

Analysis programme reviews 2015 - 2020

Since the implementation of the legislative changes of June 2015 VLUHR QA carried out **64 programme reviews** in Flemish higher education.

- 32 offered by Universities of Applied Sciences and Arts
- 19 offered by Universities
- 13 offered by Registered HEIs

Bachelors and masters

- 43 bachelor programmes, EQF 6
 - 26 professionally oriented bachelors
 - 11 academic bachelors
 - 6 advanced bachelors
- 21 master programmes, EQF 7
 - 9 masters
 - 12 advanced masters

Regular and limited assessments

- 39 regular assessments (3 or 4 standards)
- 25 limited assessments, applying to one or more of the standards

162 assessment scores have been granted among the 64 programmes.

- 101 applied to bachelor programmes
- 61 applied to master programmes

- 125 applied to regular assessments
- 37 applied to limited assessments

- The Universities of Applied Sciences and Arts counted for 74 scores
- The Universities counted for 46 scores
- The Registered HEIs counted for 42 scores

162 scores are distributed among the four standards

Scores in regular assessments

- 39 on standard 1
- 39 on standard 2
- 39 on standard 3
- 8 on standard 4 (which only counts for Registered HEIs which are exempt of the Institutional Review).

Scores in limited assessments

- 1 score granted on standard 1
- 16 scores granted on standard 2
- 17 granted on standard 3
- 3 granted on standard 4 (for the Registered HEIs only)

All scores in limited assessments granted to these programmes were satisfactory. That standard 2 and 3 are reassessed the most may not come as a surprise, given that standard 1 is a more formal standard, addressing the outcome level achieved, and standard 4 is only in effect for the Registered HEIs.

What are the reasons for scoring unsatisfactory?

Of all scores, 160 scores are labelled as satisfactory, 2 as unsatisfactory. Of those 2 unsatisfactory scores, one applied to an advanced bachelor programme (University of Applied Sciences and Arts), and one to an advanced master programme (Registered Body). Both unsatisfactory scores were given to standard 3: outcome level achieved. Digging a bit deeper into these 2 unsatisfactory scores: for both programmes counts that their evaluation policy was not in tune with the minimum requirements. Regarding the bachelor programme the panel stated that the evaluations address insights but not the skills and attitudes students must realize. The bachelor's thesis also lacks a scientific base and does not show that all intended learning outcomes can be realized. For the master programme, the panel observed that there are not sufficient guarantees that the evaluations are valid, reliable, objective and transparent. The very same time, many of the Master's theses do not show an academic level of sound scientific research. The programme, in sum, cannot assure that all intended learning outcomes are realised. Both programmes have been reassessed, and received satisfactory scores.