, the programme wants its students to have an international orientation. This orientation is visible in a number of courses. For instance in the course Strategic Mapping students have to think about defining their market and analysing their opportunities. In that perspective, differences in for instance culture and legislation are also discussed. The programme collaborates with We Grow[2], an Amsterdam based company offering scaling businesses as a service. We Grow also delivers the field expert in the second and third module. The panel advises the programme to define the ambitions in the field of internationalization in a clear and transparent way and to show how these ambitions are incorporated into the modules.

In summary, the panel concludes that the programme partly meets the demands of standard 3. Although the curriculum is relevant and interesting, the programme should make more clear how the curriculum contributes to the learning outcomes. The same goes for the way trends and internationalization are part of the curriculum. The panel is convinced that the staff agrees on the importance of these topics: the main point of attention is to let this importance be reflected in the description of the content.

Condition
Since the panel concluded that the programme partially meets this standard, the following condition will be added:

Within six months, the programme has to show the constructive alignment between the general learning outcomes, the modules and the assessment.

---

[2] For more information, see https://www.wegrow.company/

6.4 Standard 4: Curriculum; learning environment

The structure of the curriculum encourages study and enables students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Judgement
Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The programme has a number of features that stand out. An important feature is the didactic concept of CORE, which stands for Competence Oriented Research and Education. This is a constructivist approach that is based on the assumption that students construct their own understanding and knowledge through experience and reflection. The didactic key elements are student engagement, blended learning, flipped classroom and feed forward.

A second important feature is the choice for intensive five-week modules. According to the programme representatives, this structure enables in-depth study of a topic. Most modules combine daily lectures in the morning with assignments, project work and case studies in the afternoon.

The master is offered as both a full-time and a part-time programme. In the part-time programme the modules take ten weeks (instead of five) and the programme duration is two years. The programme targets students who already have (or participate in) a start-up and wish to scale this start-up alongside with the programme. During the site visit, the panel learned that the programme will first start with the part-time curriculum only, since its primary target group is the current group of in-house bachelor students studying Entrepreneurship & Innovation - who already have a start-up.

An important part of the programme is the incubator that forms the link between the module assignments and the students' own (social) business initiative. According to the staff, everything that is not covered in the modules but that a student needs, is covered in the incubator. Every student will need specific knowledge and skills to develop his or her enterprise; therefore the students set their own learning goals under supervision of the learning coaches. This also means that there is no fixed content for this part of the programme. The panel thinks that the incubator, with its tailor-made setup, is one of the strong points of the programme. In addition, both the incubator and the master project contribute to the feasibility of the programme, since both are linked to the students' own scale-up.

Internationalization, also mentioned in the previous chapter, entails an influx of international students and offers an option to do part of the curriculum abroad. The programme aims to attract a substantial group of international students; almost half of GSfE's bachelor students have an international background. GSfE has a partnership with Get in the Ring[3], which is active in over 100 countries. Through this network and that of the Student Hotel (see standard 7), students can also follow a part of their programme abroad. The programme's ambition is to scale the programme outside the Dutch borders, so that in ten years' time students can work from different cities. Again, the panel advises to clarify what options students have who want to make use of these possibilities.

---

[3] For more information, see https://getinthering.co/about-get-in-the-ring/

To facilitate international students, large parts of the curriculum are available online. The programme also has experience with online coaching. The panel wasn't able to get a firm grip on the balance between online and offline teaching, and on the requirements about contact moments in Amsterdam and studying *in situ*. The panel advises the programme to be transparent about which parts of the curriculum are time and location independent and which parts require physical attendance in Amsterdam.

The panel agrees with the choice of English as the language of instruction. In the companies and organizations targeted by the programme, English is usually the working language. Moreover, the choice fits in well with the intended student population, with a substantial number of international students.

In summary, the panel concludes that the programme meets the demands of standard 4. The panel agrees with the structure of the programme, which it finds student-centered, logical and feasible with a fair balance of theory and practice. Some effort is still needed to clarify the practicalities of internationalization and the scope of online education.

6.5 Standard 5: Student intake

The curriculum ties in with the qualifications of the incoming students.

