



ASSESSMENT REPORT

Limited programme accreditation assessment
&
Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation

European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy

Academic Masters programme
Part-time

Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences

**De kracht van
kennis.**

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Limited programme accreditation assessment
&
Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation

European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy

Academic Masters programme
Part-time

Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences

Croho registration: 69312

Hobéon Certificering BV
Dated: 17 December 2015

Audit Committee

Drs. W.G. van Raaijen, chair
Prof. dr. H.J. Polatajko-Howell, PhD
Dr. S. Kantartzis, PhD
M. Pekkanen

Secretary / co-ordinator

H.R. van der Made

CONTENTS

PART I - LIMITED ACCREDITATION ASSESSMENT	1
1. GENERAL AND QUANTITATIVE DATA	3
2. SUMMARY	5
3. INTRODUCTION	9
4. FINDINGS AND JUDGEMENTS	11
4.1. STANDARD 1: Intended learning outcomes	11
4.2. STANDARD 2: Teaching and Learning Environment	13
4.3. STANDARD 3: Assessment	21
4.4. STANDARD 4: Achieved Learning Outcomes	24
5. OVERALL CONCLUSION ACCREDITATION ASSESSMENT	27
PART II - DISTINCTIVE QUALITY FEATURE INTERNATIONALISATION	29
6. DISTINCTIVE QUALITY FEATURE INTERNATIONALISATION	31
6.1. CONCLUSIONS	31
6.2. FINDING AND JUDGMENTS	32
6.2.1. STANDARD 1: Intended internationalisation	32
6.2.2. STANDARD 2: international and intercultural learning	35
6.2.3. STANDARD 3: teaching and learning	37
6.2.4. STANDARD 4: staff	39
6.2.5. STANDARD 5: students	40
6.3. OVERALL JUDGEMENT	42
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	43
ANNEXES	45
ANNEX I Overview of judgements	47
ANNEX II The intended learning outcomes of the course	49
ANNEX III Overview of the Masters programme	51
ANNEX IV Programme of site-visit	53
ANNEX V Documents examined	57
ANNEX VI Composition of the audit panel	59

PART I - Limited Accreditation Assessment

1. GENERAL AND QUANTITATIVE DATA

General data

Institution

Name	Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences
Status	Publicly funded
Outcomes of Institutional Quality Assessment	Positive, 2013

Programme

Name of programme in Central Register of Higher Professional Education (CROHO)	European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy
ISAT-code CROHO	69312
Orientation and level	Academic Master's programme
Domain	Health
Number of credits	90EC
Variant(s)	N.A.
Eventual new name	N.A.
Specialisations	N.A.
Potential new specialisations	N.A.
Location(s)	Amsterdam (NL), Eastbourne (UK), Naestved (DK), Winterthur (CH) and Stockholm (S)
Special Quality Feature	Internationalisation

<i>Date and location of site-visit</i>	26 August 2015, Winterthur, Switzerland
<i>Contact person (name and e-mail address)</i>	M.J. (Margo) van Hartingsveldt, PhD OT m.j.van.hartingsveldt@hva.nl

Quantitative data

Cohort	11-2010	12-2011	13-2012	2013	14-2014	15-2015
▪ Number of students	17	10	13	-	17	21
Drop outs						
Cohort	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
▪ Percentage	18%	18%	4%	6%	10%	15%
Output (nominal + 1 year)						
Cohort	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
▪ Output	82%	82%	96%	88%	90%	46%
Teacher quality						
Qualification				Master	PhD.	
▪ Percentage				27%	73%	
Teacher – student ratio						
▪ Ratio	1 : 27					
Contact hours						
▪ Year of study				1	2	
▪ Hours per years				320	52	

Source: Critical Reflection Report from Academic Masters in Occupational Therapy, based on NVAO's data format for programme assessments: Indicators and definitions, 11 September 2012.

2. SUMMARY

In this chapter the key findings and judgements of the audit committee are presented, as well as the main recommendations for improvement of the programme, the overall outcome of the assessment and the panel recommendation to the NVAO.

Standard 1. Intended Learning Outcomes

The panel has established that the intended learning outcomes of the course are clearly based on and fit within contemporary European standards and guidelines. The clear articulation of progression in levels of understanding and academic reasoning using the SOLO taxonomy is to be recommended. The active role of staff in the ENOTHE Master Project Group is commended, as ensuring not only that the programme's learning outcomes are comparable with existing international requirements (and will continue to do so), but also that the programme will be actively contributing to future developments in Master's education across Europe.

The panel would suggest reconsidering the language used to express the four competences within the Knowledge and Understanding area (see Appendix I). They may not accurately reflect the Dublin Descriptors for Masters in terms of 'extending' or 'enhancing' knowledge and understanding, together with 'originality in developing and/or applying ideas'.

In summary, the panel considers the intended learning outcomes of the course relevant with regard to content, level and orientation. They lend a solid academic profile to the course, tie in with international standards and provide direction to the curriculum.

The panel therefore considers Standard 1 to be 'good'

Standard 2. Teaching and Learning Environment

The learning environment with the carousel design, opportunities to study in five European countries, with staff and students from multiple nationalities, is innovative and original. The programme is coherent, prepares students to achieve all of the intended learning outcomes and is executed on the basis of a solid educational concept that appears to work effectively in practice.

For further improvement the panel presents a few suggestions with regard to safeguarding at all times of depth of critical thinking.

Many of the staff are well-established researchers and this combined with the curriculum structure and learning activities, offers a stimulating, challenging and international learning environment, to which each student can bring their own professional experiences and interests. Research is strongly integrated throughout; the further inclusion of guest lectures to present current research and the format of the final thesis as a manuscript for potential publication are particularly recommended.

The services and facilities for the programme are very much appreciated by the students and meet the standards one should expect at the academic Masters level.

Weighing up all of the above the panel rates Standard 2 as 'good'

Standard 3. Learning Assessment System

The panel established that the assessment process is transparent and coherent. Assessments clearly address the required competences for each module and level of study, leading to the development of Master level competence. Considerable formative assessment is available, which together with self-assessment and summative assignments, offer ongoing, individualised feedback identifying student's learning needs as well as their achievements.

There is evidence of ongoing development of quality processes. The panel considers it particularly important that the Examination Board has been enhanced and is now in the process of reviewing all module assignments. Also, the panel appreciates the introduction of a marking grid for each module. The panel found evidence of the ongoing alignment of marking across examiners and staff.

The panel applauds the upcoming introduction of a system to detect plagiarism and would like to see it implemented in the near future.

Overall, the panel was convinced that the assessment system of the course is solid. Still a few suggestions for improvement remain, such as the alignment of assessments of the research modules, a more discriminatory marking system and a few alterations with regard to the graduation assessment with regard to internationalisation and the oral presentation.

In striking the balance the panel's judgement on Standard 3 reads 'good'.

Standard 4. Learning outcomes achieved

The panel is extremely satisfied with the increasing number of international and national publications as well as conference presentations, all developed from final thesis work. The panel thinks this is exceptionally good. A substantial number of graduates have been accepted in PhD programmes in a variety of countries and educational systems. Employers report enhanced competence of graduates. The theses examined demonstrate that the required Masters level has been achieved throughout, albeit more in some than others.

The panel therefore rates Standard 4 as 'excellent'.

Overall conclusion:

The consortium is to be commended for this pioneering programme that continues, for over 15 years, to offer a high standard of education at an academic Master's level to an international group of students. It demonstrates implementation of European policy with respect to internationalisation and the mobility of higher education staff and students, and thereby potentially of the work force.

The panel noted a solid quality culture. This is the more praiseworthy for a programme run in five different locations by a consortium of countries. Staff, students and management appear to 'live' the programme resulting in continuous feedback from staff and students, and the consequent quality enhancement.

With a 'good' for Standards 1, 2 and 3, and an 'excellent' for Standard 4, the panel awards the European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy with its overall judgement 'good'.

The panel recommends the NVAO to accredit the programme for another period of six years.

The Hague, 17 December 2015

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several loops and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Drs. W.G. van Raaijen,
chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, featuring a large, stylized initial 'H' followed by a long, sweeping horizontal line.

H.R. van der Made,
secretary /coordinator

3. INTRODUCTION

In this Chapter a brief introduction to the course is given, its position within the faculty/institution and the relevant historic and contextual information on the course is shared. A conclusive paragraph is dedicated to the key developments that have taken place in the wake of previous accreditation and/or internal audits.

Characteristics of the programme

The European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy (OT-Euro Master) was developed in the mid-1990s. It was one of the first discipline specific, post-qualification master programmes in Europe.

In 2004, the OT-Euro Master was the first Master of Science to be delivered in a University of Applied Sciences in The Netherlands. The programme was designed to implement European policy which promotes inter-cultural dialogue and the mobility of faculty, students and knowledge across borders.

The OT-Euro Master of Science is offered by a trans-national consortium. It is accredited in the Netherlands and approved in Switzerland. The consortium comprises the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (AUAS), the Netherlands; the University College Sjælland, Denmark; the University of Brighton, United Kingdom; the Karolinska Institutet, Sweden and the Zürich University of Applied Sciences (ZHAW), Switzerland.

Degree awarding power is held by the AUAS. In June 2013, ZHAW received approval from the Swiss State Secretariat for Education, Research and Education (SERI) to offer this programme to Swiss resident students. This development resulted in Swiss resident students being (i) registered at ZHAW additionally to the registration at AUAS; (ii) awarded the degree Europäischer Master of Science ZFH in Ergotherapie from ZHAW, in addition to the OT-Euro Master of Science degree from the AUAS; and (iii) subsidised by the Swiss government for their semester fees. Irrespective of module and location, students and staff experience one single programme and organisational structure.

The OT-Euro Master comprises a two-year, part-time programme of 90 EC (European Credits) consisting of six modules. Five modules (of 12 EC each) are hosted by the partner organisations which means that students study in five European countries. The final module, the research project (30 EC), is conducted in the student's own country with distance supervision.

Previous programme assessments

In 2009-2010 the OT-Euro Master was accredited by the NVAO and, a few month later awarded the Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation (DQFI). In the wake of these audits some recommendations for improvement were implemented. The previously suggested improvements are listed below.

Among other things, the previous panel recommended (i) to incorporate in its learning objectives the significant effects of OT practice on health and labour participation, (ii) to have the Examination Board structurally monitor and analyse the quality of graduates' theses in order to better safeguard the level achieved, (iii) to revise the graduation trajectory with regard to students' reflections, the encouragement to publish their research results, putting more focus in their work on OT's position in their respective countries and how to intervene in order to assure OT's position in the changing health systems and (iv) more feedback from the supervisors on the latter issue. Moreover, the former panel suggested to improve the availability of hard copy core texts at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences.

When granting the Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation (DQFI) in 2010, the panel made the following recommendations: (i) more English language training for staff, (ii) reinforcement of student recruitment so as to enable the composition of groups of at least 20 to 25 students and (iii) the improvement of assessment procedures to safeguard the obtained level.

