Teaching Evaluation Framework

Guidelines and suggestions for course and programme evaluations

Faculty of Humanities

Adopted by the Faculty Board on 21 November 2017

Contents

Summary

This document sets out the frameworks for teaching evaluation. Evaluations are an important instrument for understandng, monitoring and improving the teaching quality. This Framework serves to provide guidelines for teaching staff, Programme Boards (PB, opleidingsbestuur), Programme Committees (PC, opleidingscommissie) and other relevant parties.

Tasks and responsibilities with respect to teaching evaluations
- PB: has the final responsibility for teaching evaluations and for giving feedback on the results and the ensuing improvement actions to students in the study programme.
- PC: has the right of consent for the Course and Examination Regulations (CER/OER) as regards the method of evaluation, is responsible for conducting evaluations, assesses evaluation results and on the basis of this makes recommendations, checks that follow-up of previous recommendations / improvement points has taken place.
- Board of Examiners: takes account of evaluation results relating to assessment, in the quality assurance of examinations and the final examination.
- The Faculty Board (FB) and PB are responsible for ensuring that recommendations / improvement actions are implemented at the Faculty level and study programme level respectively.
- Teaching and Student Affairs (OSZ) department (Educational Advice and Quality Assurance [O&K] Team) advises the PCs on designing teaching evaluations and on interpretation of the results, advises the FB and PBs on the basis of evaluation results. OSZ coordinates the logistics relating to course evaluations and maintains contact about them with the Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching (ICLON).

Teaching evaluation at two levels

At the level of individual programme components (course, internship, thesis, etc.)
For small groups of students (≤15 students), it is preferable to work with open-ended questions (qualitative evaluation); for larger groups of students, with (mainly) closed-ended questions (quantitative evaluation). Quantitative questionnaires for course evaluations are standardised. They can be administered both on paper and digitally.

For evaluation of individual programme components, the following guidelines apply, among others:
- All courses must be evaluated at least once every three years.
- New courses are always evaluated, as are courses delivered by teaching staff who are following a track leading to the University Teaching Qualification (BKO).
- A thesis evaluation takes place at least once every two years.
- The student is asked to make an evaluation after every internship.

Aspects of the teaching that are evaluated include: overall opinion about the course, teaching quality of the teaching staff concerned, teaching / learning method(s), study material, assessment, level / difficulty level, study load, strengths / weaknesses of the programme component.

At the programme level (study programme, minor, propedeuse, etc.)
As at the level of individual programme components, at the programme level it is preferable to use qualitative evaluation for small groups of students, and (mainly) quantitative evaluation for larger groups. Study programmes can conduct their own programme evaluations (propaedeuse, period of study abroad, study programme). Special programme evaluations are instigated at the international level (International Student Barometer), or the national level (National Student Survey (NSE), National Alumni Survey, study programme visitation), University level (Minor Survey), or Faculty level (Midterm Review, Job Market Survey of Alumni of Faculty of Humanities).

For evaluation of the programme (components), the following guidelines apply:

- Programme evaluations of the study programme itself will preferably be conducted once every three years.
- If assessment is not evaluated during the course evaluation, this must be included in the programme evaluation.
- A Minor Survey is conducted every year.
- Study programmes that offer a period of study abroad on a structural basis will evaluate this at least once every two years.

- Once every 4 or 5 years, the Humanities Career Centre conducts a Job Market Survey of alumni of bachelor's and master's programmes.
- The study programme can conduct an exit survey when students leave, if so wished.

Aspects of the teaching that are evaluated include: structure of programme content, cohesion of the programme curriculum, development of general academic skills, encouragement of independent approach to studying, (spread of) study load, assessment, mentoring, study coordination, intentions after bachelor's graduation, strengths / weaknesses of the programme / curriculum.