Judgement
Partially meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
Students who want to participate in the Master of Scaling up should meet the following requirements:
- Hold a (any) bachelor degree;
- Are active in a start-up that is ready to scale (the start-up should be earning revenue or have received funding);
- Are proficient in English (level C1).

During the selection procedure an interview is held with the prospective students. Input for this interview is an introductory document to the business initiative that students have to supply. In this document, they need to describe the nature of the start-up, its aims and the financial situation at the moment of entry. There are no requirements at this stage about ethical issues or the sustainability of the start-up; the panel believes these issues can be relevant as well and should be taken into account.

The panel discussed a number of topics with the staff concerning the intake requirements. One of them is the way the requirements may have to be adjusted depending on the different target groups. For instance 'intrapreneurs' generally will not be leading their own start-up. The programme representatives stated that the programme hasn't defined specific requirements for intrapreneurs. Intrapreneurs have to substantiate their background and have to show they can work on their own project from an entrepreneurial perspective. The panel advises the programme to re-evaluate the intake procedure so that it fits all target groups. Also the required level of English should be described consistently, as the panel encountered different versions of this requirement in the provided information.

Students who wish to enroll in the master programme but are not yet active in a start-up, can participate in a pre-master program. This is a heavily condensed version of GSfE's bachelor programme in Entrepreneurship & Innovation. Students who are successful in creating a venture during this pre-master are accepted for the master programme. The panel approves of the idea of a pre-master that also allows the students to develop their own business ventures.

In summary, the panel concludes that the programme partially meets standard 5, student intake. Although an intake procedure is in place and an interview is being held with each student, the panel believes the current procedure doesn't entirely fit the target groups the programme representatives have in mind. Furthermore, the panel advises to take ethical issues and the sustainability of the business venture into account as well. Since the master programme is selective, the programme should be transparent on the requirements, for instance on governance, ethics and the nature of the business proposal.

Condition
Since the panel concluded that the programme partially meets this standard, the following condition will be added:

Within six months, the programme should re-evaluate and redesign the intake procedure so that it fits the defined target groups. In the intake procedure all requirements should be transparent, for instance on governance, ethics and the nature of the business proposal.

6.6   Standard 6: Staff

The staff team is qualified for the realisation of the curriculum in terms of content and educational expertise. The team size is sufficient.

Judgement
Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The staff consists of professionals, acting in three different roles: learning coaches, field experts and subject experts. A number of lecturers and learning coaches form the core team, the other staff members are free-lancers. In total, 1.8 fte for teaching staff will be provided for each group of 18 students. This makes for a staff-student-ratio of 1:10, which the panel finds to be commendable.

Student guidance is largely provided by the learning coaches, who will guide students in their development. They will help the students to apply the theoretical concepts to their assignments and activities. The field experts are active in the working field and bring in their practical experience; for didactic purposes, they work under supervision of the learning coaches. The subject experts are generally expert in a specific module; most subject experts are contracted as lecturers by other Universities of Applied Sciences as well.

The panel has met a number of the future lecturers and learning coaches and has no doubts about their expertise. According to the CV's the panel has seen, all relevant topics within the master programme are being covered. Moreover, the staff shows a

healthy balance of academic knowledge and professional experience. The number of lecturers that hold a PhD, however, is rather low for a master programme (less than half of the staff). The management acknowledges this, but is in the process of expanding its staff. The Academic Board has been expanded with a higher number of experts holding a PhD; they will be involved in the modules as well. The panel is happy with this development.

Since the staff consists of a relatively high number of freelancers, team-building may be an issue. The management indicated that team-building is facilitated by having the different lecturers (learning coaches, field experts and subject experts) develop the courses together, so there is a lot of exchange of different perspectives. Moreover, the panel learned that there is a lot of collaboration between the staff members that goes back a long time, so there is quite an extensive network already, with partners in the commercial field as well.

The panel has established that professionalization is still a point of attention. The learning coaches have been trained to work with the CORE didactic model, but this training has not been extended to other staff members. Very few staff members have acquired a BQE. Also, the panel has encountered no plans about monitoring and improving the level of English. The panel advises the programme to develop and implement a policy for the professional development of staff on these topics.

