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1 Executive summary

On 15 July 2011, The Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) received a request for an initial accreditation procedure, regarding a proposed joint programme ‘European Master in Social Work’ at Hanzehogeschool Groningen. NVAO convened an expert panel, which studied the information available and discussed the proposed programme with representatives of the institution and the programme during a site visit.

The following considerations have played an important role in the panel’s assessment.

The panel is positive about the level and the orientation of the learning outcomes. The programme made considerable effort to take recent developments into consideration in establishing its profile. The learning outcomes are based on a description of recent societal developments which cause an effect on the field of social work all over Europe. In addition, the programme analysed the various specific needs in the field of social work per country, related to various vulnerable groups. The learning outcomes relate to this analysis and comply with national and international standards for programmes in social work.

The programme is based upon two different aspects in social work: a senior approach in case handling and knowledge of policies within a European context. The panel found that this combination results in a somewhat diminished focus and quite a broad profile. The focus of the programme is nevertheless sufficiently provided by its European character, which also justifies the addition ‘European’ in the name of the programme.

The panel finds the programme to be well-thought of. The sequence of the curriculum, the literature, the staff and the didactic concept add to the achievement of the final qualifications. In addition, the joint character of the programme is sufficiently visible in the development of the curriculum and in the procedures under which the programme will be operated.

To the panel it was not sufficiently clear that the research line was structurally developed throughout the curriculum as a whole. Students sufficiently get acquainted with the basics of research but a more thorough instruction on research methodologies is lacking. Nevertheless, the panel is confident that students develop sufficient understanding of research in the current set-up of the programme. It strongly recommends the programme to redevelop the research line throughout the electives and ensure that students will get more knowledge of various research methods.

The programme is based on the concept of blended learning. The success of this approach depends partly on the electronic learning environment. The description of the electronic learning environment is promising, however, during the site visit, not all the features could be shown. The panel therefore advises the programme to develop the digital learning environment in such a way that it contains all the functions that are attributed to it. The panel found that the basic and most essential features are adequate. In general, the panel is positive about the way the programme approaches blended learning and is confident that this approach will be successful.

The staff of the programme is adequately equipped to educate students on a master’s level. Although various staff members perform research in the field of social work, joint research
initiatives have not been developed yet. The panel strongly recommends the programme to stimulate its staff members to develop joint research initiatives.

The panel is very positive about the quality assurance of the programme. It managed to create a joint quality culture and activate a well-thought quality assurance system on top of it.

The assessments methods used by the programme are varied. They comply with the course content and the learning outcomes. The panel remarks that the assessment method ‘individual report’ needs further attention. The system that is in place to monitor the quality of the assessments and theses are clear and promise to be effective. The responsibilities and roles among staff members of the consortium are well-described and realistic. The panel is positive about the set-up of the assessments throughout the curriculum.

The programme guarantees that students who have started their study, will be given the opportunity to finish it. There is a fee system in place which includes the possibility to provide some students with a grant. The panel remarks that the terms and conditions on which students will be granted, need to be developed.

Given these considerations, the panel advises NVAO to take a positive decision regarding the quality of the proposed joint programme ‘European Master in Social Work’ at Hanzehogeschool Groningen.

The panel advises the registration of the programme under the study field ‘Gedrag en Maatschappij’ of the Dutch national Register for Higher Education Programmes (CROHO).

The Hague, 20 March 2012

On behalf of the Initial Accreditation panel convened to assess the joint programme ‘European Master in Social Work’ at Hanzehogeschool Groningen,

Carla Frederiks  
(chair)  

Jetse Siebenga  
(secretary)
2 Introduction

2.1 The procedure

NVAO received a request for an initial accreditation procedure including programme documents regarding a proposed joint programme ‘European Master in Social Work’. The request was received on 15 July 2011 from the Hanzehogeschool Groningen.

An initial accreditation procedure is required when a recognised institution wants to offer a programme and award a recognised bachelor or master’s degree. Initial accreditation is in fact an ex ante assessment of a programme, and a programme becomes subject to the normal accreditation procedures once initial accreditation has been granted.

