



**BSc Political Science
University of Amsterdam**

© 2023 Academion

www.academion.nl
info@academion.nl

Project code P2206

Contents

- Summary 4
 - Score table 6
- Introduction..... 7
 - Procedure..... 7
 - Panel 8
 - Information on the programme 8
- Description of the assessment..... 10
 - Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes 10
 - Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment..... 11
 - Standard 3. Student assessment 17
 - Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes 20
 - General conclusion 21
 - Development points 21
- Appendix 1. Intended learning outcomes 22
- Appendix 2. Programme curriculum..... 24
- Appendix 3. Programme of the site visit..... 25
- Appendix 4. Materials 26

Summary

Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes

The bachelor's programme Politicologie (henceforth: Political Science, or BPol) offered at the University of Amsterdam has as its mission to train political scientists that can analyse and help to improve democratic government through solid foundational knowledge of political science and relevant concepts from sister disciplines history, law, philosophy, and economics. This foundational knowledge is complemented with more in-depth knowledge in a specific subfield: International Relations, Comparative Politics, Public Policy and Governance, or Political Theory. The programme challenges its students to critically engage with the subject matter and equips them with the necessary tools to understand, evaluate, and participate in academic and societal debates. The panel appreciates the programme's broad, internationally oriented profile and the four thematic priority areas which students can choose from for specializing. It also appreciates the translation of this profile into a set of clear, extensive and detailed intended learning outcomes that match Dublin descriptors for bachelor's programmes and the national domain-specific framework of reference.

Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment

The panel appreciates the well-designed structure of the BPol's curriculum, whose two phases (foundational and specialization) provide clarity as well as flexibility. Four learning pathways ensure coherence beyond individual courses, allowing students to build up knowledge and skills throughout the programme. Academic and professional skills are well-represented, and students are versed in quantitative as well as qualitative methods. The panel is also positive about the elective seminar at the start of the third year, which it considers well-timed. The possibilities of a stay abroad or an internship, which can be 6, 12, or 18 EC, are attractive options for students.

After the introduction of the English-language track in 2017, student numbers showed an unexpectedly sharp increase. The programme decided to adapt its teaching methods accordingly, offering extensive group lecture courses taught by senior staff flanked by intensive tutorial courses taught by junior lecturers in the foundational phase of the programme. The panel applauds the way in which the programme has adapted to accommodate increased student numbers and the system of alignment and constant coordination and communication that has been put in place to safeguard coherence. The panel finds that this works well on the whole, but recommends formulating a policy on the type and amount of feedback provided to students at various moments throughout the BSc to ensure that this is provided equally to all students. Also, in view of the university's aim of research-based teaching and in line with plans to reduce student intake per 2023-2024, the panel would consider it a positive development if students could be made to engage more with senior staff members in the first phase of the programme.

The panel considers the programme to be feasible, thanks to recent measures that increase flexibility and reduce the number of large final exams in courses. The programme increased the student support infrastructure and expanded the mentorship programme. The thesis trajectory was adapted and is now organized like a course, which allows students to work in a group setting on their proposal and has clear and universal deadlines.

According to the panel, the international research orientation of the BPol matches the choice of English as one of the languages of instruction. The influx of international students contributes to an activating 'global classroom' and diverse perspectives on the subject matter at hand. The panel is pleased with the way in which the bilingual track slowly builds up the use of English while allowing students to make their tests in

Dutch. It supports the (planned) *numerus fixus* for the English track, which it considers important for retaining the balance between the international and Dutch(-language) student groups in the BPol.

The panel finds that staff quality is clearly sufficient for the BPol. The tenured and tenure track staff members have good or excellent track records in research paired with didactic skills. Junior staff members are trained as a group and receive intensive supervision. Students appreciate both the permanent staff and the approachable junior staff members, and consider their teachers to be expert at what they teach. The panel understands that staff quantity has been a serious point of attention over the past period. It feels that the issue was prioritized and addressed proactively by the department. Thanks to the well-designed coordination structure that was implemented, the panel concludes that the programme is in control of the situation, although staff still experience high work pressure. It points out that staff workload should remain on the agenda even after student influx is reduced through the *numerus fixus*.

Standard 3. Student assessment

The panel appreciates assessment policies and practice in the BPol. It learnt during the site visit that assessment was adapted to accommodate the increase in student numbers. The programme now opts for more (small) multiple-choice exams in the first year, which are usually combined with other assessment types. The panel agrees with this choice and is positive about the careful and considerate way in which the change was made. It is impressed with the work done by the EB to check and improve quality of assessment in the programme. It considers the EB to be proactive and valuable to the programme and appreciates the crucial role of the EB during the student number increase and the Covid-19 pandemic in guaranteeing assessment quality.

The panel is pleased with the way thesis assessment is done in the programme. The method of having the thesis supervisor choose the second reader works out, but the panel suggests investigating whether it would be a viable option to have the thesis coordinator appoint second readers in order to increase transparency and allow supervisors from different substantive specializations to be introduced to each other's grading habits and strategies, and learn from one another. The panel looked at thesis forms and found that they provided sufficient information to underpin the final grade. However, some contained clearly more detailed feedback than others. The panel recommends clarifying expectations surrounding the thesis form to staff members so that these differences are reduced. The panel learnt that the EB has introduced thesis calibration sessions for staff members in master's programmes, and that the BPol has recently been experimenting with this in 'grading clinics'. The panel advises to systematically introduce this good practice in the BPol as well.

Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

Based on the good quality of the final theses and the success of alumni enrolling in (usually) political and social sciences master's programmes, the panel conclude that graduates from the BPol achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Score table

The panel assesses the programme as follows:

BSc Politicologie

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	meets the standard
Standard 3: Student assessment	meets the standard
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	meets the standard

General conclusion positive

Prof. dr. Petra Meier

Dr. Fiona Schouten

Date: 30 June 2023

Introduction

Procedure

Assessment

On 4 and 5 April 2023, the BSc and MSc Political Science and the MSc Conflict Resolution and Governance of the University of Amsterdam were assessed by an independent peer review panel as part of the cluster assessment Political Science. The assessment cluster consisted of 9 programmes, offered by Radboud University, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam and Leiden University. The assessment followed the procedure and standards of the NVAO Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands (September 2018).