The present panel has taken into account the recommendations made by the previous auditors and considered the implementation of them as part of the current audit. In general, the panel observed that the course has taken to heart many of the recommendations from the past. Findings, conclusions and judgements will be specified under the respective Standards in Chapter 4 of this report and the separate part on the DQFI assessment.

Stand alone audit

MOT's unique profile and position in the Netherlands did not qualify the programme for a so-called cluster visitation, introduced in 2015 as an element of the revised Dutch accreditation system. Therefore the MOT was assessed as a 'stand alone' programme.

Two assessments-in-one

In this report the findings, considerations and judgements of the panel are laid down for both NVAO's Limited Programme Assessment and ECA's Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation. Therefore this report comprises two parts: one of which deals with NVAO's criteria for limited programme assessments, whilst the other one presents the panel's findings, considerations and judgements with regard to the ECA framework for the assessment of the Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation.

To avoid repetition, the DQFI part of the report sometimes refers back to previous paragraphs from the limited programme assessment whenever the aspect of internationalisation for any particular criterion has already been covered under the related NVAO standard.

4. FINDINGS AND JUDGEMENTS

This chapter deals with the findings and judgements of the audit committee based on the documents delivered by the course staff and the subsequent discussions during the site-visit. The text is ordered according to the four standards of the applicable NVAO assessment framework.

4.1. STANDARD 1: 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.

Explanation: As for level (Masters) and orientation (academic), the intended learning outcomes fit into the Dutch qualifications framework. In addition, they tie in with the international perspective of the requirements currently set by the professional field and the discipline with regard to the contents of the programme. Insofar as is applicable, the intended learning outcomes are in accordance with relevant legislation and regulations.

Findings

The programme aims to reach in-depth, disciplinary knowledge in occupational therapy (OT) and occupational science (OS). The latter focuses on participation and the everyday life of humans in general, the former on the application of this knowledge to promote health and wellbeing. Both are intertwined.

Scope of the intended learning outcomes

The objectives of the course relate to furthering knowledge about human occupation within different cultures and societies, deepening understanding of research and evidence-based practice, increasing knowledge about national, European and international health and welfare policies, strengthening professional identity and understanding of contemporary occupational therapy practice in different cultural contexts; and fostering autonomous life-long learning.

The 20 competences of the course were derived from the objectives as stated above. The competences combine the Dublin Descriptors with the Structured Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) taxonomy (Biggs & Tank, 2007). The latter is used to make explicit the progression in academic reasoning that the students are expected to achieve in each of the six modules to attain the academic Masters level. The five areas of the level-indicators (knowledge and understanding, applying knowledge and understanding, making judgments, communication and learning skills) have been integrated with the three highest levels of the SOLO taxonomy (Multi-structural, Relational, Extended Abstract).

Orientation and level

The intended learning outcomes are expressed as competences in a competency based framework that describes the level, content and orientation of the programme. The programme applied European academic standards as the point of departure for the intended Masters level. These standards are the Dublin Descriptors for higher education in Europe (2005) and the Tuning Report describing disciplinary competences for Occupational Therapy (2008). The Dublin Descriptors indicate the level requirements from academia and the Tuning report sets the standards with regard to content and orientation, as required by the professional field.

Research and internationalisation

The panel established that both aspects of research and internationalisation have been incorporated in the intended learning outcomes (see Appendix I). Also, these topics have been addressed in a way that reflects the intended Masters level as indicated by the Dublin Descriptors for academic programmes.

Validation

The intended learning outcomes of the course (see Appendix I) have been developed with consideration of the Tuning report outlined by a broad representation of OT professionals gathered in the European Network of Occupational Therapy in Higher Education (ENOTHE). The panel appreciates the fact that MOT staff play an active role within the ENOTHE. Moreover, the panel found good evidence that the programme and its objectives are being reviewed on a regular basis by both the Advisory Committee and the Board. This emerged from (i) the audit discussion with some of the Advisory Committee members, (ii) as well as from the minutes of their meetings and (iii) the Board Policy document, which had recently been updated in November 2014.

Considerations and Judgement

The panel established that the intended learning outcomes of the course are clearly based on and fit within contemporary European standards and guidelines. The clear articulation of progression in levels of understanding and academic reasoning using the SOLO taxonomy is to be recommended. The active role of staff in the ENOTHE Master Project Group is commended, as ensuring not only that the programme's learning outcomes are comparable with existing international requirements, and will continue to do so, but also that the programme will be actively contributing to future developments in Master's education across Europe.

The panel would suggest reconsidering the language used to express the four competences within the Knowledge and Understanding area (see Appendix I). They may not accurately reflect the Dublin Descriptors for Masters in terms of 'extending' or 'enhancing' knowledge and understanding, together with 'originality in developing and/or applying ideas'.

In summary, the panel considers the intended learning outcomes of the course relevant with regard to content, level and orientation. They lend a solid academic profile to the course, tie in with international standards and provide direction to the curriculum.

On the basis of these considerations the panel considers Standard 1 to be 'good'

4.2. STANDARD 2: Teaching and Learning Environment

Standard 2: The curriculum, staff and programme-specific services and facilities enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Explanation: The contents and structure of the curriculum enable the students admitted to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The quality of the staff and of the programme-specific services and facilities is essential to that end. Curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitute a coherent teaching-learning environment for the students.

Findings

The panel evaluated this standard on the basis of a number of key documents with regard to curriculum and faculty, the audit discussions with staff, students and alumni in particular, and the assessment of course materials.

Admission

The panel noted that the admission requirements are described in the application information on the website and in the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) 2015. They include an English language test (required level IELTS 6.5). Students submit a letter of motivation and are required to possess a Bachelor of Science in Occupational Therapy or equivalent. From the minutes of Examination Board meetings, it became clear that the programme management administers the admissions, seeking advice from the Examination Board (EB) about portfolios, submitted as evidence of equivalence to a BSc in Occupational Therapy. The panel believes the course has adopted a thorough admission procedure.

In this context, and given the current economic climate, together with the real life challenges of part-time study, the panel believes it would be useful to consider the current pace of study of the programme, in order to improve the attractiveness of the programme to potential students. The current recommendation of 28 hours of study per week over 25 months is challenging and has been achieved by 60% of the students. Given the increased attention to flexible learning in terms of pace, place and mode as important elements of MSc programmes, consider: (i) stipulating a maximum time frame for studies (e.g. 6 or 7 years is not unusual as a maximum study period for part time MSc studies), or, indicate that the final thesis may be completed over an extended period and (ii) promoting registration for single modules.

Programme

Design of curriculum

The curriculum has a weight of 90EC and consists of six modules, five of which have a study load of 12 EC: the final module in which students deliver their research project has a study load of 30 EC.

The curriculum is described by the course management as 'a carousel' because students take each module in a different European partner country. This is certainly a key-element of the international characteristics of the programme and the panel commends the staff for this implicit internationalisation feature, which – so it appeared in the audit – is highly appreciated by the students and staff alike.

The first five modules are hosted by the partner organisations and students study and live in Eastbourne (GB), Amsterdam (NL), Winterthur (CH), Naestved (DK) and Stockholm (S) respectively. The final module, the research project, is conducted in the student's own country.

The modular curriculum is shown in the annex II to this report. For students the disciplinary and scientific content of each module is summarised in the Student Handbook.

With regard to the levels of progression, in the first module students show their competence on the multi-structural level where they describe, list, and combine knowledge. In modules 2, 3 and 4 students show their mastery of the competences on the relational level where they compare/contrast, explain causes, analyse, relate, and apply knowledge. In modules 5 and 6 students demonstrate to have attained the competences on extended abstract level where they theorize, generalize, hypothesize, and reflect.

With reference to what the panel already suggested under Standard 1, it would be recommended not just to indicate the levels of progression in a table, but also to link this table directly to the learning objectives of the courses by using the equivalent terminology from the SOLO Taxonomy.

From the documentation provided by the programme staff, it becomes clear that the curriculum is regularly reviewed and improved. In January 2010 the curriculum was enhanced and now has six rather than five modules. Quantitative and qualitative research methods in relation to occupation were addressed in two, rather than one module. Also, the thesis module was divided into two, to provide in-depth preparation of the research plan, before conducting the research in the final module. More recently, in 2014, the order of the first four modules was changed, to place the research method modules earlier, so as to form the basis for the development of the students' research ideas, providing a better foundation for the research plan and thesis. The panel commends the staff for these valuable changes that contribute to an improved preparation for students' final theses.

Feedback questionnaires from students and alumni show significant differences between graduates who studied the two curricula, in favour of those who studied the enhanced curriculum. Almost half the recent graduates (12/25) self-rated their command of competences more highly with regard to Knowledge and Understanding, Applying Knowledge and Understanding, Making Judgements and Communication. The staff sees this – and rightly so – as a support for the changes to the curriculum. In terms of cohesion, students declare that lecturers clearly build on and refer to each other's modules.

Educational concept and philosophy

Problem-Based Learning (PBL), constructive alignment and student-centred learning are considered the hallmarks of the programme. Throughout the curriculum class work is combined with distance learning. From the Student Handbook it is clear that a variety of teaching methods are used, including group work, lectures, workshops, practical exercises and Learning Groups (LG). The Learning Groups are peer-led and are composed of students from different countries. Students are encouraged to meet during the modules and use digital resources such as Yammer and the Digital Learning and Work Environment (DLWE). The aim is to create a supportive peer community giving constructive feedback on students' evolving research ideas, helping them to design their research framework and, finally, to conduct it. From what students and staff say in the audit the programme appears to realize this goal.

The education methods, particularly Problem-Based Learning are introduced in the first module. The PBL-groups, facilitated by a tutor, work with triggers that are formed according to the learning outcomes for each module. Students are assigned an individual supervisor for each module and are entitled to consult them three times in modules 1 to 4; and a total of eight times (12 hours) during modules 5 and 6 (also refer to 'services and facilities'). To the panel a specified number of hours for consultation seems counter-intuitive for the thesis process and it suggests reconsidering or rationalising this.

The panel concludes that the programme is executed on the basis of a well-thought out educational concept that appears to work effectively in practice.

Structure of the programme

Each module comprises two or three phases. In modules 1 to 4 these phases and the workload are:

1. *Preparatory work* when students carry out tasks related to the intended learning outcomes, in their own country. If needed, students receive guidance from module coordinators by e-mail. Workload: 56 hours.
2. *Class work and learning groups* in which students meet. This phase lasts 10 working days and includes PBL groups, workshops and seminars at the hosting universities. Approximately 80 contact hours.
3. *Independent study* in students' own country where they complete the module assignment. Students receive individual supervision and use the online learning environment. This phase finishes with a summative examination of the assignment. Workload: 200 hours.

In modules 5 and 6, students work under supervision on their research plan in their home countries, supporting each other by reviewing their work in Learning Groups at a distance. The class work in module 5, which lasts 5 working days, includes tailored master classes about research methodologies and lectures/seminars about research topics.

There is a summative examination of the written research plan and the oral presentation which includes acting as an opponent for a peer's proposal. In module 6, students work under supervision on their research project and write the thesis. The module concludes with a summative examination of the written thesis and a formative examination of the oral presentation.

The panel finds the design of the programme logical and cohesive.