A final recommendation concerns the diversity within the team. Although the team has, as mentioned, a good balance of academic knowledge and practical experience, the diversity is less visible in other areas, such as age, gender and cultural background. The panel advises to pay attention to diversity when expanding the staff.

The panel concludes that the staff is qualified. The different perspectives of the three roles and auspicious staff-student-ratio allow for highly personalized guidance of students. Holding a PhD has the attention of management in expansion of staff. The panel advises management to develop and implement a staff policy that deals with training in the CORE model, BQE and English.

6.7 Standard 7: Facilities

The accommodation and material facilities are sufficient for the realisation of the curriculum.

Judgement
Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The Global School for Entrepreneurship is situated in 'The Collab' of its partner 'The Student Hotel' (TSH) in Amsterdam. TSH Collab, according to its website, is "a global community of ambitious creatives, entrepreneurs and start-ups". It is located at the Wibautstraat in the center of Amsterdam. In the current situation, GSfE has three classrooms and four offices at its disposal. In total, 91 work stations are available on these premises. The panel has seen a presentation about these facilities and feels they are adequate and sufficient for the teaching purposes of GSfE. Since the outbreak of corona, GSfE has made investments in online learning and has re-designed the classrooms to enhance social distance.

The collaboration between GSfE, The Collab and The Student Hotel also makes the programme accessible to international students. They can easily be accommodated at the hotel. The Student Hotel offers rooms for a maximum of 12 months, but students who wish to extend their stay can easily switch between the two locations of the hotel in Amsterdam.

The panel feels that the location offers an added bonus to the students of the master programme. The location and the facilities are attractive to both international and domestic students. The partnership with The Student Hotel allows for flexibility and gives the students access to additional facilities. The panel concludes that the programme meets the demands of standard 7.

6.8 Standard 8: Tutoring

The tutoring of and provision of information to students are conducive to study progress and tie in with the needs of students.

Judgement
Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
For tutoring, students have access to a number of learning coaches. The learning coaches are both lecturer and personal mentor. In the first place, they coach the students to apply their knowledge when working on projects and assignments. In the second place, they act as mentors, ensuring the students well-being and sense of belonging. In addition, GSfE offers student counselling if they have problems of a personal nature.

Information is provided online through Canvas. Students will have access to study materials, grades, schedules and module information. When starting, students will be invited to a number of onboarding workshops, for instance on the usage of Canvas. The panel has stressed the importance of clear and transparent information for students several times in this report, for instance information about the intake procedure or about studying abroad. Since the programme is due to start in September 2021, the panel advises to give priority to the quality and quantity of the student information.

A final issue concerns the facilities for students with special needs and learning disabilities. The panel advises the programme to develop a policy for students with special needs, also because the target group (entrepreneurs) may include students with a different set of skills and needs than those of a regular master student. Also the situation of international students, some of whom will be separated from their families for the first time, is a concern.

In summary, the panel concludes that the programme meets the demands of standard 8. The tutoring system is tailor-made and guarantees that students receive a substantial amount of personal coaching. A policy for students with special needs is lacking, but the panel is confident that GSfE, with its extensive tutoring system, will find a way to cope with this issue.

6.9 Standard 9: Quality assurance

The programme has an explicit and widely supported quality assurance system in place. It promotes the quality culture and has a focus on development.

Judgement
Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The panel established that there is a system for quality assurance in place. This system consists of two cycles, a short cycle and a long cycle. The short cycle includes student surveys at the end of each module and a programme evaluation at the end of the year. The results are discussed by the Education Board, which meets at least six times a year. In the long cycle, the Board of Inspiration and the Academic Board are invited to a bi-annually programme review, thereby safeguarding the input of the working field and the academic community. Their recommendations will be reviewed by the Exam Board.

The panel discussed the way the programme guarantees an independent representation of the students, since the Education Board is chaired by the Dean. During this discussion, the panel learned that the Education Board cannot be compared to the Dutch 'onderwijscommissie'; the tasks of the Education Board are mainly implementing changes in the curriculum. For purposes of representation, the programme has three independent committees for quality assurance: the Exam Board, the Student Improvement Board and the Academic Board. The panel is satisfied with this explanation.