Quality assurance agency Academion coordinated the assessment upon request of the cluster Political Science. Fiona Schouten acted both as coordinator and secretary in the cluster assessment. She has been certified and registered by the NVAO.

Preparation

Academion composed the peer review panel in cooperation with the institutions and taking into account the expertise and independence of the members as well as consistency within the cluster. On 25 November 2022, the NVAO approved the composition of the panel. The coordinator instructed the panel chair on her role in the site visit according to the Panel chair profile (NVAO 2016).

The programmes composed a site visit schedule in consultation with the coordinator (see appendix 3) and selected representative partners for the various interviews. They also determined that the development dialogue would be made part of the site visit. A separate development report was made based on this dialogue.

The programmes provided the coordinator with a list of graduates over the period September 2020-August 2022. In consultation with the coordinator, the panel chair selected 15 theses per programme. She took the diversity of final grades and examiners into account, as well as the various tracks. Prior to the site visit, the programmes provided the panel with the theses and the accompanying assessment forms. They also provided the panel with the self-evaluation reports and additional materials (see appendix 4).

The panel members studied the information and sent their findings to the secretary. The secretary collected the panel's questions and remarks in a document and shared this with the panel members. In a preliminary meeting, the panel discussed the initial findings on the self-evaluation reports and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit. The panel was also informed on the assessment framework, the working method and the planning of the site visits and reports.

Site visit

During the site visit, the panel interviewed various programme representatives (see appendix 3). For personal reasons, one of the panel members, Sofie Marien, was unable to be present at the site visit. She provided her findings and input to the other panel members prior to the visit. The panel offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. One student requested a consultation. The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the preliminary findings.

Report

The secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to a colleague in Academion for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel for feedback. After processing this feedback, the secretary sent the draft report to the programmes in order to have it checked for factual irregularities. The secretary discussed the ensuing comments with the panel chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The panel then finalised the report, and the coordinator sent it to the University of Amsterdam.

Panel

The following panel members were involved in the cluster assessment:

- Prof. dr. Petra Meier, Professor in Politics at the University of Antwerp, Belgium (chair);
- Dr. Chris van der Borgh, Assistant Professor at the Centre for Conflict Studies Utrecht University;
- Prof. dr. Stefan Rummens, Professor in Philosophy at KU Leuven, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Marijke Breuning, Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas, USA;
- Prof. dr. Peter Bursens, Professor in Political Science at the University of Antwerp, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Maarten Vink, Professor in Citizenship Studies and chair of the Global Citizenship research programme of the Robert Schuman Centre at the European University Institute, Italy;
- Prof. dr. Sofie Marien, Associate Professor in Comparative and Historical Political Science at the University of Leuven, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Amy Verdun, Professor of Political Science at the University of Victoria, Canada;
- Dr. Laura Horn, Associate Professor in Political Economy at Roskilde University, Denmark;
- Fee A'mema MSc, Political Science graduate at Leiden University (student member);
- Elsbeth de Vries, MSc student in Political Theory at Radboud University (student member);
- Mark Dzoljic BSc, MSc student in Political Science at the University of Amsterdam (student member).

The panel assessing the Political Science programmes at the University of Amsterdam consisted of the following members:

- Prof. dr. Petra Meier, Professor in Politics at the University of Antwerp, Belgium (chair);
- Dr. Chris van der Borgh, Assistant Professor at the Centre for Conflict Studies Utrecht University;
- Prof. dr. Maarten Vink, Professor in Citizenship Studies and chair of the Global Citizenship research programme of the Robert Schuman Centre at the European University Institute, Italy;
- Prof. dr. Sofie Marien, Associate Professor in Comparative and Historical Political Science at the University of Leuven, Belgium;
- Fee A'mema MSc, Political Science graduate at Leiden University (student member).

Information on the programme

Name of the institution:	University of Amsterdam
Status of the institution:	Publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	Positive

Programme name:	Politologie
CROHO number:	56606

Level:	Bachelor
Orientation:	Academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	Dutch/English (bilingual) track English track
Location:	Amsterdam
Educational minor:	Not applicable
Mode(s) of study:	Fulltime
Language of instruction:	Dutch, English
Submission date NVAO:	1 November 2023

Description of the assessment

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 bachelor's programme Politicologie (henceforth: Political Science, or BPol) offered at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) trains academic professionals who can make a positive contribution to society by studying and improving democratic governance. The programme considers political science in the broadest possible sense as the academic discipline of power relations. Its mission is to train political scientists that can analyse and help to improve democratic government through solid foundational knowledge of political science and relevant concepts from sister disciplines history, law, philosophy, and economics.

This foundational knowledge is complemented with more in-depth knowledge in a specific subfield, allowing graduates to critically consider societal problems in all of their facets, and to do so with a perspective that transcends the national, Euro-centric level. The programme has a clear international orientation and offers a bilingual Dutch-English, and a fully English track. The BPol allows students to specialise in one of four subfields: International Relations, Comparative Politics, Public Policy and Governance, and Political Theory. The programme challenges its students to critically engage with the subject matter. It aims to equip students with the necessary tools to understand, evaluate, and participate in academic and societal debates.

The programme translated its aims into a set of 6 intended learning outcomes (see appendix 1) that reflect both the Dublin descriptors for bachelor's programmes and the Domain-Specific Reference Framework (DSRF) created by the Dutch Political Science programmes.

The panel appreciates the programme's broad and internationally oriented profile and the four thematic priority areas which students can choose from for specializing. It also appreciates the translation of this profile into a set of clear, extensive and detailed intended learning outcomes that match the expectations of the academic and professional fields linked to the programme as outlined in the Domain-Specific Framework of Reference. The panel concludes that the BPol's aims and exit qualifications solidly reflect what may be expected in an academic bachelor's programme in political science.

Considerations

The bachelor's programme Political Science (BPol) offered at the University of Amsterdam has as its mission to train political scientists that can analyse and help to improve democratic government through solid foundational knowledge of political science and relevant concepts from sister disciplines history, law, philosophy, and economics. This foundational knowledge is complemented with more in-depth knowledge in a specific subfield: International Relations, Comparative Politics, Public Policy and Governance, or Political Theory. The programme challenges its students to critically engage with the subject matter and equips them with the necessary tools to understand, evaluate, and participate in academic and societal debates. The panel appreciates the programme's broad, internationally oriented profile and the four thematic priority areas which students can choose from for specializing. It also appreciates the translation of this profile into a set of clear, extensive and detailed intended learning outcomes that match Dublin descriptors for bachelor's programmes and the national domain-specific framework of reference.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 1.

