

## SWA: assessments scores

The last 3 years [since the legislative changes of June 2015 ] VLUHR QAU carried out 38 program assessments. Of the programs assessed 21 were offered by the University Colleges, 7 by the Universities and 10 by Registered Bodies. 16 professionally oriented bachelors, 6 academically oriented bachelors and 5 advanced bachelors have been assessed (in total 27 bachelor programs, EQF 6). 4 masters, 1 Erasmus Mundus master and 6 advanced masters have been assessed (in total 11 master programs, EQF 7). Of the 38 assessments, 20 were regular assessments (3 or 4 standards) and 18 limited assessments, applying to one or more of the standards.

In total 92 scores have been granted involving the 38 assessed programs. Of all granted scores, 53 applied to bachelor programs, 39 to master programs, 66 applied to regular assessments and 26 to limited assessments. The University Colleges counted for 42 scores, The Universities for 17 scores and the Registered Bodies for 33. The 92 scores are as followed distributed among the 4 standards; 20 on standard 1; 31 on standard 2; 32 on standard 3; and 9 standard on 4 (which only counts for registered Bodies). Of the limited assessments 11 scores were granted on standard 2, 12 on standard 3 and 3 on standard 4 (for the Registered Bodies only). All scores granted to these programs were satisfactory. Thus, no program in an improvement trajectory was assessed unsatisfactory again. That standard 2 and 3 are reassessed the most may not come as a surprise, given that standard 1 is a more formal standard, addressing the link between the intended learning outcomes of the program and the formulated domain-specific learning outcomes.

Of all scores, 90 scores are labelled as satisfactory, 2 as unsatisfactory. Of those 2 unsatisfactory scores, one applied to an bachelor program (University College), and one to a master program (Registered Body). Both scores were given at standard 3: realization of the intended learning outcomes (so-called Outcome Level Achieved). Digging a bit deeper into these 2 unsatisfactory scores, for both programs count that their 'evaluation policy' was not in tune with the minimum requirements. Regarding the bachelor program the panel stated that the evaluations address insights, but not the skills and attitudes students must realize. The bachelor's thesis also lacks a scientific base and does not show that all intended learning outcomes can be achieved. For the master program, the panel observed that there are not sufficient guarantees that the evaluations are valid, reliable, objective and transparent. The very same time, many of the Master's thesis did not show an academic level of sound scientific research. The program, in sum, cannot assure that all intended learning outcomes are realized. One of these programs has been already reassessed, and received a satisfactory score. The other program will be reassessed in 2019.