Feedback on evaluation results and improvement actions
The Faculty and study programmes devote explicit attention to giving feedback on evaluation results and the ensuing improvement actions to the students. At the Faculty level, the Faculty Board is responsible for this; for feedback at the study programme level, the responsibility lies with the Programme Board. A supporting role is played by the Programme Committees and teaching staff.

1. Introduction

1.1. Teaching evaluation in our Faculty

Teaching evaluation is an important instrument for understanding, monitoring and improving the quality of the teaching. The purpose of evaluation is to improve the quality of our teaching on the basis of information collected. Questions in evaluations must therefore be aimed at collecting information that can actually be used as a basis for improving the teaching. Evaluation primarily involves asking about the experiences and opinions of those for whom the teaching is intended: the students themselves. In addition, it can involve asking other relevant people about the teaching offered or about the 'end product' of study programmes, such as teaching staff, alumni and the 'consumer field' (future employers).

This document sets out the frameworks for teaching evaluation within the Faculty. These frameworks serve as guidelines for teaching staff, Programme Boards, Programme Committees and other relevant parties. Methods, procedures and Faculty formats are given in the appendices of this Evaluation Framework. For more information on the Faculty's teaching quality assurance in the broad sense, please see the Guide to Teaching Quality Assurance in the Faculty of Humanities (Gids voor Onderwijskwaliteitszorg FGW).

The study programmes within the Faculty display great diversity, expressed in such aspects as student numbers, whether or not a standardised period of study abroad is offered, or the extent to which courses are shared with other programmes. This variety means that choices must be made regarding how the teaching and study programmes are evaluated. The Faculty endeavours to ensure that 'good practices' are available for the different kinds of teaching evaluation. In a few cases, it is mandatory to use specific types of evaluation or standard questionnaires.

This Teaching Evaluation Framework applies for all study programmes of the Faculty of Humanities.

1.2. Faculty perspective versus study programme perspective

Compared with the Faculty, the information from teaching evaluations is to some extent viewed from a different perspective by teaching staff and study programmes. They want specific, nuanced information that can be directly translated into improving courses and programmes. This involves questions such as: Did the teaching methods used achieve their purpose? How can the study material be improved? Is the spread of the study load satisfactory?

The Faculty, on the other hand, wants more global information about the quality of the teaching. There are also certain 'supra-programme' aspects, which transcend the individual study programmes and for which the Faculty is responsible. Examples include the quality of teaching staff, facilities, communication, information supply and student counselling.

If course evaluations take place in a sufficiently standardised way, we can usefully aggregate and compare their results at the Faculty and University levels. Therefore with effect from 2017-18, Leiden University works with a standardised basic set of questions for course evaluations, which not only provides good feedback at the course or study programme level for teaching staff and the Programme Board, but at the same time also provides better, aggregated management information for the Institute Board and Faculty Board.

1.3. Tasks and responsibilities with respect to teaching evaluations

The Programme Board is directly responsible for the teaching quality of the study programme. The Faculty Board provides guidelines for this, and monitors their implementation. In addition, the Institute Boards are responsible for staffing the programme curricula and for the competence of the teaching staff, which means that they too have responsibility, albeit indirect, for the teaching quality.

Programme Board and Programme Committee
The Programme Board is responsible for the evaluation of the teaching. The Programme Committee (PC) has the right of consent regarding the method of evaluation and plays an important role in actually conducting the teaching evaluation. The PC has the task of advising on improvement and assurance of the quality of the programme.

The Programme Committee also has several other rights and tasks that are relevant for the process of teaching evaluation:

1. Right of consent and right of consultation with regard to certain parts of the programme's Course and Examination Regulations (CER/OER).
2. Annually evaluating the method of implementing the CER.
3. Issuing advice or making proposals, on request or on its own initiative, to the Programme Board and the Dean about all matters concerning the programme's teaching.

These tasks mainly take the form of making practical arrangements for the teaching evaluation and giving advice on the basis of the evaluation results.