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

Curriculum

The BSc Political Science (BPol) offered at the UvA is a three-year programme of 180 EC. Each year consists of two semesters organized in three periods of 8, 8 and 4 weeks. The programme is divided into two phases, each spanning three semesters. In the first phase, students are provided with a broad foundation in political science and with a set of academic and methodological skills. All courses in this phase are mandatory. The second phase is the specialization and differentiation phase, which allows students to choose one of four specializations: International Relations, Comparative Politics, Public Policy and Governance, or Political Theory. Each specialization consists of a 12 EC core module followed by 18 EC worth of seminar-based electives. In this phase, students also broaden their perspectives within and outside the discipline, by enrolling in minors in different fields, exchange programs, or internships in the 30 EC elective space. Students also write their bachelor's thesis (12 EC). See appendix 2 for an overview of the curriculum.

The curriculum is organized according to four learning lines or pathways that build up throughout the two phases. The first is a substantive learning pathway, which ensures that students acquire a solid and broad foundation in political science before they specialize. The second is the methods pathway, which provides students with a toolkit of methods and techniques to study political processes in a rigorous and scientific manner, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative approaches. This pathway contains Research Projects I and II among other courses, where students execute a small research project. The third pathway is the academic skills pathway, which encompasses general analytical and cognitive skills, such as conceptual thinking, use of theory, synthesis, and argumentation, as well as more specific skills, such as writing, presenting, conversation and debate. The fourth is the professional skills pathway, which prepares students to enter the labour market as well-rounded professionals. Here, students are trained in transferable skills which are valued by future employers, including effective written and oral communication for various audiences and stakeholders, group work, peer review, and so on. The pathway also raises awareness among students about possible future career pathways by allowing them to interact with organizations and individuals from the field.

The programme structure was revised since, and partly as a result of, the previous site visit. The division into two parts was introduced, along with courses that transcend the four specializations (such as The Politics of Difference, and Sustainability Politics). The methods pathway was adapted to increase attention paid to qualitative methods and the application of methods. The academic skills pathway was revised and expanded through the introduction of three core academic skills courses during the mandatory phase of the programme. These courses consist of tutorials and run parallel to lecture courses, ensuring that students practice academic skills using the thematic materials from lectures on political economy, international relations, political history, political theory, and comparative politics. In this way, coherence in the programme was strengthened. In the second phase, more room was made for specialization in a subdiscipline, and the new Comparative Politics specialization was introduced.

The panel appreciates these changes and the well-designed structure of the curriculum, where the two phases provide clarity. The four learning pathways ensure coherence beyond individual courses, allowing students to build up knowledge and skills in the course of the programme. Academic skills are well-represented, and students are versed in quantitative as well as qualitative methods. In Research Project I and II, they do a small research project on a topic of their own choosing, following their personal preferences and interests. The professional skills pathway in particular is a good addition in the sense that it has students think of and prepare for their future careers early on. The panel is also positive about the elective seminars at the start of the third year, which it considers well-timed: students will have started specializing and put this semester to good use before embarking on their thesis. The possibilities of a stay abroad or an internship are attractive options for students.

The panel learnt that the internship was expanded upon advice of the previous panel. The programme now offers students the option to follow a 6, 12, or 18 EC internship, so that students can include larger internships in the curriculum. The coordinator of the professional skills pathway also serves as the internship coordinator, whose approval is necessary before a student can embark on one of these three types of internships. The BPol has also created the opportunity to do an internship in the context of a thesis project. According to the panel, this flexibility is a good addition to the programme.

Didactic approach and teaching methods

After the introduction of the English-language track in 2017, student numbers showed an unexpectedly sharp increase. They have since tripled, from 558 in 2016/17 (first-year intake 155) to 1584 at the start of the academic year 2022/23 (first-year intake 551). This growth coincided with the Covid-19 pandemic, placing a strain on scientific and administrative staff and students. The programme decided to adapt its teaching methods to accommodate the large number of students. In the first phase of the programme, the substantive courses make use of large lectures taught by senior staff members. These lectures are supported by teaching methods such as roundtable sessions, or guest lectures by practitioners and researchers from the department. Also running in parallel are the academic skills courses, where students work in tutorial groups of around 25 students, with slightly smaller groups in the first semester to allow a softer landing through more intensive teaching. Their tutors here are junior teaching staff, coordinated by a senior lecturer. In the tutorial groups, students participate in a variety of teaching methods, and practice presenting, writing, group and team work, academic debate, conference-styled sessions, and small research projects. In the second phase, this method – coordinating senior tenured staff with junior staff teaching tutorials – becomes less prominent as students specialize in usually smaller-scale electives taught by tenured staff and write their thesis.

The panel discussed teaching methods with management, staff and students. It found that students are satisfied with the way the programme is shaped. They appreciate the fact that the tutorials are taught by younger and approachable tutors supervised by senior staff, and consider the more hands-on and intensive training they receive here to correspond well with the parallel course content in the lecture courses. Lecturers, tutors and management consider the programme manageable in this setup. The programme has invested in a strong coordinating structure to ensure that coherence is safeguarded and that all students have similar experiences in the tutorial groups. Three programme coordinators are tasked with logistics, accounting, and planning of education. The BPol has a first-year and a second-year coordinator, as well as coordinators of learning pathways, specializations, and other key components of the programme. Each course has a senior lecturer as a coordinator. Also, the programme has appointed an internship coordinator and a thesis coordinator. This structure works through continuous communication between programme management and staff members tasked with coordination roles. Recently, the importance of these

coordination tasks has been recognized formally and time is allotted to staff members who engage in these tasks.