Disciplinary knowledge

The knowledge base for the course is derived from the Tuning report and the learning outcomes about occupation and participation on micro-, meso-, and macro-levels are addressed from the start, with the pre-course work for module 1. Students are assigned a pre-course task to reflect on OT within their own country. Module 1 continues at micro and meso-levels regarding basic concepts of the occupational nature of humans. Next, in module 2 the subjective experiences of meaning, diversity and culture (micro/meso level) are explored. In module 3 occupational performance in groups and populations (meso/macro level) is considered. Then, in module 4 the socio-cultural level is addressed on the macro level using selected concepts from OS (i.e. occupational justice, occupational deprivation) and other interdisciplinary knowledge such as sociology and anthropology.

The panel reviewed both compulsory and recommended literature and concluded that the literature being used is topical and relevant for an academic Masters course in OT.

Scientific knowledge

Within the course disciplinary knowledge is intertwined with scientific knowledge. For instance, the learning outcomes in module 1 focus on epistemology, ontology, ethics and qualitative and quantitative traditions in research. Module 2 addresses qualitative research methods; module 3 concentrates on quantitative methods and module 4 on scientific and theoretical argumentation.

Disciplinary and the scientific learning outcomes are integral to each module. Theoretical and empirical articles from the discipline are used plus practical experience. For example, a small-scale qualitative study on the influence of culture and diversity on occupation is conducted on a joint topic with a fellow student in module 2. Students practice the whole process, from reviewing the literature, conducting interviews, coding using software, then interpreting and reporting the findings, including a comparison with the findings of the fellow student.

In modules 5 and 6 disciplinary and scientific knowledge continue to merge. In module 5 the final assignment is a research plan. Students are expected to apply their learning from earlier modules. This includes identifying a knowledge gap within the discipline, relating this gap to relevant concepts from within the discipline, selecting an appropriate research design and method for collecting, analysing and collating data.

In module 6 the research plan is put into reality in a research project. Students collect, interpret, and analyse data and are supposed to critically discuss the results and method, including the implications for practice in their national setting and then disseminate the findings at a public seminar.

The panel welcomes the scientific content and approach of the course; the panel members believe the scientific content ties in well with the targeted academic Masters level. At the same time, the panel would like to see that depth of critical thinking is evident in all student assignments.

Alignment of learning objectives and learning outcomes

As part of the audit, the panel reviewed the learning objectives of each module, formulated in terms of 'demonstrated competences'. The last module, module six, culminates in the final qualifications of the course, which means that in doing the research project the graduate has to demonstrate all of the intended learning outcomes.

The panel concluded that the learning objectives of all of the modules fully cover the scope of the intended learning outcomes of the course.

Research

The panel members commend the staff for the way in which research has been made an integral part of the curriculum. From the start of the course research is integrated into each module to develop methodological knowledge, to promote evidence-based practice and encourage students to explore their research interests.

A provided overview of recent contacts of partners with world-wide research practices shows that all partner institutions are active in research projects. Methods and outcomes of each partner's research activities are used in the teaching modules. In the audit students confirm that they are exposed to research from the start, through class work and the Learning Group. For example, to connect students to ongoing research and stimulate ideas a "research dating" session is organised in the first module. The panel welcomes the initiative to invite prominent occupational therapy researchers with a national and international reputation to contribute as guest lecturers and to inspire students with new ideas.

To encourage the students to enter the world of science, the format of the thesis is a manuscript for publication, following targeted journals guidelines. To produce a publishable Masters thesis is an important scientific quality criterion for the programme. Although the staff is of the opinion that publication in scientific and professional journals goes beyond the limits of the programme, at the time of the audit a respectable number of over 50 graduates have done so, which is more than one third of the graduates so far.

The programme's own annual evaluations show that on a five point scale students rate most aspects of the programme as good, very good or excellent. Particularly statements like 'the programme was essential for the development of my competences as described in the study guide', 'the curriculum stimulated the acquisition of research skills' and 'it enhanced my knowledge of the concept of human occupation' gained high scores.

The panel was impressed by the way research had been interwoven into the programme, thus facilitating students to deliver work that is Master's worthy (see Standard 4). At the same time, the panel would suggest that the staff consider incorporating a greater emphasis on critical thinking, particularly in two key areas for this programme: knowledge of occupation/occupational therapy and scientific enquiry.

Staff

Composition

The core staff is made up of 22 faculty from universities in five European countries. All core staff members are employed by, and subject to, the personnel policies of their home institutions. The Programme Management Team are supported by a secretary and other non-teaching staff at the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (AUAS). The staff student ratio for 2014 was 1:27. On the basis of these figures and the panel discussions with faculty and students, the latter showing great satisfaction with the number and quality of staff available, the audit panel concludes that both the quantity of staff and their quality is excellent.

Quality

As part of the audit the panel also reviewed the resumes of faculty and concluded that they demonstrate a broad, varied experience. All have relevant professional knowledge and experience in the field of occupational therapy and they are embedded in the research programmes of their home institutions. Most faculty hold a PhD, four are PhD-students and three hold a Masters degree.

As for students, a 6.5 band score on the academic IELTS test is considered a prerequisite for all teaching staff. Although in the audit no students expressed any concerns about lecturers' command of English, the panel would think a 7.5 band score (which equals in between C1 and C2 level within the CEFR, Common European Framework of Reference for Language Levels) for faculty would be more appropriate and in tune with the overall ambitions of this Masters course.

From their resumes it can be seen that all lecturers are experienced educators. An overview of staff qualifications provided by the programme management certifies that more than half (13 out of 22) possess additional teaching and assessment qualifications. Many are researchers with international reputations, leading grant funded programmes and with extensive experience of PhD supervision and examination. Some received national awards for their contribution to research and education, and others worked for national, professional organisations, adding a policy perspective.

Also, many contribute to national Masters programmes. A third of the faculty is composed of alumni, serving as role models for current students and supporting succession planning.

The panel would recommend a more substantial inclusion of guest lectures to present current research and would suggest to consider the skill set of the staff group as a whole to identify areas where the current group may have less expertise and to take this into account in future staff recruitment.

The students on the auditee panel suggested that the staff group may be predominantly engaged in qualitative research which may in part account for the limited number of theses using quantitative designs (see standard 4).

With regard to staff development each of the participating institutions is responsible for *'funding the necessary (inter-)institutional staff development in order to support the programme'* as stated in the Memorandum of Cooperation. The budget allows a team member to attend the four staff meetings held each year. During the audit the lecturers with whom the panel spoke had all participated in these staff meetings. The Staff Development Plan (2015-2018) that was provided during the audit outlines the arrangements for the induction of new staff and regular workshops to enhance the programme.

Following on from this, whilst acknowledging the diversity in experience and research, the panel noticed that the staff team have made strong efforts to ground the programme in the same pedagogical structure (PBL) through all the modules. It appeared that to this effect pedagogical workshops, discussions/seminars regarding teaching and assessment are regularly held at the staff meetings. As a recent result of these discussions staff-led Action Learning Groups were altered into student-led Learning Groups in 2014, which the panel considers very appropriate for a Masters course.

Also, in January 2015, the Examination Board and staff participated in a training day with an AUAS examination expert in order to support the faculty in its transition to the AUAS policies and procedures as a consequence of altered legislation (WHW) in the Netherlands. Among other things, this training resulted in the consideration if, and how examiners will gain the AUAS Basic Examiner (BKE) and Senior Examiner (SKE) certification or any alternative qualification. The panel is strongly favours the realization of these intentions.

Services and facilities

During the site visit at the Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Winterthur, Switzerland, the panel members observed the available services and facilities at this particular institute. Also an overview was delivered of the available facilities at each of the five participating Universities. Moreover, the panel reviewed the online resources and discussed with the students their experiences with the quality of the services and facilities provided in the various locations.

Programme-specific services and facilities

The Memorandum of Cooperation (2014) between the five partner institutions states that all students have equal access to the facilities at each partner organisation when attending the relevant module. Of course, these facilities vary between the institutions, but as students put it: they all meet the requirements for this Masters study.

Students have full access to the on-line libraries at the Universities of Brighton and Amsterdam. From these on-line libraries students browse through relevant databases, e-books and full text articles from the start of their study. The Memorandum of Co-operation ensures that they gain access to each library with their international collections and specialist librarians. The panel agrees with the course management that access to these type of resources is vital, not only for an academic Masters programme, but also because searching and working with literature is a key part of the PBL method.

The Administrative Office at the Amsterdam location is the first port of call for students. In the audit students confirmed that the programme is coordinated by this central office. It is managed by the two Directors with the support of a part-time secretary. The Programme Management handles the complex range of services required by an international programme, such as support for visa applications. In the audit students expressed their satisfaction about the services provided in this field; regular evaluations further confirm these observations.

For the exchange of information and the discussions between students and between students and their lecturers two digital resources are available: the DLWE and Yammer were both implemented only recently, in 2014-2015. In reviewing these digital platforms, the panel noticed up-to-date programme and module information on the DLWE as well as the course assignments. Yammer, as a closed social network is linked to the DLWE and used for social conversations, to share information and have discussions within the Learning Groups. All students also have access to Eduroam wifi.

Provision of programme-specific information

Lately, there has been a considerable investment in the on-line resources with the introduction of the Digital Learning and Work Environment and Yammer. This resulted in positive feedback from students. In addition, faculty are further developing blended e-learning by exploring how to use digital resources to foster learning, for example, by integrating peer review in the DLWE. The panel appreciates this development.

Accommodation

Students are self-supporting when it comes to organising their accommodation for the period abroad. Information about affordable accommodation is included in the module guides and shared between students. In 2015, students are using Yammer to share up-to-date information. It appears that students spend a lot of time on their search for affordable lodgings in the various countries. The staff consider this an on-going problem that is more or less beyond their control. The panel has established that the module coordinators do everything within their power to provide students with the required housing information well in advance. It appreciates the introduction of digital facilities to share housing details between students.

Study counselling

As stated earlier, the partner organisations receive funding for 12 hours of thesis supervision which students are encouraged to plan and use for substantive topics, during the final modules (5 and 6).

Student evaluations show that the quality of the supervision is generally appreciated, although students at times establish different approaches between supervisors. Simultaneously, the restricted time allotted for supervision is criticized, particularly during their thesis phase. Notwithstanding the need for the students to become self-reliant, the panel believes this issue should be monitored carefully.

In the programme evaluations students express their satisfaction about the services as a whole. Services receive a good or very good rating, in particular the on-line libraries at the University of Brighton and the AUAS are appreciated and frequently used. This is confirmed by the students with whom the panel spoke during the audit.

Student progress is monitored at staff meetings and the success rate is reviewed each year in the annual report. Figures of the last cohorts show that 60% of the students complete the programme within the set time, but 40% (71/176) do not. Reasons for this are delays in conducting their research, particularly in gaining ethical approval, or the general struggle of post-graduate students to match multiple roles. The drop-out rate has remained steady at 1-2 students per cohort (see Chapter 1). The reasons for non-completion are family life roles, serious illness and failure to achieve Masters level.

The panel is positive about the quality of the study counselling offered.