Since the programme is provided by an international consortium of several European Higher Education Institutes, NVAO convened an international panel of experts. The panel consisted of:

- Prof. dr. C.M.A. Frederiks (chair), professor Science of Nursing at the Radboud University Nijmegen;
- Prof. dr. K. Svensson, professor in Social Work at the Lund University;
- Prof. dr. M. de Bie, professor in Educational Sciences at Ghent University;
- T. Smulders BSc (student-member), Master Healthcare Policy and Innovation Management, School for Public Health and Primary Care at Maastricht University.

Since the programme is a joint programme the principles for the accreditation of joint programme from the ‘European consortium for accreditation’ (ECA) were applied. Mette Reinholdt MSc, policy advisor from the Danish Accreditation Institution (ACE Denmark), was present during the site visit and the preparation thereof.

On behalf of the NVAO, drs. Irma Franssen was responsible for the process-coordination and Jetse Siebenga MSc for the drafting of the expert’s report.

This composition reflects the expertise deemed necessary by NVAO (Annex 1: Composition of the panel). All the panel members signed a statement of independence and confidentiality.

The panel has based its assessment on the standards and criteria described in the NVAO Initial Accreditation Framework (Stcr. 2010, nr 21523).

The following procedure was undertaken. The panel members studied the programme documents (Annex 3: Documents reviewed) regarding the proposed programme. Their first impressions were sent to the secretary of NVAO, in order to outline these remarks within the accreditation framework and detect the items to be clarified during the site visit.

Based on their first findings, the panel organised a preparatory meeting the day before the site visit. The site visit took place on 13 February 2012 at Hanzehogeschool Groningen (Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit).
The panel formulated its preliminary assessments per standard immediately after the site visit. These are based on the findings of the site visit, and building on the assessment of the programme documents.

On 28 February 2012, the draft version of this report was finalised taking into account the available information and relevant findings of the assessment. Where necessary, the panel corrected and amended the report. The panel finalised the report on 20 March 2012.

2.2 Panel report

The first chapter of this report is the executive summary of the report, the current chapter is the introduction.

The third chapter gives a description of the programme including its position within the Hanzehogeschool Groningen and within the higher education system of the Netherlands.

The panel presents its assessments in the fourth chapter. The programme is assessed by assessing the standards in the Initial Accreditation Framework. For each standard the panel presents an outline of its findings, considerations and a conclusion.

The outline of the findings are the objective facts as found by the panel in the programme documents, in the additional documents and during the site visit. The panel's considerations are the panel's subjective evaluations regarding these findings and the importance of each. The considerations presented by the panel logically lead to a concluding assessment.

The panel concludes the report with a table containing an overview of its assessments per standard.
3 Description of the programme

3.1 Overview

Country: The Netherlands  
Institution: Hanzehogeschool Groningen  
Programme: European master in Social Work  
Level: master  
Orientation: professional (hbo)  
Degree: European master in Social Work  
Location: Groningen, Vilnius, Odense, Freiburg, Gabrovo, Malaga  
Mode of study: parttime  
Field of study: Social Sciences

3.2 Profile of the institution

The origins of the Hanzehogeschool go back to 1798, when six citizens of Groningen founded the first multi-sectoral University of Applied Sciences in the Netherlands. Nowadays, the Hanzehogeschool consists of 19 schools which in total offer 77 programmes, from associate degrees to bachelor- and master-programmes. The 2700 employers of the Hanzehogeschool offer their services to 25,500 students. Practice oriented research is operated through 34 ‘lectoraten’ divided in 6 knowledge centres.

In 2007, Hanzehogeschool hosted the yearly meeting of the SocNet 98 network, a network of 20 European Schools of Social Work. Here, the idea to develop a European Master in Social Work was developed. Shortly after, a consortium was formed to realises this idea. The consortium exists of the following members:

- The Technical University of Gabrovo, Bulgaria;
- The University of Southern Denmark, (participating campus in Odense);
- University college Lillebaelt, Odense, Denmark;
- The Hanzehogeschool Groningen, University of Applied Science, the Netherlands;
- The University of Malaga, Spain;
- Vilnius University, Lithuania;
- University of applied sciences Freiburg, Germany.

3.3 Profile of the programme

New programme in the Netherlands

The programme document indicates that no other institution of higher education in the Netherlands offers a programme with a similar profile.