The panel applauds the way in which the programme has managed to accommodate increased student numbers. It finds that the process of alignment and constant coordination and communication that has been put in place is well-designed and well-executed. The combination of extensive and intensive classes that tie into one another creates a sufficiently interactive and varied teaching-learning environment for students. The panel learnt that the BPol, in line with the UvA Vision on Teaching and Learning, strives for 'research-intensive teaching'. The panel finds that the programme manages this particularly in the academic skills courses and the second phase, where it offers students multiple opportunities to gain experience with doing research. In order to make teaching throughout the BPol more 'research-intensive', it would be positive if students could engage more with the senior staff members who teach the substantive courses. The panel expects that the planned limitation of student intake to 600 per year (see under 'Language') will be helpful here, since it should allow students better access to senior researchers.

In spite of the intensive coordination system that was implemented, the tutor groups still show variation in feedback practices. The panel learnt from students that they experience differences between the feedback they receive on written tests. The panel recommends formulating a policy on the type and amount of feedback provided to students at various designated moments in the BSc. It points out that sufficient feedback on individual assignments is important for students' development and should be provided equally to all students.

Feasibility and guidance

In the previous accreditation, feasibility of the programme was a point of attention. The programme addressed this in a number of ways. For instance, the BPol previously had entry requirements for individual courses, allowing students only to enter them after completing another courses. These requirements have been lifted in most cases: only two courses in the research methods learning line retain them since they build upon each other. Thanks to this adaptation, the flexibility of the programme was greatly enhanced. The programme also opted for more frequent, smaller exams with the possibility of repairing grades during the course (see also standard 3).

The student support infrastructure was also expanded. The BPol now has four study advisors. Upon advice of the previous panel, the mentorship programme was expanded beyond the first year. Mentorship is now offered throughout the foundational phase and connected to the academic skills tutorial groups. The mentorship scheme consists of individual and group meetings with the mentor (a teaching staff member). The group sessions cover introduction to university life, study skills, diversity in the classroom and career orientation. Alumni and senior year students are invited to share their experiences. The five individual meetings help students become self-reflective professionals who are able to take charge of their personal development. Staff members who act as mentors are supervised by the first- and second-year coordinators, in cooperation with the study advisors. The coordinators also act as contact persons for any mentor that needs extra support in this role. Mentors are offered workshops that address diversity, dealing with different kinds of problems that students encounter, and conversation techniques for the individual mentor meetings.

The thesis trajectory was adapted to increase feasibility. Students write their thesis in the Bachelor Thesis Project course. This course runs either in periods 2-3 or periods 5-6 of year 3 and comes with clear deadlines specified in advance in the thesis manual. Students work in thesis groups capped at 15 students, who complete a collective phase of four to five weeks culminating in a research proposal. After that, they are individually supervised. One thesis project per semester devotes particular attention to professional skills by

allowing students to combine their thesis with an internship. The topics and lecturers for the thesis project are selected by the specialisation coordinators and the programme director. Students choose a top three of available projects and are assigned a project subsequently by the programme coordinators.

The panel considers the measures taken to enhance feasibility to be well chosen. It noted that the measures have yielded results: graduation rates have gone up considerably, as 40-50% of students graduate within three years (as opposed to 17% in 2016-17), and 80% within four years (against 64% in 2016-17). Students and alumni from both tracks confirmed to the panel that they considered the programme to be feasible. They appreciate the guidance options and the mentorship system, and experience the thesis groups as helpful and useful. Students also mentioned the active study association Machiavelli as a factor in community-building and monitoring feasibility. Machiavelli has an education committee that convenes regularly to discuss matters related to the curriculum, with a particular focus on first-year student issues. It also provides services for students regarding exam preparation, public lectures, and social and political events. The panel concludes that the BPol is clearly feasible and compliments the programme with the improvements made here.

Language

The programme's languages of instruction are Dutch and English. At the start of the programme, students choose to study in the English-only international track or the bilingual Dutch-English track. Students enrolled in the international track are obliged to take all courses and exams in English. Those in the bilingual track enrol in Dutch tutorials during the first three semesters and take exams in Dutch. In this track, active language skills such as writing and presenting are offered in Dutch, while passive language skills such as reading and listening are taught in English. The track gradually transitions to fully English-taught courses in the second phase of the programme as a preparation for subsequent master's programmes, but students are still able to complete written exams and their thesis in Dutch.

According to the panel, the international research orientation of the BPol matches the choice of English. The use of English as language of instruction fits its international outlook and orientation. The influx of international students contributes to an engaging 'global classroom' and brings in diverse perspectives on the subject matter at hand. The diverse backgrounds of both students and teaching staff have added value for the learning environment and the quality achieved in especially the tutorial courses. The panel is pleased with the way in which the bilingual track builds up the use of English while allowing students to make their tests in Dutch. It finds that students are well-prepared for an English-language master's degree through this setup. The panel also ascertained that the diverse and international programme staff are well able to deliver the programme in English, as students confirmed.

Before the introduction of English as a teaching language, the BPol had under 1% of non-Dutch students. This changed after the English track was introduced per 2017-2018. The BPol started that academic year with 187 students in the bilingual track and 217 in the English track. In 2019-2020, the English track had grown to 260 students versus 116 students in the bilingual track. After the start of the Covid pandemic, the English track grew dramatically to include 375 and (in 2021-2022) 473 students, against 111 and 136 students in the bilingual track.

The programme and the panel agreed during the site visit that the recent unforeseen increase in student numbers brought with it an imbalance between the bilingual and the English track. The programme intends to control intake numbers and eventually create a better balance by introducing a *numerus fixus* which allows the BPol to select students, at first programme-wide and eventually (after the bill in parliament has passed) in the English-language track only. Through this selection process, the programme aims to limit

student intake to 600 a year and ensure that the Dutch(-language) students remain a solid part of the total student body. At the time of the site visit, the programme had been granted a general *numerus fixus* system for both tracks together, which was scheduled to become valid per September 2023. Just after the site visit, it was announced by the ministry of Education that distinction per track is envisaged in the future (by September 2025 at the earliest), so that selection can be limited to the English-language track and does not impact the bilingual track. The panel applauds this measure and considers it important for retaining the balance between both student groups in the BPol.

Teaching staff

The academic staff teaching in the BPol currently consists of 133 staff members, who are predominantly employed by the Department of Political Science. 60% have the Dutch nationality and 40% have other national backgrounds, mostly from European or English-speaking countries. Recently, hiring has become more diverse, both attracting tenure track staff diverse geographic and ethnic backgrounds. Based on the 1448 students enrolled on 1 October 2021, the staff-student ratio is 1:39. Of the 133 staff members involved in teaching, 71 are tenured staff (or on a tenure track). 96% of these staff members hold a PhD and 85% have obtained a university teaching qualification (UTQ), with 10% in the process of acquiring one.