Considerations and Judgement

The learning environment with the carousel design, opportunities to study in five European countries, with staff and students from multiple nationalities, is innovative and original. The programme is coherent, prepares students to achieve all of the intended learning outcomes and is executed on the basis of a solid educational concept that appears to work effectively in practice.

For further improvement the panel presents a few suggestions with regard to the safeguarding the depth of critical thinking.

Many of the staff are well-established researchers and this combined with the curriculum structure and learning activities, offers a stimulating, challenging and international learning environment, to which each student can bring their own professional experiences and interests. Research is strongly integrated throughout; the further inclusion of guest lectures to present current research and the format of the final thesis as a manuscript for potential publication are particularly applauded.

The services and facilities for the programme are very much appreciated by the students and meet the standards one should expect at Masters level.

Weighing up all of the above the audit committee rates Standard 2 as 'good'

4.3. STANDARD 3: Assessment

Standard 3: The programme has an adequate assessment system in place.

Explanation: The tests and assessments are valid, reliable and transparent to the students. The programme's examining board safeguards the quality of the interim and final tests administered.

Findings

The assessment system of the course consists of (i) a variety of competency based assessment methods, (ii) rigorous examination procedures as described in the Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER), (iii) experienced examiners and (iv) an Examination Board (EB).

The panel made the following observations with regard to the course assessment system:

- Assignments/tests are connected to the competences of each module with explicit criteria for pass and fail; also, standard examination forms are used that refer to the intended learning outcomes and marking grids (that indicate a fail/pass);
- All required information on the assessment system is transparent and available to students. The Student Handbook has the overall assessment plan as well as the rationale for the assessments. Also, the submission and examination procedures are explained and the Student Handbook contains the examination timetable, the TER, the examination forms and the marking grids. Moreover, the separate Module Guides go into detail about each assignment;
- The Examination Board complies with the Dutch WHW; it is composed of lecturers as well as an external expert on assessments and it acts with authority and independence, and formal EB responsibilities such as the appointment of examiners and the allocation of exemptions have been implemented. From the panel discussions it became clear that the EB takes an active stand when it comes to the quality assurance of assessments: it scrutinizes the quality of assessments on a regular schedule, both from the perspective of the academic level, as well as clarity and fairness from the student perspective; also, the quality of assessments is evaluated systematically among students;
- The thesis is assessed by an independent examiner and co-examiner usually from different countries; differences of opinion are resolved through discussion or by a third examiner nominated by the EB;
- In the thesis examination the roles of the supervisor and examiner have been separated to avoid bias;
- New OT-Euro Master examiners are inducted into their role and supported by experienced examiners;
- Examiners are engaged in a dialogue, within and between module teams, about the alignment of criteria and judgments to strengthen reliability and validity;
- Examination forms show that examiners give comments and guidance to students about their strong and weak points in order to support the individual learning process; in case of fail, students confirm that they receive specific guidance on what is needed to pass;
- The teaching and examination regulations are updated each year, following discussion with staff and the approval of the Board and Dean. In 2014, the student representatives commented on the draft Teaching and Examination Regulations (TER) for the first time. The panel learned that this will become standard practice.

For each module students select the subject for their assessment according to their professional practice and research interests. The panel agrees with the faculty that this approach enhances the relevance of the assessments and truly adds to the learning process of the students.

Methods and structure

A variety of assessment methods is applied to test competence development, both formatively and summatively. The written, summative assessments are a critical appraisal of research papers (module 1); a small-scale qualitative research project (module 2); a small-scale quantitative research project (module 3); an argumentation for a research topic (module 4); a research plan (module 5) and the thesis, reporting a semi-independent research project (module 6).

Here, the panel would like to make a minor suggestion for improvement: it would recommend to review the module 3 assessment to ensure that the assessment regarding quantitative research is comparable to that for qualitative research in module 2.

The examiners use the competency based framework that specifies the intended learning outcomes for each module, standard examination forms and the marking grids to assess each module assignment and the thesis. If judged a fail, as indicated, the examiner will specify the areas for improvement. The student may re-submit at the next date on the examination timetable.

The work of students is marked fail or pass only. The Examination Board recommended to replace the pass and fail grade with a 10-point scale, which is the general AUAS policy. However, for several reasons the faculty rejected this idea. Although the panel understands the arguments in favour of a pass/fail system, it would seriously suggest that this standpoint be reconsidered and that an approach to marking that will differentiate between students' performances and facilitate graduation 'with distinction' be adopted.

The panel examined a sample of summative assessments as recently delivered by the students. By and large the content and level of the assessments as well as the fairness and transparency in the marking were considered good. However, with regard to the assessment criteria for the final thesis the panel missed reference to internationalisation competences. This requires a review of the assessment form.

Final examination

Achievement of the Master of Science level is ultimately demonstrated in the final examination which comprises a thesis and an oral defense at a public seminar. The course culminates into a 10,000 word thesis, which reports the semi-independent research conducted in the final module. The thesis takes the format of a manuscript of an article prepared for publication in a specific, peer reviewed journal. Also, a comprehensive literature review and a reflective conclusion must be delivered. Students present their findings at a public seminar, in exceptional circumstances via Skype, with an international audience, consisting of faculty, students from the host institution, first year OT Master students, family and friends. The oral defense is a formative assessment, with students receiving written feedback on the examination form about their communication skills. The panel would recommend reconsidering the formative character of the oral assessment, as it covers one of the key-competences.

When students submit their thesis, an independent examiner and a co-examiner are appointed from the examiners approved by the EB. The examiner must hold a PhD. If they reach consensus, the pass or fail grade is communicated to the student by the examiner. If not, they take advice from the Exam Board who may appoint a third examiner. If passed, students present their research, defend their study and act as an opponent, questioning a fellow student's research at the thesis seminar.

Initially, international external examiners scrutinised a sample of assignments and attended the oral, thesis examination. Since 2014, the new EB includes an independent expert from outside with a decision-making role.

Overall, the panel thinks this is an adequate way to conclude the course and to ascertain whether students have achieved the Masters level. However, it would like to suggest a few refinements, such as a review of the marking grid for Module 6 to incorporate the internationalisation competences. This should facilitate students to clearly address cultural aspects in their thesis including language use and implementation of the results and touch upon the relevance to local practice.

Moreover, the panel would like to see the oral examination for module 6 be altered into a summative assessment, as it is assessing an important communication competence for Masters' students.

In the audit students expressed their satisfaction with the way the course deals with assessments. Their views were congruent with the outcomes of the student evaluations. On a five point scale student ratings are good to very good with regard to quality of the assessment system: 'The assessment promoted my learning (4.4.)', 'in general, the relation between the preparatory work and the assignment was good (3.5)', 'in general, the relation between the class work and the assignment was good (4.2)' and 'there was enough time to make the assignment within each module (4.1)'.

Considerations and Judgement

The panel established that the assessment process is transparent and coherent. Assessments clearly address the required competences for each module and level of study, leading to the development of Master level competence. Considerable formative assessment is available, which together with self-assessment and summative assignments, offer ongoing, individualised feedback identifying student's learning needs as well as their achievements.

There is evidence of ongoing development of quality processes. The panel considers it particularly important that the Examination Board has been enhanced and is now in the process of reviewing all module assignments. Also, the panel appreciates the introduction of a marking grid for each module. The panel found evidence of the ongoing alignment of marking across examiners and staff.

The panel applauds the upcoming introduction of a system to detect plagiarism and would like to see it implemented in the short term.

Overall, the panel established that the assessment system of the course is solid. Still a few suggestions for improvement remain, such as the alignment of assessments of the research modules, a more discriminatory marking system and a few alterations with regard to the graduation assessment.

In striking the balance the panel's judgement on Standard 3 reads 'good'.

4.4. STANDARD 4: Achieved Learning Outcomes

Standard 4: The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Explanation: The level achieved is demonstrated by interim and final tests, final projects and the performance of graduates in actual practice or in post-graduate programmes.

Findings

As already stated in section 4.3, students demonstrate their achievement of Master of Science level competences through the research reported in the thesis. Also, their actual performance as newly graduated professionals is a gauge for their Masters level.

In order to reach a sound judgement on whether students obtain the targeted Masters level throughout and by the end of the programme, the audit committee members reviewed a random selection of interim and final tests on-site, spoke to alumni and members of the professional field and reviewed all of the graduation papers (15) delivered by students who had most recently graduated (11-2013 to 01-2015).

Performance of graduates

Some 60% of the students worked in a clinical setting and almost 40% in an education setting when they started the OT-Euro Master of Science. After graduation this ratio changed: most practitioners moved into education, research or a combination. Also, a growing number of graduates show interest in studying for a PhD (18%, 4/25). So far 13 graduates have in fact gained a PhD and 10 are in progress. The Master programme has been accepted as an entry qualification at universities in Austria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

A survey of graduates' performance was conducted among graduates themselves and their employers by the Kohnstamm Instituut, Amsterdam in 2005, 2009 and 2014; in addition, the course gathers impact data through personal contacts, their alumni network and the Advisory Committee.

Evaluation of graduation results from external examiners shows satisfaction with the achieved learning outcomes: "The bottom-line level for a Master of Science thesis was judged in the written thesis and found to be met" (External Examiner Report, 2013). The representatives of the professional field with whom the panel spoke as part of the audit confirm this view. Some employers noted specific changes after a student had graduated, particularly with regard to a stronger participation in education, research and management. Asked about the graduates' specific performance on each of the final competences, 'making judgements' clearly stands out.

As already noted in the programme's Critical Reflection, it is important that the overall impact of the programme is identified, particularly the societal benefits of the programme and the development of occupational therapy. As a programme particularly aiming at high academic standards, in the eyes of the panel members it will be useful to identify the long-term impact of the graduates' leadership on local and national developments.

Publication track record

The publication rate, too, confirms that the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Between 2010 and 2014, 16 graduates published in scientific journals and 6 published in national professional journals. In addition, the 2014 survey of graduates show dissemination at international and national, peer reviewed conferences.

In all, the panel commends the faculty for these achievements that clearly demonstrate that graduates are adding to the knowledge base of occupational therapy and occupational science.

Review of theses

As part of the audit, prior to the site visit the panel members reviewed 15 of the most recent final projects. In the view of the panel these theses clearly achieved the standard required for the award of MSc. They demonstrated the breadth of topic undertaken by the students, related to their own geographical location as well as professional background or work place.

As well as students aligning their thesis to the ongoing research of faculty, the panel would suggest consideration be given to encouraging students to develop their research projects with local employers/service users and carers/policy makers to ensure the relevance of the research undertaken.

Considerations and Judgement

The panel is extremely satisfied with the increasing number of international and national publications as well as conference presentations, all developed from final thesis work. The panel thinks this is exceptionally good and is of the opinion that the European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy in this respect is clearly outperforming other comparable Master programmes. Moreover, a substantial number of graduates have been accepted in PhD programmes in a variety of countries and educational systems. Employers report enhanced competence of graduates. The theses examined demonstrate that Masters level has been achieved throughout.

The panel therefore rates Standard 4 as 'excellent'.