New programme for the institution

The institution has recently developed a master programme (joint degree) in social work which received accreditation by the NVAO on 17 November 2010. The new European Master in Social Work differs from the existing programme by its international orientation and the fact that it is a joint programme, provided by a consortium of seven international partners.

Credits

The programme consists of 90 EC.
Assessment per standard

This chapter presents the evaluation by the assessment panel of the four standards. The panel has reproduced the criteria for each standard. For each standard the panel presents (1) a brief outline of its findings based on the programme documents and on documents provided by the institution, and the site visit, (2) the considerations the panel has taken into account and (3) the conclusion of the panel.

The panel presents a conclusion for each of the four standards.

3.4 Intended learning outcomes (standard 1)

The intended learning outcomes of the programme have been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements.

Outline of findings

The programme developed 4 generic competences: (I) cooperate internationally, (II) practice oriented research, (III) innovate, (IV) professionalize, and 5 more specific competences: (V) Diagnose, (VI) Evaluate, (VII) Manage, (VIII) Advise, (IX) Intervene. The information dossier contains a further description on these competences, which can be found in annex 4.

The information dossier starts with an introductory description of major societal developments (such as migration) that have a strong impact on the field of social work. This description provided the structure for analysis of needs in the field of social work, which the programme performed separately for all the participating countries. Both the description of major developments and the analyses of countries’ needs, provided the context and justification for the developed learning outcomes and competences.

The programme defined the following professional roles: the policy expert, the senior case worker, the networker/trainer, the coordinator-project manager-senior staff officer and the practitioner-researcher. The programme related these professional roles to those of the professional profile in social work, which was developed in 2006 by the KBA. In addition, the programme refers to the international standards for social work adopted by the IASSW and IFSW, which were also used in the establishment of the competences and learning outcomes for this programme.

During the site visit, the programme emphasized its twofold focus. It aims to establish a senior approach in case handling and to focus on knowledge of social work policies within the European context. The programme chose to develop one set of competences for all students.

The programme prefers registration under the CROHO-domain of ‘Gedrag en Maatschappij’ since all programmes in social work are registered under this domain.

1 Vraag en aanbod van Masters Social Work, Kenniscentrum Beroepsonderwijs Arbeidsmarkt, 2006
Considerations
The programme distinguishes itself from other programmes in social work by its European character. This specific profile is sufficiently based upon the description of threats and challenges in the European area of social work and on the analysis of needs in the countries of the participating institutions. The panel regards both as relevant to the establishment of a European master-programme in social work. The overall aims and goals of the programme are satisfactorily translated into the learning outcomes and competences. These outcomes and competences sufficiently comply with the international standards for educational programmes in social work.

The panel understands the choice of the programme to combine its twofold focus into one set of learning outcomes but remarks that the intended learning outcomes cover a wide range of skills and knowledge, which diminishes the focus of the programme. The European character of the programme however, binds the two elements and provides an encompassing context for all learning outcomes. It directs the broad profile of the programme in such a way that it maintains a clear focus. The combination and integration of elements reflects the master level of the programme. The programme balances a professional orientation with an academic orientation in such a way that the professional master level is adequately reflected in the learning outcomes. This also results from the good cooperation between the several partners (among which are academically oriented universities and universities of applied science).

The panel agrees with the registering of the programme under ‘Gedrag en Maatschappij’ of CROHO.

Conclusion
The panel assesses standard 1 ‘Intended learning outcomes’ as satisfactory.
3.5 Teaching-learning environment (standard 2)

The curriculum, staff and programme-specific services and facilities enable incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Outline of findings
The programme is divided in four semesters and consists of 90 ECTS – each ECTS represents 28 study hours.

Each semester is divided in two blocks of which each (except for the blocks in the thesis semester) starts with an intensive week of study at the partner institute which offers the core or elective courses. After that week, students go to their home country to work on their assignments in the context of their own work environment, tutored by the teaching staff via the concept of blended learning.