All tenured teaching staff with a research appointment (assistant, associate, and full professors) are members of one of the research programme groups of the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research (AISSR). The scores on quality and quantity of the research groups that feed into the programme were assessed as excellent according to the latest research reaccreditation report in 2020. Staff members have been successful in acquiring international (EU) and national (NWO) funds over the past few years and are internationally influential academics in their fields. Full, associate and assistant professors spend 60% of their contract time teaching. In case of large research grants or substantial research management involvement, this can be reduced, but in line with the general Social Sciences policy at the UvA, all permanent staff members teach at least 30% of their contract time in order to realise the ambition to provide research-based teaching. In recruiting new tenured staff and staff promotion, teaching performance is therefore given weight.

Aside from the tenured or tenure-track staff, junior lecturers are a vital part of the BSc programme. Almost all tutorial teaching is carried out by junior lecturers, occasionally complemented with PhD researchers, under the supervision of a tenured member of the staff who functions as course coordinator. Junior lecturers also act as mentors for students during the foundational phase of the programme. They carry out certain coordination tasks for large lecture courses under supervision of a tenured member of staff, and participate in grading exams in these courses. Junior lecturers hold a master's degree in political science or related field and are hired as temporary staff. Their contract extends to four years. Junior lecturers are required to take didactic and mentor training during their first years and are offered the opportunity to focus on more career-oriented training later in their tenure or the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ) to prepare for subsequent career paths both within and outside of academia when their contract ends.

As mentioned before, the programme has seen a steep increase in student numbers over the past period. This caused the workload for staff members to grow as well. The sharpest increase happened in the Covid-19 pandemic, which caused work pressure to rise due to the greater influx of international students on the one hand, and the need to develop and immediately apply new classrooms environments, working methods, student support, and examination protocols on the other. In due course, the programme took measures that included hiring more junior lecturers for intensive teaching in the academic skills track. In order to make this system work, a solid coordinating structure was implemented (see above). Through this system, junior staff members are always supervised and coached in their work while coherence is safeguarded on various levels.

The panel studied staff composition and discussed this theme as well as staff workload with staff, students and management. It concluded that staff quality is clearly sufficient for the BPol. The tenured and tenure track staff members have good or excellent track records in research paired with didactic skills. Junior staff members are trained as a group and receive intensive supervision. The extension of their contracts to four years is an improvement, since it allows for more continuity and security. Students appreciate both the permanent staff and the approachable junior staff members, and consider their teachers to be expert at what they teach.

The panel understands that staff quantity has been a serious point of attention over the past period. It feels that the issue was prioritized and addressed proactively by the department. Thanks to the well-designed layered coordination structure that was implemented, the panel concludes that the programme is in control of the situation right now, although staff still experience high work pressure. Students are taught by junior staff in the skills courses and by senior staff in the parallel substantive courses. In the second phase of the programme, their specialization brings them into closer contact with senior staff. The panel is convinced that the programme and its staff will be in a more comfortable position once the *numerus fixus* is implemented. It points out that staff workload should remain on the agenda even after student influx is reduced in this manner.

The panel is positive about the programme's aim to increase staff diversity. It was pleased to see that the staff was composed of teachers with varied backgrounds. Like elsewhere, the higher positions are still occupied by a less diverse group, demonstrating the need to keep investing in staff diversity.

Considerations

The panel appreciates the well-designed structure of the BPol's curriculum, whose two phases (foundational and specialization) provide clarity as well as flexibility. Four learning pathways ensure coherence beyond individual courses, allowing students to build up knowledge and skills throughout the programme. Academic and professional skills are well-represented, and students are versed in quantitative as well as qualitative methods. The panel is also positive about the elective seminar at the start of the third year, which it considers well-timed. The possibilities of a stay abroad or an internship, which can be 6, 12, or 18 EC, are attractive options for students.

After the introduction of the English-language track in 2017, student numbers showed an unexpectedly sharp increase. The programme decided to adapt its teaching methods accordingly, offering extensive group lecture courses taught by senior staff flanked by intensive tutorial courses taught by junior lecturers in the foundational phase of the programme. The panel applauds the way in which the programme has adapted to accommodate increased student numbers and the system of alignment and constant coordination and communication that has been put in place to safeguard coherence. The panel finds that this works well on the whole, but recommends formulating a policy on the type and amount of feedback provided to students at various moments throughout the BSc to ensure that this is provided equally to all students. Also, in view of the university's aim of research-based teaching and in line with plans to reduce student intake per 2023-2024, the panel would consider it a positive development if students could be made to engage more with senior staff members in the first phase of the programme.

The panel considers the programme to be feasible, thanks to recent measures that increase flexibility and reduce the number of large final exams in courses. The programme increased the student support infrastructure and expanded the mentorship programme. The thesis trajectory was adapted and is now

organized like a course, which allows students to work in a group setting on their proposal and has clear and universal deadlines.

According to the panel, the international research orientation of the BPol matches the choice of English as one of the languages of instruction. The influx of international students contributes to an activating 'global classroom' and diverse perspectives on the subject matter at hand. The panel is pleased with the way in which the bilingual track slowly builds up the use of English while allowing students to make their tests in Dutch. It supports the (planned) *numerus fixus* for the English track, which it considers important for retaining the balance between the international and Dutch(-language) student groups in the BPol.

The panel finds that staff quality is clearly sufficient for the BPol. The tenured and tenure track staff members have good or excellent track records in research paired with didactic skills. Junior staff members are trained as a group and receive intensive supervision. Students appreciate both the permanent staff and the approachable junior staff members, and consider their teachers to be expert at what they teach. The panel understands that staff quantity has been a serious point of attention over the past period. It feels that the issue was prioritized and addressed proactively by the department. Thanks to the well-designed coordination structure that was implemented, the panel concludes that the programme is in control of the situation, although staff still experience high work pressure. It points out that staff workload should remain on the agenda even after student influx is reduced through the *numerus fixus*.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 2.