Further information about the composition and appointment of the Programme Board and the Programme Committee can be found in the [Faculty Regulations and Implementing Regulations for Administrative Bodies of Study Programmes of the Faculty of Humanities](#). Further information about the responsibilities, tasks and procedures of the Programme Committee can be found in the Faculty's Manual for Programme Committees.

Standing Committee for Education
The Faculty has a *Standing Committee for Education* (Vaste Commissie voor het Onderwijs), which issues advice to the Faculty Board or the Programme Boards about the teaching policy, the policy on teaching quality assurance, and the Course and Examination Regulations and curricula in the Faculty. To enable it to perform this advisory task, the Committee is provided with ('supra-programme') reports produced by the Educational Advice and Quality Assurance (O&K) Team of the Teaching and Student Affairs (OSZ) department, or the Committee can conduct specific teaching evaluations itself, in consultation with OSZ. The Committee also functions as the regular Programme Committee for e.g. the evaluation of the Faculty's core curriculum courses (see also 2.3.3.) and for some of the modules offered by the Expertise Centre for Academic Skills (2.3.5.). For these, the Faculty Board functions as the Programme Board.

In the case of some courses or combinations of courses, it is not self-evidently clear which Programme Committee is responsible for the teaching evaluation. More clarity about this will be given in section 2.3.

1.4. Aspects of teaching to be evaluated: course level and programme level

Roughly speaking, teaching evaluation takes place at two levels: the level of individual programme components (course, internship, thesis, etc.) and the level of programmes (study programme, minor, propaedeuse, etc.). Different evaluation instruments can be used at the two levels. Both the course evaluation and the programme evaluation concentrate on a number of critically selected aspects that are relevant for good teaching, but these aspects will be different at each level.

For course evaluation, these aspects comprise:
- overall opinion about the course
- teaching quality of the teaching staff concerned
- teaching / learning method(s)
- study material
- assessment
- level / difficulty level
- study load
- strengths / weaknesses; other comments

And possibly:
- cohesion / structure of the course
- encouragement of independent, active learning
- support by Blackboard/ICT and the balanced mix of digital and non-digital learning methods
- links to the other parts of the programme

For programme evaluation, these aspects comprise:
- structure of programme content
- cohesion of the programme curriculum
- development of general academic skills
- encouragement of independent approach to studying
- (spread of) study load
- assessment
- mentoring (for e.g. propaedeuse)
- study coordination
- intentions after bachelor's graduation (only for bachelor's years)
- strengths / weaknesses; other comments

The study programmes are free, within certain limits, to add their own aspects to these Faculty-wide aspects in the form of extra questions.

More information about course and programme evaluation is given in Chapters 2 and 3.

1.5. Anonymity and respectful feedback

Students in principle have the right to anonymity if they participate in an evaluation, so that they need not feel inhibited when giving their opinion. Personal details are therefore not requested on a regular evaluation form. This is usually not problematic in larger educational groups; recognition of handwriting is then a negligible issue. In smaller groups, however, recognition of handwriting can be relevant. If paper evaluation forms are used, consideration can be given to retyping or paraphrasing the responses and comments. If the evaluation is digital, recognition of handwriting is naturally not an issue. Finally, the student's anonymity cannot always be guaranteed when more or less individual programme components (internship, thesis) are being evaluated.

Therefore, although the student's anonymity applies as a basic principle, the Faculty believes it is important to create an atmosphere within the study programmes in which teaching staff and student(s) can communicate openly and constructively about the quality of the teaching. If that open atmosphere exists, a teaching staff member can, for instance, simply be present at evaluation discussions. A study programme can choose, if it so wishes, a procedure where the results of an anonymous survey are discussed between the teaching staff member(s) and a student panel whose members have no objection to entering into open dialogue with the teaching staff about the teaching they have followed.

It is the responsibility of the Programme Committee to take decisions about what is and is not possible with respect to guaranteeing anonymity. A convenient solution could be, for instance, that the PC can know the names of students and supervisors in the case of internship or thesis evaluation, but does not have to pass them on to anyone else in order to fulfil its role in quality assurance.