5. OVERALL CONCLUSION ACCREDITATION ASSESSMENT

The consortium is to be commended for this pioneering programme that continues, for over 15 years, to offer a high standard of education at master's level to an international group of students. It demonstrates implementation of European policy in respect to internationalisation and the mobility of higher education staff and students, and thereby potentially to the work force.

Information available indicates that graduates of the programme have been significant in the development of occupational therapy both within their own areas of practice and in national and international developments, while further information on the impact of the programme would be useful at a micro level in respect to individual graduates, service users and practice areas but also at a macro level in respect to both society and the higher education area particularly in occupational therapy and occupation science.

A proactive approach to ongoing programme development is evident, for example, at a structural level with the approval by the Swiss authorities for the participation of Swiss resident students, and at programme level with the ongoing quality assurance systems, leading to the introduction, for example, of the new Examination Board in 2014 and related marking and assessment processes. This proactive approach should be maintained in order for the programme to remain a leader in occupational therapy and occupational science post-graduate education in Europe and potentially globally.

The panel noted a solid quality culture. This is the more praiseworthy for a programme run in five different locations by a consortium of countries. Staff, students and management appear to 'live' the programme resulting in continuous feedback from staff and students, and the consequent quality enhancement.

With a 'good' for Standards 1, 2 and 3, and an 'excellent' for Standard 4, the panel awards the European Master in Occupational Therapy with its overall judgement 'good'.

The panel recommends the NVAO to accredit the programme for another six years.

PART II - Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation

6. DISTINCTIVE QUALITY FEATURE INTERNATIONALISATION

6.1. CONCLUSIONS

Standard 1: Good

The Consortium incontestably takes internationalization as one of its basic principles. This has been anchored in the Consortium's policy document, which serves as guide for the execution of the course and its quality assurance. The internationalization objectives need to be formulated in a more verifiable way.

Standard 2: Satisfactory

The panel concludes that the learning outcomes of the programme clearly incorporate cultural issues and diversity, European and global perspectives. These are translated into the competences developed within each module.

The learning outcomes are translated into the competences to be achieved and assessed for each module. However, the marking grid for the final thesis does not incorporate statements of identified international and intercultural learning outcomes and should be revised accordingly. Although there is some evidence from the activities of alumni of them having achieved the intended internationalization goals, it is still difficult to link this directly to the programme outcomes. The panel suggests to develop methods to identify graduate impact.

Standard 3: Excellent

Teaching principles and methods encourage the incorporation of the acknowledgement of and reflection on differing world views, together with the ability to communicate with peers in an international forum.

The learning methods are appropriate for developing the required competences and learning outcomes.

International teaching and learning is considered a strong point of the programme and, hence, its learning environment which is multinational, both regarding place and persons.

Standard 4: Good

The composition of the staff, both in quality and quantity, facilitates the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes. The core lecturers have considerable international experience, including research collaboration. Given the high academic standards pursued, the panel would like to suggest to adopt a higher English language standard for faculty. Also, the programme may wish to consider incorporating visiting lecturers from other continents or from Southern/ Eastern Europe.

In view of staff professionalization four staff meetings are held each year. Recently, assessment design has been given priority.

Standard 5: Excellent

The student body shows a variety of national and cultural backgrounds and is fully in line with the programme's internationalisation goals. Students consider the services provided by the consortium adequate and well-attuned to the varied group of students. Alumni should be stimulated to participate structurally in ongoing international networking and collaboration following graduation.

Overall judgement

On the basis of ECA's assessment rules, the panel nominates the Academic Master Occupational Therapy of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences for the Certificate for Quality in Programme Internationalisation.

6.2. FINDING AND JUDGMENTS

In this chapter of the report the panel evaluates to what degree the programme European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy complies with the criteria of the Assessment Framework for the ECA Distinctive Feature in Internationalisation. As internationalisation as such is also part of the NVAO Framework for Accreditation, particularly for Master programmes, if and when applicable ample references are made to the panel's findings and conclusions as stated in the previous part.

6.2.1. STANDARD 1: Intended internationalisation

Criterion 1a, supported goals: *The internationalisation goals for the programme are documented and these are shared and supported by stakeholders within and outside the programme.*

Findings

The Board has adopted a Board Policy in which the internationalisation goals are stated. The Board Policy covers the period from 2015 till 2020. The goal is to support the academic development of occupational therapy, primarily in Europe but also worldwide. This goal was established with two European networks that were instrumental in developing the OT Euro Master of Science in the 1990s: the Council of Occupational Therapists for the European Countries (COTEC) and the European Network for Occupational Therapists in Higher Education (ENOTHE).

Faculty and graduates continue to be active in these professional networks, collaborating on projects such as the ENOTHE Master Project Group, as committee members and contributing to conferences.

In 2014, the Board Policy was revised following a six month consultation with Board and staff. During this process, the aim and mission were discussed and agreed. The consortium aims to be: *"a European-centred, sustainable, world renowned educational consortium which is respected for its ability to provide advanced level study on the complex relationship between occupation, health and participation to benefit the individuals and diverse communities served by occupational therapists"*.

The mission of the consortium summarises the internationalisation goals of the programme. These are to:

- (i) offer a global perspective on contemporary healthcare and welfare, providing research-informed education in advanced theoretical and scientific studies. This will enable graduates to use evidence-based practices to improve the quality, safety and effectiveness of occupational therapy;*
- (ii) to adopt a critical, evaluative approach to innovations;*
- (iii) to be effective members of traditional multi-professional or citizen-led teams and able to develop national and international networks;*
- (iv) to respect and accommodate inter-cultural differences and strive to address occupational injustices. Such specialist, international education is vital to deliver local services which are inclusive and equitable"*

Internationalisation is expressed in the structure, values and working practices. The programme is offered by a consortium of five European partners who work together in a spirit of cooperation, reciprocity, compromise and agreement to achieve the shared goal.

The values and structures are formalised in a Memorandum of Co-operation which was updated in 2014, whilst the overall goal/mission is evident in the working practices. These include the admission procedures to safeguard an international cohort; the carousel curriculum with students learning in five countries; teaching and learning methods to optimise sharing national experiences; and the inter-cultural and internationalization topics for the formative and summative assessments.

These goals are supported by internal and external stakeholders. Direct support is evident through commitment to the programme by students, employers, alumni, the Advisory Committee; and the partner organisations as they maintained their financial commitment during the recent economic recession, especially in 2013 when the programme was not able to attract sufficient students to offer a quality international programme. A notable example of external endorsement occurred in 2013, when the Swiss Government approved the programme as the first Master of Science at an applied university in Switzerland.

Panel judgement

The MOT programme has internationalisation at its core, with a stated commitment to internationalisation, a consortium of partner institutions from five European countries leading the programme, teaching taking place on location in these five countries and the diverse group of students attending the programme.

Occupational therapy also recognises diversity in its theoretical understandings of the contextualised nature of the people's everyday lives, while the programme offers multiple opportunities for students to present, discuss and reflect on this.

Internationalisation is clearly supported in the aim and mission statement of the programme, in the consortium of European institutions working in partnership to provide the programme, and in the commitment to the programme from stakeholders, not only emerging from documents, but also testified by the participants on the various audit panels.

Criterion 1b, verifiable objectives: *Verifiable objectives have been formulated that allow monitoring the achievement of the programme's internationalisation goals.*

The Board Policy document of the MOT contains four implementation strategies, one of which is "to *strengthen the international and inter-cultural dimensions*". This internationalization strategy encompasses 11 objectives to be achieved within five years. These are to:

1. promote the international and inter-cultural dimensions as the programme's unique selling point in marketing material;
2. make explicit how occupational therapy 'is taken to new international levels';
3. direct market at under-represented nationalities/continents to support the academic development in countries where occupational therapy is a new discipline;
4. monitor recruitment to assure an international cohort with a mix of nationalities, countries and/or continents represented in each group;
5. continue to evaluate the student experience of the 'carousel' curriculum that involves experiencing life and study in five European countries through the programme evaluation;

6. review the module and programme competences to make sure they reflect the international and inter-cultural dimension;
7. continue to promote inter-cultural dialogue in relation to the complexities of occupation through the curriculum, teaching and learning methods and assessments;
8. investigate and incorporate current evidence about the most effective teaching and learning methods to promote internationalism and inter-culturalism;
9. ensure the mobility of faculty to facilitate co-supervision and co-examination, for research capacity building, and so international experiences benefit the programme.
10. critically evaluate the course model of embracing cultural diversity in education and promote it through the website, presentations and publications.
11. explore ways of sharing the body of knowledge from the students' analysis of occupational therapy within national health and welfare systems and systematic international comparisons.

The panel has established that the Board agrees the priority objectives each year as part of the annual action plan. Some objectives are on-going, for example monitoring admission to ensure an international cohort. Progress is reviewed each year through the annual report to the Board.

Panel judgement

Eleven objectives are linked to the strand of the implementation strategy focusing on the international and inter-cultural dimensions. However, the panel would recommend that the objectives are expressed in more 'verifiable' terms. For example, making more explicit the under-represented nations/continents which will be targeted for direct marketing; outlining the means by which recruitment will be monitored to ensure an international cohort and how this aspiration will be matched with the reality of applications and budget restraints, etc.

Criterion 1c, measures for improvement: *As a result of periodic evaluations of the programme's internationalisation, the successful implementation of measures for improvement can be demonstrated.*

The panel has reviewed several action plans that were drawn up in the wake of evaluations and (internal) audits. It appears that internationalisation has been scrutinised as part of the programme's quality cycle since 2010, when it was first awarded the distinctive quality feature internationalisation. Recommendations were (i) to organize more English language training for staff, (ii) to reinforce student recruitment so as to enable the composition of groups of at least 20 to 25 students and (iii) to improve assessment procedures to safeguard the obtained level. The panel concluded that all recommendations have been carefully considered and improvements implemented.

Also, evaluating whether the intended learning outcomes still meet international requirements was a key objective in the 2014-2015 Improvement Plan, and the 2015-2016 Action Plan contains the improvements suggested at the Internal Audit.

An example of a recent measure, following the Swiss approval of the course which made it eligible for government subsidy of tuition fees, is that the Board has set a limit on the number of Swiss students to be admitted in order to safeguard the mix of nationalities.

Panel judgement

It is evident that the Internationalisation aspect has been an object of the quality cycle since 2010. The current Board Policy 2015-2020 clearly articulates internationalisation goals, the attainment of which is monitored closely, and – if needed – adjusted on the basis of solid action plans. The panel has established that these are executed accordingly.

Overall assessment of Standard 1: **Good**

6.2.2. STANDARD 2: international and intercultural learning

Criterion 2a, Intended learning outcomes: *The intended international and intercultural learning outcomes defined by the programme are a clear reflection of its internationalisation goals.*

With reference to Standard 1 (Intended learning outcomes) of the Accreditation Assessment Framework, the panel established that internationalisation has been incorporated in the intended learning outcomes (see Appendix I). To qualify for the Master programme, the graduate (i) is required to create and conduct a rigorous, ethical and coherent research project to answer questions within the discipline, situate the findings within theoretical framework(s) and national or *international contexts*, as appropriate, or (ii) generate suitable strategies to collect and interpret data for their research questions and generate improvements and possible innovations in OT/OS by implementing findings on national or *international* levels and (iii) to critically review concepts such as occupation and participation from national, *international and cultural* perspectives.