Standard 3. Student assessment

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

Findings

All programmes in the social sciences at the UvA work with a joint assessment policy, which operates within the central UvA Assessment Policy Framework. Aimed at unity, coherence and transparency, this policy outlines the conditions for the assessment process (notably the relationship between Dublin descriptors, learning outcomes, and assessment design, formats, and procedures); the scheduling and distribution of assessments; the assessment of internships and final projects; the regulatory framework; and the quality assurance of assessment and testing, including the division of responsibilities.

A range of practices has been developed to ensure the quality, variation, transparency and effectiveness of assessment within the programme. The programme's starting point is that the criteria of assessment are clear in advance to staff and students. Written exams always have an answer key specifying which answers are expected, how points are divided across (sub-) questions, and when and how many points are given for partially correct answers. Assessment criteria are specified either in the course manuals or in separate assignment descriptions, this information is usually distributed to students via Canvas. Examiners are responsible for organising peer review on written exams and other larger assignments. The four-eyes principle is applied in test composition: in the case of co-teaching, teachers provide feedback on each other's questions and assignments, while staff members who teach a course on their own actively seek the advice of other staff members in the programme.

The BSc programme employs a variety of modes of assessment, which are aligned with the learning outcomes of courses and the exit qualifications of the programme. Assessment types include multiple choice

exams, closed-book written exams, presentations, etc. The increased focus on professional skills has led to assessment types that include non-academic forms of writing, such as policy briefs, blogs, op-eds, and party manifestos, although academic papers still constitute the bulk of the final grade. The internship is assessed by the internship coordinator based on the student's internship report and the feedback from the daily supervisor at the internship organization.

The panel appreciates assessment policies and practice in the BPol. It learnt during the site visit that assessment was adapted to accommodate the increase in student numbers. The programme now opts for more (small) multiple-choice exams for large lecture courses, which are usually combined with other assessment types. The introduction of more multiple choice elements was done carefully and was accompanied by efforts to use this testing method in the best and most effective way possible, which included staff professionalization training on the subject. The number of written assessments at the start of the programme was reduced somewhat to limit the workload of staff members, and grading in the larger courses is now done by teams of junior lecturers supervised by the (senior) course coordinator, which leads to exchanges and discussions on grading. The panel found during the site visit that this system works well in practice, and constitutes a good training for junior staff members and that it seems to have raised awareness among staff about the importance of calibration of assessment.

Thesis assessment

Thesis assessment is done by the student's supervisor and a second reader who is not involved in that supervision and only acts as assessor. 20% of the grade is made up by the assessment of the writing process and participation in the thesis groups, where students are supposed to actively encourage and critique one another. The supervisor and second reader assess the thesis with the help of a standardised assessment form. The supervisors meet without the student present and jointly determine the grade, which is then communicated in writing or in person to the student, followed by a final meeting with supervisor and student. In case the supervisor and second reader do not reach an agreement, their judgement differs more than one grade point, or one of the grades is a fail and the other a pass, a third reader is appointed by the Examination Board.

Thesis supervisors select the second reader themselves, according to guidelines stipulating that recurring couples of the same staff members are to be avoided as much as possible; that a less experienced staff member always forms a couple with an experienced staff member; and that a thesis written in Dutch is always assessed by at least one native speaker of the Dutch language. Thesis supervisors find their own second readers based on these principles and alert the thesis project coordinator. Where necessary, the thesis project coordinator and programme director assist thesis supervisors in finding appropriate second readers.

The panel appreciates the way thesis assessment is done in the programme. It is pleased with the clear working method and especially with the fact that active participation in the thesis class is assessed as well. It finds that this adds to the students' development as critical thinkers, active participants and involved researchers.

The method of having the thesis supervisor choose the second reader works out as long as the guidelines are adhered to. The panel therefore appreciates the fact that the BSc is planning to introduce structural checks on whether this is the case. An advantage of the current working method is that it ensures that the second reader is an expert on the thesis subject. Nevertheless, the panel suggests investigating whether it would be a viable option to have the thesis coordinator appoint the second readers, and to look beyond the own group and expertise of the thesis supervisor. This would increase transparency and allow supervisors from different

substantive specializations to be introduced to each other's grading habits and strategies, and ensure more consistency in grading across the specializations.

The panel looked at thesis forms and found that they provided sufficient information to underpin the final grade. However, some forms contained clearly more detailed feedback than others. The panel learnt that some assessors prefer to give extensive oral feedback and then summarize this briefly on the form. Others see the form as a significant feedback document and provide more input. The panel recommends clarifying expectations surrounding the thesis form and the oral feedback moment to staff members, so that these differences are reduced.

Examination Board

The BPol shares an Examination Board (EB) with the master's programmes in Political Science and Conflict Resolution and Governance (CRG). The EB consists of five members, including two chairs (one for the bachelor's and one for the master's programmes), supported by a secretary. In addition, an external member is part of the EB to look critically at the procedural and substantive aspects of testing/assessment and the functioning of the EB in general.

The Board performs regular checks to safeguard quality of assessment in the programme. A rotating committee consisting of one or two EB members, two lecturers, and the department's test assessment specialist perform an assessment periodically to monitor alignment between learning objectives, forms of assessment and exit qualifications, as well as the variety of assessment forms and knowledge levels tested. In addition, specific courses may be reviewed in-depth, with a focus on clarity of learning objectives, assessment procedures and quality of feedback. This practice was performed in a less structured manner during the Covid-19 pandemic but has been taken up in full again per 2022-2023.

In the past, the EB's recommendations resulting from such checks have led to the appointment of an assessment expert at the department level who provides peer review and shares best practices with lecturers. In some cases, the EB recommended changes to learning outcomes of individual courses. More recently the EB advised the programme director to redesign the assessment of large lecture courses to a compensatory model and advised the programme director to reserve funds for the further professionalisation of multiple-choice exams. Also, given the growth of the programme and the frequent recruitment of new faculty, the EB strongly recommended to provide stronger guidance to new colleagues regarding modes of assessment in their courses, particularly in those instances where they teach a course by themselves, such as an elective. These recommendations will be taken up in the academic year 2023-2024.