It should be noted, however, that anonymity is not a licence for unprofessional conduct. We expect students to give their feedback on teaching staff in a respectful manner. Disrespectful feedback will be ignored and may be removed from evaluation reports by the PC.

It can never be compulsory for a student to take part in teaching evaluations.

Finally, attention should also be given to the privacy of teaching staff. The student responses to questionnaires are therefore not automatically accessible to everyone. More details about this are given in section 4.5 and Appendix 8.

2. Evaluations at the course level

2.1. Course evaluations

2.1.1. Methods of course evaluation

Quantitative versus qualitative
The most important factor in the choice of the right evaluation method – between a qualitative or quantitative method (with open-ended versus closed-ended questions respectively) – is the size of the educational group that is being evaluated. The decisive consideration is the number of students who are expected to participate, or be able to participate, in the course evaluation. The Faculty guideline is *to use a quantitative questionnaire for groups of more than 15 students*, with closed-ended questions and responses on a five-point scale. *For smaller groups, we advise that a qualitative questionnaire with open-ended questions is used.*

Collection of qualitative information can take place orally or in writing, in groups or individually. Which method is best or most efficient depends on the context of the course or study programme. A Faculty list of standard (open-ended) questions is available (see Appendix 1b). The Educational Advice and Quality Assurance (O&K) Team can advise the Programme Committee on designing course evaluations and on interpreting the results.

For the quantitative evaluations, a standard questionnaire is *mandatory* (see Appendix 1a). Using standardised basic questions enables the teaching staff member to compare the course ratings with previous years and with average scores on specific themes in the Institute or Faculty. In addition, standardised questionnaires make it possible to generate management information at an aggregated level, and comparisons can be made with previous years or between courses, study programmes or faculties.

A study programme can add a limited number of extra questions (open- or closed-ended) to the standard questionnaire. The study programmes are advised to use the added value of a few open-ended questions, for example in the form of the following two questions: Please name a few strengths of this course; and: Please name a few improvement points for this course.

Evaluation using a quantitative questionnaire can be followed later, if so wished, by the collection of qualitative information, for example to ask in more detail about what precisely students experienced as less satisfactory when topics received a low score on the closed-ended questions. However, this kind of evaluation in two stages takes extra time and effort, especially if the student group is no longer together. In some faculties and institutions, the quantitative report is first discussed, for example, in the presence of the teaching staff member and a student panel, before the Programme Committee writes its report and/or advice. By using this two-step method, a better and more nuanced interpretation of the quantitative scores can usually be given.

In exceptional cases, the Programme Committee can choose to replace separate course evaluations with a general evaluation meeting, at which participants look back on the courses of the whole (completed) semester.

Paper versus digital evaluation
Questionnaires can be presented to students either on paper or digitally. For quantitative evaluation in larger study programmes / groups, it can often be much more efficient to use digital evaluation. Moreover, students who fill in a digital questionnaire at home after a course has finished, for instance, will often do this more seriously and with more attention than if they do it on paper at the end of the last contact hour. On the other hand, requesting digital evaluation usually yields lower response rates. Where possible, the preference is for digital evaluation.

Procedures
Course evaluations are conducted according to clear procedures, in which all the steps and responsible actors in the evaluation process are specified. These procedures are set down in writing and shared with all the relevant parties (see Appendix 6a/b). Clear agreements are also made with regard to archiving (see 4.7).

2.1.2. Frequency of course evaluation

The Faculty applies the following basic principles for the frequency of course evaluation:

- All courses must be evaluated *at least once every three years.*
- New courses are always evaluated, in any event.
- The Programme Board can decide, in consultation with the Programme Committee, to increase the frequency for specific courses if there is good reason to do so (for example, if problems were observed in the previous year, there is a new member of teaching staff, or a significant change in a course).