The panel spoke with representatives of the Exam Board about their involvement with quality assurance. During this conversation, the panel gained the impression that the Exam Board has been involved quite intensively with the development with the master programme. The Exam Board has made a number of recommendations, with a focus on (but not limited to) the assessment procedures. The Exam Board also shares the opinion of the panel that some documentation could be more elaborate; however, improvements have been made in the last few months.

In summary, the panel trusts that once the programme is up and running, the different committees will ensure the operation of a quality assurance system. The existence of three different independent boards in combination with the two cycles lay a good foundation for a functioning quality assurance system. Therefore the programme meets the demands of standard 9.

6.10 Standard 10: Student assessment

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

Judgement
Meets the standard.

Findings, analysis and considerations
The student assessment is based on the Assessment Plan, that was put at the disposal of the panel. This plan contains an assessment cycle, that is leading in the development, execution and evaluation of assessments.

The students' progress is monitored with both formative evaluation and summative assessment. In formative evaluation the focus is on feedback, through coaching sessions, 360⁰-feedback and feedback on essays and presentations. The assessment methods are connected to the learning goals of the modules: the most common are essays and written reports. No more than two summative assessments are used in each module (of 7 to 10 EC). In cases where an assessments consists of a group deliverable, an individual component is always included, so students will always also be assessed on their individual contribution. The panel finds this set-up to be satisfactory.

All assessments are constructed using the four-eyes principle. Two learning coaches will develop an exam or assignment in consultation with the subject expert. They will also develop a grading rubric, thereby ensuring consistency. Furthermore, examinations and assignments will be subject to approval by the Exam Board. The panel concludes that the programme has taken extensive measures to safeguard the validity and reliability of the assessments. The panel does see consequences for the workload of this extensive quality assurance. The panel advises to monitor the workload and to make sure that the time invested is in balance with the intended results.

The panel had a meeting with the Exam Board and discussed its tasks and responsibilities. The Exam Board appoints the examiners and has to approve of the Assessment Plan. When the programme is running, the Board intends to perform regular quality assurance checks on examinations. The Board safeguards that the assessments conform to level 7 by way of the rubrics, which the panel has studied. The panel believes that these rubrics are sufficiently detailed and help the staff in assessing the students' products in a transparent way.

A point of attention, according to the panel, is the assessment of the incubator (8 EC). Since each incubator is an individual trajectory, the students develop their own key performance indicators (KPI's) and learning goals and assessments are based on these learning goals; this means each assignment will be tailor-made. The panel understands the necessity of this approach, but advises to monitor and compare the results to make sure the incubator assessments conform to level 7.

The panel approves of the assessment of the master project, in which the students develop a scaling plan. This plan contains the strategy mapping, a root cause analysis, a Pitch deck to Investors, a Two-pager, an Information memorandum and an HR plan. Together with a reflection these documents are combined into a portfolio for assessment. The panel has established that this form of assessment is closely connected to the working field and will help the students to develop and scale their business venture.

In summary, the panel concludes that the programme meets the demands of standard 10, student assessment. The assessment policy is in place and the panel finds that the Exam Board is well equipped to monitor that the policy will be implemented in a proper way. The intended quality assurance during the assessment development is commendable and the panel has encountered sufficient variety in the assessment forms.

6.11   Grade and field of study

The panel advises awarding the following grade to the new programme: Master of Science in Scaling up.

The panel supports the programme's preference for the following field of study: Business

6.12   Conditions

In this report, a number of conditions have been set. Below, these conditions have been put in a schedule for purposes of clarity:

Standard:	Time:	Condition:
2	6 months	*Within six months, the programme should further elaborate its learning goals concerning research and methodology. Furthermore, the programme should deliver a plan to show how these learning goals are implemented into the various modules.*
3	6 months	*Within six months, the programme has to show the constructive alignment between the general learning outcomes, the modules and the assessment.*
5	6 months	*Within six months, the programme should re-evaluate and redesign the intake procedure so that it fits the defined target groups. In the intake procedure all requirements should be transparent, for instance on governance, ethics and the nature of the business proposal.*

The full report was written at the request of NVAO and is the
outcome of the peer review of the new programme
Master Scaling up of Global School for Entrepreneurship.

Application no: AV-1029

NVAO