The course presents the following examples of how the intended learning outcomes have been transferred to the course level, in this case module 4 'socio-cultural perspectives of human occupation'.

Dublin Descriptor	Competence
Knowledge and understanding	Identifying socio-cultural perspectives of translating knowledge in the field of OT and OS in different social situations and cultural settings. Identifying, reviewing and debating issues and developments in the field of OT, OS from sociological, political, economic and cultural perspectives.
Applying knowledge and understanding	Critiquing a case in the field of OT and OS and debating the findings from socio-cultural perspectives. Applying knowledge and understanding in a semi-independent way by formulating a research topic that covers relevant questions within the discipline of OT and OS in Europe and the global context.
Learning to study	Integrating their reflections upon socio-cultural perspectives of human occupation. Identifying and their own learning needs in relation to socio-cultural perspectives of human occupation in general.

Panel judgement

The panel concludes that the learning outcomes of the programme, expressed within the Dublin Descriptors, clearly incorporate consideration of cultural issues and diversity, European and global perspectives. These are translated into the competences developed within each module

The panel would suggest that considerations be given to including more specific reference within the learning outcomes and related competences to the development of a critical awareness of the cultural location of contemporary occupational therapy knowledge. The panel considers this particularly important when the programme is attracting students from countries with limited theoretical disciplinary development.

Criterion 2b, Student assessment: *The methods used for the assessment of students are suitable for measuring the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.*

With reference to Standard 3 of the Accreditation Assessment Framework, the panel established that the assessments are based on the competency based framework of the course and therefore cover all the intended learning outcomes, including the internationalisation goals. As already stated, a range of written and oral, formative and summative assessment methods are used. As an example, the formative assignment for module 3 involves a discussion about occupational performance and how OT is evaluated within their country/ context.

Panel judgement

The learning outcomes are translated into the competences to be achieved and assessed for each module. Assignments therefore must address the required competences, including the international and intercultural dimensions.

The panel would like to note that the current examination form and marking grid for Module 6 (thesis) do not incorporate statements of identified international and intercultural learning outcomes. The panel would suggest to ensure that student theses (and other assignments as appropriate) clearly locate geographically and culturally the literature used, that the research undertaken addresses local needs, that methodology addresses cultural issues (e.g. translation) and that results are clearly discussed in relation to local policy, practice and/or theoretical development.

Criterion 2c, Graduate achievement: *The achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes by the programme's graduates can be demonstrated.*

The Critical Reflection of the course states on this criterion that 'All students demonstrate the international and intercultural competences in the thesis. A module 6 competence is '*presenting how their findings can be implemented in the professional, societal and cultural contexts*'. Some chose to make inter-cultural studies the topic for their research. Forty percent (14/35) of the most recent theses contain a country in the title, including Armenia, Czech Republic, Iran, Peru, Portugal and Switzerland. Examples of intercultural studies include occupations of a family with migrant background in Sweden; occupational justice of some elderly female ethnic German repatriates; and Latin American female domestic workers in Spain.' And also: 'Students and graduates consistently rate internationalisation as a highlight of the programme. This is one of the most mentioned learning outcomes (equal to research-skills) using words like i(nternational)-connections, i-knowledge, i-atmosphere, i-network, different i-backgrounds opened your mind. In the 2014 survey of graduates and their employers almost half (9/23) of the graduates recalled the international and intercultural dimensions, using phrases such as "*the international aspect provided unique opportunity to develop an international OT Network,*" and "*sharing experiences from different parts of the world was enriching.*" '

The Internal Audit in 2014, however, revealed that it was difficult to judge whether students had achieved the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes because they are not explicit. This point was considered at the December 2014 staff meeting and the staff agreed to make internationalisation more explicit in some competences, but only in a general way to stay true to the principal that internationalisation is explored in the context of professional practice and as a means to an end.

Panel judgement

The panel noted that almost half of the final theses are reported to have included a country in the title, although only one of the consortium partner countries – Switzerland – was identified in this way. The competences achieved to complete the programme (Module 6) require a consideration of national, international and cultural perspectives, although this should still be made explicit in the marking grid (see criterion 2b).

The panel concludes that there is some evidence from the activities of alumni of the ongoing application of knowledge and skills, but also a general awareness of, and interest in, the importance of working in global contexts, although it is still difficult to link this directly to the programme outcomes. The panel suggests to develop methods to identify graduate impact.

Overall assessment of Standard 2: **Satisfactory**

6.2.3. STANDARD 3: teaching and learning

Criterion 3a, Curriculum: The content and structure of the curriculum provides the necessary means of achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

The panel observed that internationalisation is integrated throughout the carousel curriculum, linking to the core subjects of occupational therapy (OT), occupational science (OS) and research. A third of the programme (modules 2 and 4) specifically addresses the topics of society, culture and diversity. The pre-course tasks in modules 1-4 all focus on different aspects of occupational therapy in the students' countries and specific cultural aspects of occupation. For example, in module 4 students produce a document regarding OT and OS in their country and present this to their fellow students in a "state of the art" lecture that is followed by a discussion. This exchange of facts and experiences facilitates intercultural dialogue and understanding. In modules 5 and 6, students are expected to be familiar with the international literature to show a gap in knowledge that their research will address.

Panel judgement

Internationalisation is distinctly integrated throughout the curriculum through the lived experience of attending the programme in five different countries, learning with a diverse range of lecturers and students, and engaging with a range of formative and summative assignments that require attention to international and cultural issues in order to demonstrate the required competences.

Criterion 3b, Teaching Methods: The teaching methods are suitable for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

Problem Based Learning (PBL) is the over-arching educational principle. This approach is introduced and explained in the Student Handbook. Students, supported by a trained PBL tutor, work in small groups gathering information, sharing perspectives and using input from their national and diverse socio-cultural backgrounds.

With reference to the NVAO Assessment Framework, already a variety of teaching methods are described under Standard 2. The panel agrees with the course faculty, that all methods, including the Learning Group, are very appropriate to foster deep approaches to learning and focus on relevance to their cultural and practice context, given the international composition of the cohort.

Panel judgement

Teaching principles and methods, particularly PBL and the Learning Groups, encourage the incorporation of each student's professional perspectives, the acknowledgement of and reflection on differing world views, together with the ability to communicate with peers in an international forum.

The panel considers these appropriate methods for developing the required competences and learning outcomes. In addition, skill and experience in learning effectively over a distance using electronic resources, is essential for maintaining international networks and ongoing learning, following graduation.

Criterion 3c, Learning Environment: The learning environment is suitable for achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

With reference to what has already been said about the learning environment under NVAO Standard 2, the key part of the learning environment within this academic Master is the international student body and faculty. The exchange between students and lecturers clearly enhances the learning environment of such an international Masters programme and facilitates students in achieving the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

The faculty are multi-lingual, multi-national and possess experience of migration (see Criterion 4a). Students come from multiple countries (see Criterion 5a) and study at five higher education institutions, each with different libraries, facilities, cultures and expertise, which means that students adjust to new places, conditions and systems. Students use digital resources, the Digital Learning and Work Environment (DLWE), Yammer, on-line libraries and Eduroam. They work in international groups in all modules.

Internationalisation within the different university-cultures is considered part of the socio-cultural learning process. Each partner varies in the focus on research, methods and views on science. This can be experienced by students as frustrating at the time, but can be appreciated in the end as one student expressed in the evaluation: "*The different modules were interesting and the view of different teachers and students from different backgrounds are beneficial to 'open' your mind.*"

Panel judgement

International teaching and learning is clearly a strong point of the programme and, hence, its learning environment. This was designed into the modular 'carousel' curriculum, with students living and learning in five European countries. It is part of the educational approach which promotes inter-cultural understanding, through discussion of the similarities and differences in health beliefs, occupational therapy practice, health and welfare services and policies in Europe and beyond.

The panel therefore concludes that the learning environment is multinational, both regarding place and persons.

Overall assessment of standard 3: **Excellent**

6.2.4. STANDARD 4: staff

Findings and judgments about the quality, quantity and experience of staff is already provided under NVAO Standard 2) as well as the services provided to the staff. The following additional panel observations focus on the internationalization and intercultural aspect with regard to the staff.

Criterion 4a, Composition: The composition of the staff (in quality and quantity) facilitates the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

From the information provided by the course management and the staff resumes, a distinct international staff emerges. Core staff are from eight nationalities and speak thirteen languages. The faculty is substantial and recruited from all five institutions. The majority are multi-lingual and many multi-national. Staff are extremely experienced, many with numerous publications in international journals, and teaching in a number of institutions throughout the world, i.e. in Australia, Chile, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Finland, Uganda and the USA.

Some senior researchers hold positions at other universities, for example at the University of Trondheim, Norway, the University of Malaya, Malaysia and the University of Illinois at Chicago.

In the audit students refer with appreciation to the international experience of their lecturers and their international input in the lectures.

Panel judgement

It is obvious that the composition of the staff, both in quality and quantity, facilitates the achievement of the intended international and intercultural learning outcomes.

Criterion 4b, Composition: Staff members have sufficient internationalisation experience, intercultural competences and language skills.

Please refer to NVAO Standard 2 for details. Specifically for this criterion the panel would like to state that the programme is taught entirely in English as part of the learning process, rather than as a learning outcome for students.

One of the appointment criteria for staff is the ability to communicate in English on an academic level, as evidenced by the International English Language Testing System (IELTS). Thus a band score of 6.5 or equivalent is required.

Panel judgement

The staff group have considerable international experience, including research collaboration. All staff have the required competence to teach in English, evidenced by publications; all the same, given the high academic standards pursued, the panel would like to suggest to adopt a higher language standard (e.g. IELTS band score 7.5 or TOEFL 590 score) for faculty.

Also, the programme may wish to consider incorporating visiting lecturers, e.g. via video conferencing, from other continents or from Southern/ Eastern Europe to broaden the experiences and professional/theoretical/cultural positions, introduced to students.

Criterion 4c, Composition: The services provided to the staff (e.g. training, facilities, staff exchanges) are consistent with the staff composition and facilitate international experiences, intercultural competences and language skills.

With regard to this criterion, please refer to Standard 2. The panel established that professionalization activities were acknowledged in the internal Audit Report (2014) and the Staff Development Plan (2015-2018). Four staff meetings are held each year and the panel has ascertained that most lecturers attend those meetings. Lately, assessment design has been given priority.

Overall assessment of Standard 4: **Good**

6.2.5. STANDARD 5: students

Criterion 5a, Composition: The composition of the student group (national and cultural backgrounds) is in line with the programme's internationalisation goals.

The panel notes that the admission policy ensures that each cohort contains students from an average of eight countries. From a survey provided by the course, it shows that of the 243 students who started the programme between 1999 and 2015, 47 (19%) lived in another country from their country of birth. This experience adds to the rich mixture of cultural perspectives.