Entry requirements
The programme is developed for professionals with working experience who have an interest in European development in the area of social work. The entry requirements of the programme are:

- A bachelor degree in social work or related bachelor degree in the domain of applied social studies.
- A minimum of two years experience in domain of social work and/or social welfare, including policy advisor in social work.
- A current job in the domain of social work and/or social welfare, including policy advisors in social work, for at least 20 hours a week. The relevance and level of the job are assessed by the examination board.
- Adequate proficiency in English: IELTS 6.5 or equivalent.

The programme expects two categories of students: students with a career as a case worker which now work at a senior level and students with a career as policy advisor and ambitions to work in a European context.

Curriculum
In terms of content, the three main components of the programme are (I) the political and ethical developments in social work in Europe, (II) methods in social work and (III) applied research in social work. The programme starts with one semester ‘core courses’ containing essential courses such as ‘English communication’, ‘writing skills for social work’, ‘scientific competences’ and comparative social policy. This part of the curriculum will be offered at the Hanzehogeschool Groningen.

The second and third semester consist of electives. The programme offers fourteen electives which can broadly be divided in electives concerned with (I) political/ethical developments in social work and (II) social work methods. It is not desirable that students choose all their electives in one of these two main components. Therefore, students need to choose at least one elective in each component.

The main component (III) “applied research in social work” runs through the entire programme. It starts with the course ‘scientific competences’ in the first block. During the electives, students have to work on ‘real life-issues’ related to their own work environment.
The fourth semester is completely dedicated to research-based thesis work. The thesis has to be related to the personal work environment of each student.

**Thesis**
By the end of the first year, students are required to find themselves a thesis supervisor from the university in which they enrolled. The supervisor must have a PhD-degree and will be chosen on the basis of a common area of interest. The student must hand in a first literature review and discuss this with his/her supervisor before the end of the year. In the second year, students will refine their literature review and finalise their research proposal, supported by the electives in which lectors will specially address the formulation of research questions. The student can express preference for a second reader from another institute. When possible, this preference will be honoured. Besides the first and second supervisor, who will also be the examiners, a lecturer of Hanze University always has the final responsibility for the assessment of the thesis and therefore all research proposals will also be approved by a teacher from Hanze University.

**Orientation and didactical approach**
The programme is professionally oriented. The programme requires students to connect real life cases with research and analyses, which should result in professional products and contribute to the field of social work.

The emphasis of the programme is on the achievement of competences, its didactical approach is therefore competence-driven. However, it involves a number of other important aspects which mark the distinction of the programme. In the first place, the programme is, due to the number of international partners, inevitably based on the concept of blended learning. Important to the concept of blended learning, is the digital learning environment. At the demonstration thereof, the programme was not able to present the many elaborate features which were attributed to the environment. The presented environment, functions as a communication instrument with the possibility of up-and-downloading documents and assignments. All course outlines can be downloaded by students, it contains a place for announcements, assignments and provision of feedback on assignments.

A second element which concerns the didactical approach is the intercultural exchange and the achievement of intercultural competences. The programme aims to train students interculturally by the assignments and in the meetings. Students are expected to exchange knowledge on national social work policies and different cultural approaches towards social work. Staff members are trained to model intercultural exchange to the students. Most courses are organized by two staff members with a different nationality and the programme developed a staff-members’ buddy system: two members of staff from different partners/countries are linked to each other, reviewing each others’ modules.

During their study, the programme will contact the workplace of students.

**Staff**
The staff team consists of 33 persons of which 25 hold a doctorate degree and 4 are in the final phase of their Doctorate thesis. In addition, 2 lectors of Hanzehogeschool are aligned in the staff team and 17 staff members are full or associate professors. The aspired student/staff ratio is 1:18. Most staff members have professional experience at Social Work institutions and a part of the staff team is experienced in working in an international context. Besides, staff members were trained in several aspects. In 2009 all staff members trained

---

2 Professors at a University of Applied Sciences, with a special research assignment for the development of applied research in a specific area.
on the concept of blended learning. In 2010, staff members received instruction and training on intercultural competences. Another training session in 2011 addressed competence-based learning and assessment and peer review of the developed modules.

**Joint character and quality assurance**

All developed modules were reviewed by colleagues from various partners and by the members of the advisory board. Secondly, all modules were reviewed through the buddy system. A third review of the modules was performed by an educational expert, with specific attention for assessment.