The EB also conducts a periodic thesis peer review to monitor the assessment of the final products. The previous accreditation panel recommended improving harmonization of thesis assessment. After conducting a detailed review of course manuals for thesis projects as well as the regrading of randomly selected bachelor's theses, the EB made several recommendations to improve the course manual, harmonize the working method and rules and regulations, and adapt the assessment form to clearly distinguish the process grade from the thesis grade.

The panel is impressed with the work done by the EB to check and improve quality of assessment in the programme. It is positive about the efforts of the EB to improve thesis assessment and harmonization, and suggests keeping this on the agenda to further harmonize the feedback. It considers the EB to be proactive and valuable to the programme. The panel appreciates the role of the EB during the student number increase and the Covid-19 pandemic. An illustration of this key role is the fact that the EB approached the need to implement more multiple choice exams not as a threat but rather as an opportunity and means to ensure that assessment is done in an objective and efficient way wherever the method is suitable and

matches the learning goals that are assessed. The panel learnt that the EB introduced thesis calibration sessions for staff members in the master's programmes and that the BPol has recently been experimenting with this in 'grading clinics'. The panel advises to systematically introduce this good practice in the BPol as well.

Considerations

The panel appreciates assessment policies and practice in the BPol. It learnt during the site visit that assessment was adapted to accommodate the increase in student numbers. The programme now opts for more (small) multiple-choice exams in the first year, which are usually combined with other assessment types. The panel agrees with this choice and is positive about the careful and considerate way in which the change was made. It is impressed with the work done by the EB to check and improve quality of assessment in the programme. It considers the EB to be proactive and valuable to the programme and appreciates the crucial role of the EB during the student number increase and the Covid-19 pandemic in guaranteeing assessment quality.

The panel is pleased with the way thesis assessment is done in the programme. The method of having the thesis supervisor choose the second reader works out, but the panel suggests investigating whether it would be a viable option to have the thesis coordinator appoint second readers in order to increase transparency and allow supervisors from different substantive specializations to be introduced to each other's grading habits and strategies, and learn from one another. The panel looked at thesis forms and found that they provided sufficient information to underpin the final grade. However, some contained clearly more detailed feedback than others. The panel recommends clarifying expectations surrounding the thesis form to staff members so that these differences are reduced. The panel learnt that the EB has introduced thesis calibration sessions for staff members in master's programmes, and that the BPol has recently been experimenting with this in 'grading clinics'. The panel advises to systematically introduce this good practice in the BPol as well.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 3.

Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Based on the 15 theses from the BPol that the panel read, it concludes that its students clearly achieve the expected academic bachelor's level in political science. The choice in topics is both varied and topical for both tracks, and in some cases innovative. The methodology is well-chosen, and can be qualitative or quantitative. The panel is generally pleased with the level achieved in the programme's final theses.

Graduates from the BSc normally enter into a master's programme upon graduation. Alumni stay at the UvA or move on to other Dutch or international universities to further specialize in (usually) political sciences or other social sciences. The panel interviewed bachelor's alumni who mentioned that they felt very well prepared by their bachelor's programme to enter into a master's programme. It concludes that the programme is successful in training students for further studies in the field.

Considerations

Based on the good quality of the final theses and the success of alumni enrolling in (usually) political and social sciences master's programmes, the panel conclude that graduates from the BPol achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 4.

General conclusion

The panel's assessment of the programmes is positive.

Development points

1. Look into ways to have students engage more with senior staff members in the first phase of the programme when the anticipated reduction of student intake is effectuated per 2023-2024, to better realize the university's aim of research-based teaching.
2. Formulate a policy on the type and amount of feedback provided to students at designated moments in the BSc, since sufficient feedback on individual assignments is important for students' development.
3. Keep staff workload on the agenda even after the *numerus fixus* is put in place.
4. Investigate whether it would be a viable option to have the thesis coordinator appoint the second readers to increase transparency and allow supervisors from different substantive specializations to be introduced to each other's grading habits and strategies, and learn from one another.
5. Clarify expectations surrounding the thesis form to staff members so that the forms end up containing equal amounts of feedback.
6. Systematically introduce 'grading clinics' or thesis calibration session among BPol staff members.

Appendix 1. Intended learning outcomes

1. The student graduating from the programme must:

- a) possess knowledge of and insight into the structure and mechanisms of national, international and transnational political administrative systems and processes, and normative theory;
- b) possess knowledge of and insight into the relevance of the major research methods that belong to the field of political sciences;
- c) possess knowledge of and insight into other disciplines (especially law, economics, history and philosophy) that are relevant to the field of political science
- d) possess knowledge of and insight into the nature and status of politics in contemporary societies;
- e) possess knowledge of and insight into the main theoretical models, approaches and existing debates within the field of political science;
- f) also possess more specific empirical and theoretical knowledge of one of the various sub-fields of political science.

2. The student graduating from the programme is capable of:

- a) collecting information on political phenomena, critically examining these phenomena on the basis of concepts from the aforementioned knowledge sources and able to work to develop practical applications based on this knowledge both individually and as part of a team;
- b) formulating a problem statement;
- c) formulating a research question;
- d) formulating and accounting for the extent to which the collected data address the research question and why.

3. The student graduating from the programme:

- a) is able to analyse and interpret current societal and political developments on the basis of theoretical knowledge;
- b) has a broad overview of empirical research methods applied in the field of political science, and their respective possibilities and limitations;
- c) is able to formulate and account for the extent to which the collected data address the research question and why.

4. The student graduating from the programme:

- a) is able to communicate knowledge orally, especially in the form of clearly worded presentations;
- b) is able to communicate knowledge in written form, especially in the form of easily readable reports;
- c) is able to participate actively in academic and political/societal debates in both orally and in writing, on the basis of sound arguments;
- d) is able to process the acquired data into a clearly worded and easily readable report.

5. The student graduating from the programme:

- a) is able to read and summarise (both orally and in writing) theoretical and empirical academic texts;
- b) is able to apply documentation from relevant libraries and other relevant sources of information.

6. Students will specialise in one of the thematic priority areas within the Political Science programme. Following this specialisation, the graduate will possess knowledge of and insight into:

- a) the key theoretical models and approaches currently applied in the specialisation in question;
- b) how these theories may be applied in order to analyse political developments;
- c) how these theories may be used in conducting empirical research;
- d) the normative relevance of these theories;
- e) how research into this specialisation could facilitate the analysis of societal issues and the identification of solutions to these issues.