It is clear that the diversity of students is considered a fundamental feature of the OT-Euro Master. Students resident in 36 countries have enrolled in the programme. There are students from five to 11 countries in each cohort. More than half (60%, n=145) lived in a country hosting the programme; one in four (27% n=66) lived in another European country and 13% (n=32) live in the rest of the world, as was exemplified in one of the annexes to the Critical Reflection of the programme.

So far students from between 5 and 11 countries have been part of each cohort up to this time.

Panel judgement

Up till now the composition of the student group with a variety of national and cultural backgrounds is fully in line with the programme's internationalisation goals.

According to the panel continual efforts should be made to ensure the programme is able to attract students from outside the five host nations and that an appropriate balance between Swiss and the other students is maintained.

Criterion 5b, Experience: The internationalisation experience gained by students is adequate and corresponds to the programme's internationalisation goals.

Students experience internationalisation throughout the programme. All students are outbound, spending a total of nine weeks in five countries. Inter-cultural dialogue occurs naturally, given the international composition of the faculty and cohort. Academic experiences are complemented by participating in extracurricular activities.

Cultural understanding is deepened by sharing accommodation, socialising together and participating in national celebrations and activities which coincide when visiting each country.

Students with whom the panel spoke were delighted about the international aspect and the carousel character of the programme. It offered them 'an unforgettable multicultural and international experience'.

Panel judgement

The panel concludes that internationalisation is clearly an integral element of the learning experience of the course, with learning undertaken in five European countries, with fellow students from diverse backgrounds and staff with multi-national experience. This, together with the focus on culture, national and international policy and developments in many of the modules, ensures that each student engages in a rich international experience.

Criterion 5c, Services provided to students: The services provided to the students (e.g. information provision, counselling, guidance, accommodation, Diploma Supplement) support the programme's internationalisation goals and correspond to the composition of the student group.

As already stated under NVAO Standard 2, equal access to services is required in the Memorandum of Co-operation (2014) between the five institutions. These also comprise tutoring and supervision, the on-line resources, the administrative office, libraries and accommodation.

In addition, students may access Student Counsellors at the AUAS, receive support with visa applications and join the alumni network. This is an international community with links to the programme, partner institutions and each other through lasting friendships. The programme developed an updated Alumni Policy (2015-2018) in consultation with the alumni in 2014. The aims include offering support with publications, doctoral studies and joining scientific networks, such as the International Society for Occupational Science (ISOS).

The Diploma of the Euro Master in Occupational Sciences comes with a Supplement in English, explaining the contents of the course.

Panel judgement

As students convey during the audit, the services provided by the consortium are adequate in view of the internationalization goals of the programme and truly correspond to the varied group of students.

The panel would like to suggest to energize alumni in developing more organised processes to facilitate ongoing international networking and collaboration following graduation.

Overall assessment of Standard 5: **Excellent**

6.3. OVERALL JUDGEMENT

The programme is awarded a 'good' for Standards 1 and 4, a 'satisfactory' for Standard 2 and an excellent rating for Standards 3 and 5.

In tune with ECA's assessment rules which decide that a programme certifies for Quality in Internationalisation when at least three out of the five standards are assessed as good or excellent and no standard is assessed as unsatisfactory.

Based on the programme's documented internationalisation goals, the programme has successfully implemented effective internationalisation activities which according to the panel demonstrably contribute to the quality of teaching and learning.

The panel therefore proposes that the Academic Master Occupational Therapy of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences be awarded the Certificate for Quality in Programme Internationalisation.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

In line with the audit process the panel would like to give the following recommendations:

With regard to accreditation:

- Consider reviewing terminology (e.g. learning outcomes, level descriptors and competences) to align with the Tuning project (as this is clearly identified as an important resource for the programme). Alternatively provide clear definitions of how these terms will be used within the development and documentation of this particular programme, particularly relevant for the mobility of graduates. Ensure there is a clear differentiation between the use of the terms competence and learning outcome.

This would enable a closer alignment of the programmes competences (primarily described as learning outcomes in this programme's documentation) with those identified as part of the Tuning Occupational Therapy Project, and particularly to second cycle descriptors. It would also support closer alignment to the programme's aims as stated in the Critical Reflection to be not only a pathway to doctoral training, careers in research and education, but also to prepare graduates to take leading roles in health and social care.

- Consider placing a greater emphasis on the development of competences that incorporate originality and creativity in proposals for change, reflecting and responding to the complex and changing needs of contemporary society.
- Consider promoting further the programme's unique opportunity to facilitate diverse theoretical development in Europe. This is underpinned by the programme's international character, the inclusion of a number of students representing the first or early academic development in their home countries, with recognition of the cultural relativity of knowledge and the current dominance of English language, Western theory. Also, develop marketing strategies to outline the unique features of the programme for students.
- Consider an enhancement of the consultation with employers and service user groups. As a programme specifically identifying with a leadership role in Europe it is important to more clearly identify the role and involvement of service users/groups, families and carers in both the delivery of the programme and the research of the students, but also in identifying future directions of occupational therapy academic and practice developments.
- Regarding the future directions of the programme the team would appear to be working hard on the financial viability of the programme. There were some discussions of the potential challenge to the programme from other programmes offering 120 EC. Potential future developments could also consider – the incorporation of a module specific to a practice area (perhaps elective) to enhance occupational practice specialisation and the incorporation of IPE (Interprofessional Education) with a joint module with other disciplines.
Moreover the panel suggest that funding issues be examined as this is a very expensive programme for most students.

With regard to internationalisation:

- While contact with the professional organisations in the consortiums home countries is important, the panel considers it advisable to enlarge and strengthen contacts with professional organisations throughout Europe, particularly in the East and South that are not included in the consortium. As well as ensuring the programme remains relevant to developments in occupational therapy practice and research throughout Europe, important given the aim of the programme to support academic development, this could be also useful in encouraging students from throughout Europe to join the programme.
- While internationalisation is an important goal, the panel would suggest to consider the potential impact of northern European English language academia on the development of occupational therapy practice and/or theoretical development in those countries where occupational therapy is a new discipline with limited local research.

ANNEXES

ANNEX I Overview of judgements

Overview of judgements on the Academic European Master in Occupational Therapy (part-time) of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences	
Standard	Judgement
Standard 1. Intended Learning Outcomes	Good
Standard 2. Teaching and Learning Environment	Good
Standard 3. Assessment	Good
Standard 4. Learning Outcomes Achieved	Excellent
Overall judgement	Good

ANNEX II The intended learning outcomes of the course

Knowledge and understanding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflecting and theorising upon the impact of society, culture and diversity on occupation and participation for health and wellbeing of individuals and communities 2. Reflecting and theorising upon personal and contextual factors that influence the identity of profession of occupational therapy. 3. Reflecting on epistemology and ontology when exploring research questions within the field of occupational science (OS) and occupational therapy (OT). 4. Reflecting on appropriate scientific methodology and methods when exploring research questions
Applying knowledge and understanding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Reflecting on and hypothesizing upon complex issues from several = theoretical perspectives within occupational therapy, occupational science and related scientific disciplines. 6. Creating and conducting a rigorous, ethical and coherent research project to answer questions within the discipline, situate the findings within theoretical framework(s) and national or international contexts, as appropriate. 7. Generating suitable strategies to collect and interpret data for their research question. 8. Generating improvements and possible innovations in OT/OS by implementing findings on national or international levels.
Making judgments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Critically reviewing concepts such as occupation and participation from national, international and cultural perspectives. 10. Critically reviewing and theorizing upon the national, European and global contextual structures influencing OT practice and OS. 11. Composing a coherent vision on the complex relation between occupation, health and wellbeing related to their own academic work. 12. Reflecting and theorizing upon the chosen methods for data collection and analysis in their own research project. 13. Reflecting on implementation and generalisation of their findings to fields within and outside occupational therapy. 14. Making judgments regarding the ethical issues in their research project (and act according to that)
Communication	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. Disseminating by presenting orally and in writing according scientific criteria the acquired knowledge from their research project to specialists and non-specialists audiences. 16. Communicates orally and in writing their research project in a synthesized way to contribute to the continuing scientific discourse in the discipline of occupational therapy and occupational science. 17. Presenting how the findings can be implemented in the professional, societal and cultural contexts.
Learning to study	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Reflecting on skills of lifelong learning by critically reflecting upon their personal and professional development. 19. Generating their own learning needs and searching, finding, and retrieving appropriate information. 20. Applying the competences in knowledge and understanding, applying knowledge and understanding, making judgments and communication in an independent, autonomous and self-directed way.

ANNEX III Overview of the Masters programme

Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Module 4	Module 5	Module 6
University of Brighton in Eastbourne	University of Applied Sciences	University of Applied Sciences	University of College Zealand in Naestved	Karolinska Instiutet	
UK	NL	CH	DK	S	Own Country
12 EC	12 EC	12 EC	12 EC	12 EC	30 EC
Week 1-12 Wk 3-4 class January	Week 15-25 Wk 16-17 class April	Week 33-44 Wk 35-36 class August	Week 46-7 Wk 48-49 class November	Week 8-19 Wk 19 exam/class May	Week 20-4 Wk 4 Exam January
Exploration of concepts of occupation and research	Qualitative research methods and human occupation, diversity, culture and participation	Quantitative research methods in relation to evaluation and enhancement of occupational performance	Socio-cultural perspectives of human occupation	Planning a research project within the body of knowledge of the OT discipline	Conducting a research project within the OT discipline
Preparatory work Class work: Introduction to OT- EuroMaster: skills for postgraduate learning and competence based teaching and assessment Concepts of occupation Epistemology Ontology (philosophy underpinning science) Ethics	Preparatory work Class work: Understanding and applying qualitative methods Developing skills in qualitative methods Dynamic interaction of human occupation with diversity, culture and participation	Preparatory work Class work: Understanding and applying quantitative methods Developing skills in quantitative methods Development of assessment for measuring occupational performance Implementation of research	Preparatory work Class work: Societal and sociological perspectives on human occupation, population health and OT-practice. Political, economic, healthcare and cultural conditions and the relationship(s) to human occupation in different social situations and cultural settings Using theoretical perspectives to argue for research topics	Semi-independent research plan Master classes Literature review as background study Research plan Methodological master classes connected to the research plans	Semi-independent research Data collection Data Analysis Discussion on results Synthesize the material to a master thesis
Assignment Critical appraisal of literature	Assignment A report on a small scale qualitative study	Assignment A report on a small scale quantitative study	Assignment Paper on argumentation for a research topic	Assignment Research plan Oral presentation	Assignment Thesis Oral presentation

Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Module 4	Module 5	Module 6
Learning Group reflections on own research ideas and ongoing research	Learning Group reflections on different research designs	Learning Group reflections on different research designs	Learning Group seminar on students' research ideas	Learning Group reflections on research plan	Learning Group as peer review