All consortium partners have their own, internal quality assurance policy. On top of this, the partners of the consortium have developed their own quality assurance policy and plan specifically for the consortium activities. The evaluation instruments include student satisfaction surveys per block, panel discussions, alumni interviews, teaching staff interviews, meetings of the educational committee, surveys among the professional field, a yearly evaluation by the academic board and meetings of the advisory board. The academic board holds the responsibility for the quality of the programme.

The programme is not accredited in all participating countries. In Spain as well as in Germany the consortium partners hope for accreditation of the programme via a mutual recognition agreement of national accreditation organisations with the NVAO. In Lithuania and in Bulgaria the accreditation of the programme is prepared. In Denmark, the programme is presented by faculties with a tradition in social work at both University level and at the level of the University College. These are however not intending to get the programme accredited in Denmark.

**Considerations**

**Curriculum**

From the discussions during the site visit, the panel concludes that the programme is well-thought. The panel is positive about the sequence of the curriculum, with the core modules at the start and a focus on the thesis from the beginning of the second year. In addition, the literature is up-to-date and complies with the international standards. The programme uses standard works, handbooks and several articles in leading journals. The curriculum is coherent and addresses issues that are very relevant to the development of social work within a European context. The panel found that this part of the curriculum is of very good quality. The social work method elements were less strong but still sufficient.

The programme adequately teaches the general principles of qualitative and quantitative research in the core courses. Students learn how to develop a research plan and formulate a research question. The panel is less convinced with the follow-up of the research line throughout the elective courses. Students insufficiently get acquainted with various research methodologies at a deeper level. The panel strongly recommends the programme to redesign the research line throughout the electives with sufficient attention for the instruction of research methodologies.

**Intake and guidance of students**

The programme is tailored to professionals with work experience in various countries. The programme is sufficiently fit to serve the needs of two types of professionals, policy advisors and social workers. It effectively combines the experience and knowledge that both groups bring in. The panel remarks that the demand of two years’ working experience is low with regard to the senior level that students should have. The panel advises to raise the
demonstrated years of working experience and further explicate the criteria for the assessment of students' previous experiences. The panel wants to draw attention to the fact that with regard to research skills, there might be a wide gap among prospective students with a professional bachelor degree on the one hand and students with an academic master degree on the other.

The admission board is responsible for the quality of the workplace. In case the admission board doubts about the quality of the workplace, it can establish contact with the national professional board of each country, in order to verify the status of that workplace.

Guidance and thesis supervision
The panel is positive about the way the thesis supervision is arranged. The programme guarantees that at least two institutions will be involved in supervising a student. The panel is positive about the involvement of Hanze University in the thesis supervision. Since students will be likely to receive a degree from Hanze University as well, Hanze can be held accountable for the level of each final thesis. This procedure also adds to the joint character of the programme but also contains an extra insurance that the level of the thesis and the assessments thereof will be sufficiently coherent throughout the overall programme. With regard to the thesis, the panel suggests to the programme to explore opportunities to connect students whose research focuses on the same topic. This would also allow for comparison of a certain practice in two different countries. Such opportunities could be more than a platform on the digital learning environment, but could also include a final week in which all students attend each others' thesis defence.

Staff
The panel studied the cv's of all staff members involved. The academic level of the staff members satisfies the needs of this programme and the number of staff members is sufficient. Most staff members have relevant experience in the field although this is not very recent in most cases. The buddy system is a helpful instrument in establishing coherence. The provision of this system as well as the meetings and trainings that were held in order to establish the programme, show the enthusiasm of all staff members and their drive to succeed in the establishment of this programme. The panel advises the programme to cultivate this enthusiasm and develop joint research initiatives. The panel further remarks that the allotted time for supervision of the thesis might be insufficient and advises the programme to reconsider this.

Blended Learning and the Electronic Learning Environment
The concept of blended learning complies with the international and post-initial character of the programme. The panel is confident that the concept has sufficiently been thought through and that the programme will provide a structure which compensates the lack of face-to-face contacts with students and teachers, in comparison to a regular programme.