Appendix 2. Programme curriculum

Bachelor Political Science				
Year 1	Foundation	Semester 1	<p>Period 1 (Sept/Oct)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● History of the Modern World since 1750 (Lecture, 6 EC, EN & NL) ● Introduction to Political Science (Lecture, 6 EC, EN & NL) ★ Academic Skills I (Tutorial, 6 EC, EN & NL) 	<p>Joint Programme 42 EC</p> <p>Core Module Specialisation (1 of 4) 12 EC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comparative politics - International Relations - Political theory - Public policy and governance <p>Bachelor Seminars (2 of many) 12 + 6 = 18 EC</p> <p>2nd year Electives (1 of 2) 6 EC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability politics - Violence & security <p>Research Project II (1 of many) 6 EC</p> <p>Free Electives 30 EC</p> <p>Bachelor Thesis Project (1 of many) 12 EC</p> <p>Learning Pathways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Substantive ■ Methods ★ Academic Skills ▲ Professional Skills
		Semester 1	<p>Period 2 (Nov/Dec)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Public Policy & Governance (Lecture, 6 EC, EN) 	
		Semester 2	<p>Period 3 (Jan)</p> <p>■ ▲ Research Project I (6 EC, EN & NL)</p>	
		Semester 2	<p>Period 4 (Feb/Mar)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● History of Political Thought (Lecture, 6 EC, EN) ■ Introduction to Political Science Research (Lecture & Tutorial, 9 EC, EN & NL) ★ Academic Skills II (Tutorial, 3 EC, EN & NL) 	
		Semester 2	<p>Period 5 (Apr/May)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● International Relations (Lecture, 6 EC, EN) 	
		Semester 2	<p>Period 6 (Jun)</p> <p>● ▲ Law and Politics (Lecture & Tutorial, 6 EC, EN & NL)</p>	
Year 2	Specialisation & Differentiation	Semester 3	<p>Period 1 (Sept/Oct)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Political Economy (Lecture, 6 EC, EN) ■ Research Methods (Lecture & Tutorial, 9 EC, EN & NL) ★ Academic Skills III (Tutorial, 9 EC, EN & NL) 	
		Semester 3	<p>Period 2 (Nov/Dec)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Democracies, Autocracies & Transitions (Lecture, 6 EC, EN) 	
		Semester 3	<p>Period 3 (Jan)</p>	
		Semester 4	<p>Period 4 (Feb/Mar)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Politics of Difference (Lecture, 6 EC, EN) ● Core Module Specialisation (1 of 4) (Lecture & Tutorial 12 EC, EN) 	
Semester 4	<p>Period 5 (Apr/May)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 2nd year Elective (1 of 2) (Lecture, 6 EC, EN) 			
Semester 4	<p>Period 6 (Jun)</p> <p>■ ▲ Research Project II (1 of many) (Tutorial, 6 EC, EN & NL)</p>			
Year 3	Specialisation & Differentiation	Semester 5 or 6	<p>Period 1 (Sept/Oct)</p> <p>○ □ ☆ △ Free Electives (Diverse formats, 30 EC, EN & NL)</p> <p><i>Additional electives Political Science or other programmes, minor, exchange, internship etc.</i></p>	
		Semester 5 or 6	<p>Period 2 (Nov/Dec)</p>	
		Semester 5 or 6	<p>Period 3 (Jan)</p>	
		Semester 5 or 6	<p>Period 4 (Feb/Mar)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ■ ★ △ Bachelor Seminars (2 of many) (Diverse formats, 6 + 12 = 18 EC, EN & NL) ● ■ ★ △ Bachelor Thesis Project (1 of many) (Seminar, 12 EC, EN & NL) 	
		Semester 5 or 6	<p>Period 5 (Apr/May)</p>	
		Semester 5 or 6	<p>Period 6 (Jun)</p>	

Appendix 3. Programme of the site visit

4 April 2023

10.30	10.45	Welcome to Panel
10.45	12.15	Internal session panel/possible walk-in session for students and staff
12.15	12.45	Session with the staff/management responsible: Bachelor (BPol)
12.45	13.15	Session with the staff/management responsible: Masters (MPol & CRG)
13.15	14.00	Lunch
14.00	14.45	Student session BPol
14.45	15.30	Lecturer session BPol
15.30	16.00	Break
16.00	16.45	Student & alumni session MPol
16.45	17.30	Lecturer session MPol

5 April 2023

09.00	09.45	Student & alumni session CRG
09.45	10.30	Lecturer session CRG
10.30	11.15	Internal session panel
11.15	12.00	Examinations Board session
12.00	12.30	Internal session panel (preparation final session)
12.30	13.15	Lunch
13.15	14.00	Final session with formal management all programmes
14.00	16.00	Internal session panel (preparation preliminary oral feedback)
16.00	17.00	Development dialogue
17.00	17.30	Preliminary oral feedback

Appendix 4. Materials

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses for the BSc Political Science. Information on the theses is available from Academion upon request. The panel also studied other materials, which included:

- List of Improvements based on Previous Accreditation
- Domain-specific Framework of Reference
- Dublin Descriptors, Domain-specific Framework of Reference and Exit Qualifications
- Relations Exit Qualifications to Curriculum (Learning Outcomes Courses)
- Relations Assessments Formats & Learning Outcome (Assessment Plan)
- Curriculum Overview
- List of Electives, list of Bachelor Thesis Projects 2022-2023
- Course Information
- Teaching and Examination Regulations 2022-2023 (TER)
- Information on Numerus Fixus 2023-2024
- Staff Overview 2022/23
- Student data
- Lecturer-Student Ratio & Staff Composition
- Benchmark with other programmes
- Thesis Assessment Form Bachelor Political Science
- Annual reports and minutes of the last two years of the Examinations Board
- Assessment Policy
- Annual report and minutes of the last two years of the Programme Committee
- Detailed course information/assessment information for selected courses, per programme
- General access to all current courses in the digital learning environment
- Thesis Manuals
- Internship manual bachelor
- Faculty Handbook
- Quality Assurance memo Social Sciences (in Dutch)
- Policy on Free Speech
- Relevant URLs to UvA document (vision on Teaching) and programme sites