ANNEX IV Programme of site-visit

Programme date: 26 August 2015

Location: Zurich University of Applied Sciences, Technikumstrasse 71, Winterthur

Time	Auditees	Topics for discussion
08.00 – 09.00	Reception by school management and preparatory meeting panel members	
09.00 – 10.00	Programme management and Board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fenna van Nes, PhD, Director education ▪ Claudia Galli, lic. Phil I, Director Organisation ▪ Birgitta Bernspång, PhD, Chair of the Board ▪ Christiane Mentrup, MSc, Director Institute of OT at ZHAW, member of Board ▪ Wilma Scholte Op Reimer, Dean AUAS ▪ Gaynor Sadlo, Professor of Occupational Science, University of Brighton, School of Health Sciences; member of Board ▪ Margriet van der Zanden, International Coordinator 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ mission & strategy ▪ developments in professional/academic field ▪ market position / competitive position ▪ education performance / success rate ▪ interaction with professional field / customer relationship management ▪ curriculum development ▪ distinctive quality feature internationalisation ▪ intrinsic backbone of the programme's contents ▪ research & development ▪ personnel management / staff policy ▪ quality assurance ▪ internationalisation
10.00 – 10.15	Panel retrospective	
10.15 – 11.15	Faculty (6-8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jon Wright, PhD, module coordinator module 1, teaching staff ▪ Ton Satink, MSc OT, PhD student: module coordinator module 2, teaching staff ▪ Mette Andresen, PhD: module coordinator module 4, teaching staff ▪ Ann-Helen Patomella, PhD, module coordinator module 5, teaching staff ▪ Staffan Josephsson, PhD, module coordinator module 6, teaching staff ▪ Jesper Maersk, MSc in Educational Science, PhD student, teaching staff module 4 ▪ Mandana Fallahpour, PhD, teaching staff module 5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ curriculum development ▪ involvement professional/academic field ▪ intrinsic backbone of the programme's contents ▪ distinctive quality feature internationalisation ▪ practical components ▪ learning assessment (methods, standards, parties involved, scoring & feedback) ▪ tutoring ▪ (applied) research & development ▪ education performance / success rate ▪ interaction with the management ▪ internationalisation
11.15 – 11.30	Panel retrospective	
11.30 – 12.30	Students (6-8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Muriel Lüthi, cohort 14, 2014-2016, student representative (CH) ▪ Jeroen te Dorsthorst, cohort 14, 2014-2016, student representative (NL) ▪ Pauline Hoellinger, cohort 14, 2014-2016 (Belgium) ▪ Jacqueline Leenders, cohort 15, 2015-2017, student representative (NL) ▪ Sussi Assander, cohort 15, 2015-2017, student representative (Sweden) ▪ Marielle André, cohort 15, 2015-2017 (France) ▪ Joseph Ndiwalana, cohort 15, 2015-2017 (UK, Uganda) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ quality of teachers ▪ information and communication facilities ▪ learning assessment / feedback ▪ tutoring (incl. practical periods) ▪ feasibility and workload ▪ educational facilities ▪ final projects/exams ▪ student participation in the school's decision making ▪ internationalisation
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch, review of additional documents	

Time	Auditees	Topics for discussion
13.30 – 14.00	Student/staff presentations of research project(s) Two students from cohort 15 will shortly present their assignment and discuss the process of supervision and examination If possible, their supervisor or examiner will be present as well	
14.00 – 14.30	Panel retrospective and consultation session for faculty and students	
14.30 – 15.15	Examination Board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hans Jonsson, PhD; chair of Examination Board ▪ Jon Wright, PhD, member of Examination Board ▪ Mette Andresen, PhD, member of Examination Board ▪ Marie-Antoinette van Kuyk-Minis, PhD, external member of Examination Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ quality assurance learning assessments ▪ authority of the examination board ▪ relation to the management ▪ assessment: involvement of the professional/academic field ▪ available assessment expertise ▪ internationalisation
15.15 – 16.00	Field representatives (2 Adv. Committee, 2 employers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inger Wallenbert, Member of Advisory Committee (Swe) ▪ Luc de Witte, Member of Advisory Committee (NL) ▪ Albrecht Konrad, employer (and alumnus) (CH) ▪ Prof. Andreas Luft, employer (Medical director Cereneo, Center for Neurology and Rehabilitation, CH) Alumni (3-4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stefania Moioli, MSc, cohort 13 (2012-2014), graduated in Sep 2014 (CH) ▪ Margarita Mondaca, MSc, cohort 9, graduated in Apr 2010 (Chile) ▪ Cornelia Kocher Stalder, MSc, cohort 12 (2011-2013), graduated in Jan 2013 (CH) ▪ Jens Schneider, MSc, cohort 13, graduated in Jan 2014 (D) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ mission & strategy ▪ developments in professional/academic field ▪ market position / competitive position ▪ education performance /output/ success rate ▪ interaction with professional/academic field / customer relationship management ▪ distinctive quality feature internationalisation
16.00 – 16.15	Pending issues (if any)	
16.15 – 17.15	Panel retrospective/drawing up of preliminary conclusions	
17.15 – 17.30	Panel feedback to all invited by the school	

Working methods

Selection of the delegations / the auditees

In compliance with the NVAO regulations the audit panel prior to the audit decided on the composition of the delegations (auditees) in consultation with the course management and on the basis of the points of focus that had arisen from the panel's analysis of the course documents.

Prior to the site-visit students and faculty were invited by email to bring forward any issues to the audit committee's secretary through email. The audit committee verified that the invitation was sent to all parties involved in the programme in a correct and timely manner. No students or staff members used the opportunity to address the audit committee.

Auditing process

The following procedure was adopted. The panel studied the documents regarding the programme (Annex II: Documents reviewed) and a number of theses. The panel secretary organised input from the auditors and distributed the preliminary findings among the panel members prior to the audit. A preparatory meeting of the panel was held before the site visit took place at the institute, on 25 August 2015. (Annex III: Programme of the site visit).

The panel formulated its preliminary assessments per theme and standard immediately after the site visit. These were based on the findings of the site visit, and building on the assessment of the programme documents.

A first version of the assessment report was drafted by the secretary and circulated among the members of the panel for review and comments. The final draft was subsequently forwarded to the institute to correct factual inaccuracies. The panel finalized the report on 12 December 2015.

Assessment rules

The assessment panel evaluates the programme against the standards of the assessment framework applying the following assessment scale: unsatisfactory - satisfactory - good - excellent.

For a positive final conclusion regarding the programme, each theme must at least be judged as satisfactory.

The final outcome of the programme assessment will always be "unsatisfactory" if standards 1, 3 or 4 are judged "unsatisfactory". In case of an unsatisfactory score on standard 1, no improvement period will be assigned and the programme will have to close down.

The final conclusion regarding a programme can only be "good" if at least two standards are judged "good", one of which must be standard 4.

The final conclusion regarding a programme can only be "excellent" if at least two standards are judged "excellent", one of which must be standard 4.

The final conclusion regarding a programme will always be "unsatisfactory" if standards 1 and/or 3 are judged "unsatisfactory". In case of an unsatisfactory score on standards 1 or 3, NVAO cannot grant a conditional initial accreditation.

Distinctive Quality Feature Internationalisation

With regard to the assessment of the DQFI, the ECA assessment-scale was applied. This scale is based on the definitions given below. These definitions relate to the assessments at the level of standards only. The starting point of the assessment scale is not threshold quality but generic quality. Generic quality is defined as the quality that can reasonably be expected from an international perspective.

Unsatisfactory: The programme does not meet the current generic quality for this standard and shows serious identifiable shortcomings.

Satisfactory: The programme meets the current generic quality for this standard and shows an acceptable level across the standard's entire spectrum.

Good: The programme systematically surpasses the current generic quality for this standard across the standard's entire spectrum.

Excellent: The programme systematically and substantially surpasses the current generic quality for this standard across the standard's entire spectrum; it explicitly includes one or more exemplary practices and can be regarded as an international example for this standard.

Awarding decision as set by ECA

A programme receives the Certificate for Quality in Programme Internationalisation when at least three standards are assessed as good or excellent and no standard is assessed as unsatisfactory.

ANNEX V Documents examined

List of documents examined

- Critical Reflection OT Euro Master, June 2015
- Board Policy (2015 – 2020) including internationalisation goals
- Memorandum of Cooperation with Organisation Chart, 2014
- Overview of contacts with active researchers and partner organisations
- Overview of the curriculum in diagram form
- Student Handbook 2015
- Module Guides 1 – 6
- Overview of international composition of student population (1999 – 2015)
- Overview of International and intercultural learning outcomes in the six modules
- Teaching and Examination Regulations OT Euro Master, 2015
- Overview of teachers' qualifications and international experience
- Reports on consultations in relevant committees / bodies;
- Test questions with corresponding assessment criteria and requirements (answer models) and a representative selection of actual tests administered (such as presentations, work placements, portfolio assessments) and assessments;
- Reference books and other learning materials.
- List of graduates of past two years; 15 final projects/papers were randomly selected and examined prior to the audit¹, including the corresponding assessment forms:

500657929	Portugal
500613907	Peru
500633710	Chile
500049609	The Netherlands
500657925	Switzerland
500613892	The Netherlands
500636864	Kenya
500658646	Germany
500542984	Czech Republic
500657930	Germany
500633711	The Netherlands
500613895	Republic of Armenia
500613898	Iran
500633714	Uruguay
500633731	Germany

¹ Following NVAO regulations student enrolment numbers have been denoted here. For reasons of privacy names of students and projects are known to the panel members and panel secretary only. To indicate the international mix of students, graduates' nationalities are also shown.

ANNEX VI Composition of the audit panel

Panel members	Expertise						
	auditing and quality assurance	education	assessment	professional field	discipline	Inter-national	student-related
Drs. W.G. van Raaijen, chair	X	X	X			X	
Dr. S. Kantartzis, PhD, expert member		X	X	X	X		
Prof. Dr. H.J. Polatajko-Howell, expert member		X	X	X	X	X	
M. Pekkanen, student member				X	X		X

co-ordinator/certified secretary H.R. van der Made

Succinct CVs of panel members and secretary/co-ordinator

1	Mr Van Raaijen is partner at Hobéon and has chaired numerous accreditation audits both in the Netherlands and abroad.
2	Mrs Kantartzis is at present Lecturer at the Margaret University, Edinburgh, UK. Among others she lectures at the BSc Honours OT programme and the Master of Science in Occupational Therapy.
3	Mrs Polatajko-Howell is associate Chair at the Graduate Department of Rehabilitation Science of the Medicine & School of Graduate Studies at the University of Toronto, Canada.
4	Ms Pekkanen works as an occupational therapist in the Rehabilitation Competence Centre at the primary health care services of Helsinki, Finland; she is currently following a Master of Science programme in Occupational Therapy at the Jönköping University, Finland.

On 8 May 2015 the NVAO endorsed the composition of the panel to assess the European Master of Science in Occupational Therapy of the Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences (Hogeschool van Amsterdam) registration 003841.

Prior to the audit all panel members undersigned declarations of independence and confidentiality which have been registered by the NVAO. This declaration certifies, among other things, that panel members do not currently maintain or have not maintained for the last five years any (family) connections or ties of a personal nature or as a researcher/teacher, professional or consultant with the institution in question, which could affect a fully independent judgement regarding the quality of the programme in either a positive or negative sense.



Strategische dienstverlener voor kennisintensieve organisaties



Lange Voorhout 14
2514 ED Den Haag

T (070) 30 66 800

F (070) 30 66 870

E info@hobeon.nl

I www.hobeon.nl