The panel was very positive about the website with the information about the programme. The structure and the information displayed provide a very clear presentation of the programme. The panel however was somewhat disappointed by the demonstration of the electronic learning environment. The basic arrangements were provided but the panel advises the programme to develop the electronic learning environment up to the level of its description.
Based on the description of the system and partly based on the demonstration, the panel is certain that by use of the Electronic Learning Environment students will sufficiently be challenged and monitored during the programme.

Quality assurance
Although the quality assurance of the Hanze Hogeschool has been reviewed during the institutional audit and the panel is therefore not required to assess the system, the panel indicates that the joint character of this programme and the number of partners involved, raises the importance of this aspect for the overall quality of the programme. The panel applauds the programme for the measures that were taken in the preparation of the programme. These not only testify of a quality culture, but also of the ability of the consortium to manage this and activate a well-thought formal system on top of it. The panel regrets that the national accreditation procedures are not perceived as being of added value to the programme and recommends the Consortium partners to strive for national recognition of the programme in each country.

Conclusion
Based on the quality of the staff, the prescribed literature and the overall content of the programme the panel is confident that the programme will attain the master-level. The panel strongly recommends the programme to develop a more structural approach towards teaching research methodologies. The panel assesses standard 2 'Teaching-learning environment' as satisfactory.

3.6 Assessment (standard 3)
The programme has an adequate assessment system in place.

Outline of findings
The assessment policies of the programme relate to the achievement of competences. This strategy has led to assessments that are developed throughout the programme and teachers were and will be trained in order to ensure the quality of the assessments and the harmonized approach.

The assessments methods used are several and include pre-session tasks, online peer editing/peer review, virtual learning environment activities, paper/essay, oral presentation, written exam, online test, portfolio, project assignment, interview and logbook. The criteria for each assessment are described in each course manual. The thesis will be assessed by staff from two different universities of which at least one from the Hanzehogeschool Groningen. At least one staff member holds a doctorate degree in order to secure the content level. In practice, many theses will be assessed by two staff members at Doctorate level. Thesis assessors will be appointed by the examination board.

The panel learned during the site visit that the examination board has to validate each thesis proposal before the student can begin to carry out his/her research. In addition, the thesis will be read by at least one member of the examination board and the grade given by the thesis assessors has to be approved by the examination board as well.
Considerations
The panel found that the system of control on the assessments is well-thought. The programme has developed useful methods to ensure that the content of the examinations is of the adequate level and sufficiently corresponds with the learning outcomes of each course. The responsibilities between each role and person are sufficiently clear.

The panel remarks that the assessment method ‘individual report’ lacks specified criteria and as such is insufficient to provide a solid judgement on the achieved competences. In addition, the panel questions the comprehensiveness of the assessment by the sole means of an individual report. The panel therefore advises the programme to specify the assessment criteria for this type of assessment and additionally consider the extension of assessments methods for courses in which the individual report is the only assessment method. In relation to this, the panel noticed that for courses with a similar structure and approach, several use the term portfolio and some others don’t. The panel advises the programme, for reasons of clarity, to use equal names for equal methods of assessment.

Besides these remarks, the panel finds the level of assessment and the validity of the assessments sufficiently coherent with the goals and aims of the programme. The assessment methods are apt to the didactical approach and sufficiently varied.

The panel had the opportunity to evaluate the thesis guide and study the assessment form. Prescriptions from the thesis guide address both form and content and are sufficiently coherent with the programme as a whole. The thesis comprises the assessment of all learning outcomes and as such matches the programme’s goals and objectives. The assessment form is a useful instrument for the assessment of students achievements.

Conclusion
The panel assesses standard 3 ‘Assessment’ as satisfactory.

3.7 Graduation guarantee and financial provisions (standard 4)

The institution guarantees students that they can complete the entire curriculum and makes sufficient financial provisions available.

Outline of findings
The development of the programme is supported by a grant of € 300.000 from the Lifelong Learning Programme of the European Commission. In addition, Hanze University granted € 55.000 from its central budget for strategic development. The envisaged minimum number of students is 30. The programme has set the tuition fee on € 9.432. This covers the cost per semester and at the same time allows the programme to enhance a grant system for which students will be able to apply. The terms and conditions of this grant system will be communicated to prospective students on the website of the programme.

Considerations
The panel finds that financial provisions sufficiently guarantee that all students who start the programme will be offered the opportunity to finish it. The panel is positive about the grant system and advises the programme to soon establish the terms and conditions under which students will be eligible to receive a grant.
Conclusion
The panel assesses standard 4 ‘Graduation guarantee and financial provisions’ as satisfactory.
4 Overview of the assessments

The panel presents its assessments per standard, as outlined in chapter 4, in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Intended learning outcomes</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Teaching-learning environment</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assessment</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Graduation guarantee and financial provisions</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1: Composition of the panel

Chair: Carla Frederiks
Carla Frederiks is emeritus professor of nursing science at the Radboud University in Nijmegen. She has been working as assistant and associate professor at the universities of Maastricht and Brussels before she became professor in Nijmegen in 1996. She wrote a thesis on care needs of and care facilities for elderly people, in which she inventoried subjects psychological and social problems of the research group. She is experienced in evaluation and accreditation of education in nursing and related sciences, both professional and university degrees. During her career, she was board member of several organisations in health care.

Member: Maria de Bie
Maria De Bie is professor in educational sciences at Ghent University. She received her a PhD in social and political sciences from Ghent University. Since 1974 she is engaged in research on educational and social work practices, with special interest on youth research and on social welfare rights. She has practical experience in the field of youth work, youth care and forensic social work. Actually, she is head of the Department of Social Welfare studies; this department is responsible for the research and teaching in social pedagogy and social work at Ghent university. She publishes regularly on social work themes, in scientific as well as in professional journals.

Member: Kersten Svensson
Kerstin Svensson is professor of Social Work at Lund University in Sweden. After working as a social worker for more than ten years she returned to Lund University and completed a PhD in Social Work. She then became teacher and researcher at Lund University, but has also taught at other universities in southern Sweden. She has published several textbooks and taught Social Work on every level, from the first semester in the Social Work Program via master to PhD. She is at present supervisor for five PhD students. Her focus in research is professionalism and organizations; this has been studied in several organizational settings, which includes prisons, probation, victim support, social services, police, schools and institutional care for drug abusers and for youth. Kerstin Svensson has always taken active part in cooperation between research and practice. In 2006-10 she was president for FORSA, a Swedish national organisation for development of exchange between research and practice in social work. She was appointed Docent in 2006 and Professor in 2010. Since 2009 she has been Head of School of Social Work at Lund University. She is a representative for the national network of Schools of social work in Sweden in national discussions about development of social work educations.

Member: Toine Smulders
Toine Smulders is a student in the Master programme of Healthcare Policy and Innovation Management at the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences at Maastricht University. He has a Bachelors degree in Health Sciences, and successfully completed the Honours Programme in Medical Education. Toine is an active student representative, he completed terms in the educational committee and board of examiners of his faculty, was chairman of the student council for over one year and a half, and currently is in his second term as student advisor to the board of educational directors and in his second term as
student advisor to the executive board of the Maastricht University Medical Centre. Next to this he participates in many other committees and taskforces, such as the facultry complaint committee, student-capacity taskforce and the jury for the annual Maastricht University-employee award.
Annex 2: Schedule of the site visit

The panel undertook a site visit on 12 February as part of the external assessment procedure regarding the European Master in Social Work at Hanze University of Applied Sciences.

Site visit programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.15</td>
<td>reception / preparatory meeting panel</td>
<td>Marian van Os (NL), Michele Garnier (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>session 1 meeting with institutional management</td>
<td>Marian van Os (NL), Michele Garnier (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.30</td>
<td>panel meeting (confidential)</td>
<td>Alice Rasmussen (DK), Bert Gijsbers (NL),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornelia Kricheldorff (D), Jolita Buzaytyte-Kasalyniene (Lt), Michele Garnier (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>panel meeting (confidential)</td>
<td>Alice Rasmussen (DK), Bert Gijsbers (NL),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornelia Kricheldorff (D), Jolita Buzaytyte-Kasalyniene (Lt), Michele Garnier (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>meeting with representatives work field</td>
<td>Anke Beuck (DK), Audrone Vareikyte (Lt), Eddie van Hierden (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>session 3 meeting with representatives work field</td>
<td>Anke Beuck (DK), Audrone Vareikyte (Lt), Eddie van Hierden (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>Meeting with (prospective) members of examining board and programme committee</td>
<td>Maria Luisa Gomez Jimenez (ES), Jolanda Kroes (NL), Romas Lazutka (Lt), Marion Troia (NL), Nausikaa Schirilla (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>panel meeting, lunch (confidential)</td>
<td>Maria Luisa Gomez Jimenez (ES), Jolanda Kroes (NL), Romas Lazutka (Lt), Marion Troia (NL), Nausikaa Schirilla (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>tour of the facilities including demonstration of digital learning environment and website, Skype conference with Bulgaria</td>
<td>Zwetelina Gankova Ivanova (Bg)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>session 5 meeting with lecturers</td>
<td>Ana Lopez (ES), Ida Skytte Jacobsen (DK),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacqueliien Rothfusz (NL), Laimute Zalimiene (Lt), Louis Polstra (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>panel meeting (confidential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>session 6 second meeting with programme</td>
<td>Alice Rasmussen (DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>management (optional)</td>
<td>Bert Gijsbers (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornelia Kricheldorff (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jolita Buzaytyte-Kasalyniene (Lt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michele Garnier (NL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>panel meeting (confidential)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>presentation of initial findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Documents reviewed

Programme documents presented by the institution
- Information dossier
- Subject-specific frame of reference framework and the learning outcomes of the programme
- European Master in Social Work – a Sketch for a vision
- The Consortium of Universities
- Needs Analysis
- Curriculum Overview
- Outline of description of the curriculum components
- Body of knowledge European Master in Social Work
- Teaching and examination regulations
- Overview of allocated staff
- The buddy system
- Steering group, overall coordination, external advisory board
- Overview of contacts maintained with the professional field
- Approval of Progress Report Erasmus Programme EMSW
- Information about accreditation of the programme at Consortium Partners
- Organisational Chart of the Curriculum
- Guarantee letter Thesis Approval Hanze University
- Croho-domain

Documents made available during the site visit
- Course descriptions of all courses
- Thesis Manual
Annex 4: Learning Outcomes

Generic Competences

Cooperate internationally:
The graduate is able to cooperate in new or unfamiliar environments, inside and outside its own organisation in an intercultural and international context.

Practice oriented research:
The graduate is able to use a range of methods and techniques of practice oriented research and knows how to apply them in an effective manner. The graduate is able to justify his/her policy advice of proposals based on valid judgements derived from evaluations and/or research results.

Innovate:
The graduate is able to carry out assignments for organisations based on disciplinary expertise in relation to developing, introducing and implementing innovations such as new products, programmes for new target groups and new methods. The graduate arrives at answers for local problems using knowledge from the European environment. The graduate is able to track, creatively translate, develop and introduce relevant national and international trends, policies, practices and social concepts so that the quality of professional practices can be improved.

Professionalize:
The graduate is able to develop professional knowledge, skills and attitudes, based on incomplete or limited information, including reflecting on social and ethical responsibilities. The graduate is able to integrate personal achievements successful in the organisation. The graduate can also improve the own competences and use them for the benefit of colleagues and the organisation. The graduate’s professional practice connects to the current and anticipated developments. The graduate can systematically transfer personal expertise and vision to colleagues and other experts in the professional field.

Specific Domain Competences

Diagnose:
The graduate is able to adequately identify and analyse complex problems of client groups in relation to the social environment and in the context of social trends/developments in Europe.

Evaluate:
The graduate is able to evaluate quality, efficiency and effectiveness of measures based on a thorough knowledge of methods and methodologies. The graduate is able to evaluate national and international developments in different types of organisations at distinct levels.

Manage:
The graduate is able to cooperate in a planned, policy and project oriented manner in a multidisciplinary environment for a variety of organisations, both local and international, so that solution strategies are developed and carried out efficiently, effectively and responsibly.
Advise:
The graduate is able to advise on how to improve and enhance the quality of optimal professional practice in both a national and an international context.

Intervene:
The graduate is able to intervene in complex problem situations of new or unfamiliar client groups in relation to the social environment and in the context of social trends / developments in Europe.
The panel report has been ordered by NVAO for the initial accreditation of the programme European Master in Social Work of Hanze University of Applied Sciences.
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