- The teaching delivered by teaching staff who are following a track leading to the University Teaching Qualification (BKO) must also be evaluated, because the Faculty's BKO Committee will take the results of the evaluation into account in the assessment of the teaching staff member.
- A member of teaching staff can also ask the PC to evaluate his/her teaching for special reasons.

Each year the Programme Committee, in consultation with the Programme Board, will draw up a timetable of the courses to be evaluated in the forthcoming academic year.

Reasons for not evaluating all courses every year are: students could develop 'evaluation fatigue', the investment in time and energy that evaluation demands from the Programme Committee or study programme, and finally the costs of evaluation.

2.1.3. Timing of course evaluation

The point in time when the evaluation is made has an influence on the following aspects:
- the content of the evaluation (e.g. if assessment / examination has to be covered by the evaluation, then that evaluation must obviously take place after the assessment)
- the attention that students give to the questionnaire
- the way it is administered (paper vs. digital)
- the response rate

Assessment is an important part of the education. The evaluation should therefore preferably be timed in such a way that assessment of the course (or part of the course) can be included in the evaluation; in other words, *after both the course and the examination have been completed.*

If there are serious objections to the evaluation taking place after the course and examination have been completed, because it would be impracticable or the response rate would be too low, then the evaluation should preferably take place during the last contact hour of the course. To ensure that students give sufficient attention to filling in questionnaires, it is advisable to make time for this at the beginning (and not at the end) of this last contact hour.

2.2. Evaluation of theses / final essays

Given that the thesis is an important final element of the study programme, it is important that study programmes should monitor the students' experiences with the process of writing their thesis and with the quality of the information, supervision and grading provided. . The procedure relating to the finalisation and archiving of the theses therefore includes a standardised final evaluation by the students, after their thesis has been graded. The students' experiences with feedback on and grading of the thesis are part of that evaluation. In the study programmes that have a thesis seminar, the evaluation is combined with the evaluation of the seminar, whenever possible. The Faculty provides formats for questionnaires (Appendix 2a/b).

To keep the workload under control, thesis evaluation can be conducted, for example, *once every two years.* In one year, all the students are asked to make an evaluation, and in the next year, no evaluation takes place at all. In small study programmes, all the students make an evaluation. The Programme Committee will decide on the procedure that is most suitable, on condition that it periodically forms a clear picture of the quality of thesis preparation, supervision and grading within the study programme, and on the basis of this can give advice to the Programme Board (and the Board of Examiners, if necessary).

2.3. Evaluation of other programme components / external programmes

2.3.1. Internships

One of the characteristics of internships is that they take place outside our own Faculty, elsewhere in the Netherlands or abroad. Nevertheless, the study programme has the final responsibility for the quality and quality control of internships. In addition to the internship report, every student is therefore asked to fill in an internship evaluation form at the end of the internship. The Faculty has a standard form (still to be developed), which contains questions that make it possible to give feedback to both the study programme and the internship coordinators of the Faculty's Student Career Service (Teaching and Student Affairs [OSZ]).

The evaluation forms are taken in by the Student Career Service, temporarily stored and made available - in digital form - at pre-determined times to the responsible Programme Committees.

Interim 'evaluation' of a student's progress and well-being during the internship usually takes place during the contacts maintained by the (internal) internship supervisor and the student. The study programme can support this method of 'keeping a finger on the pulse', if so wished, by asking the student to fill in a short interim evaluation form.

2.3.2. Shared / inter-programme teaching

Some courses are used in more than one study programme (known as 'inter-programme' teaching). In this situation it is sometimes less clear who is responsible for evaluation of the course concerned. We use the following guidelines in these situations:

1. Every course falls in principle under the primary evaluation responsibility of one Programme Committee.
2. For courses that fall under the Faculty's core curriculum, see section 2.3.3.
3. Courses that are a compulsory component of the curriculum in one study programme, and are an elective or minor course in other study programmes, fall under the primary responsibility of the study programme where the course is compulsory. This means that they are evaluated by the Programme Committee of that study programme. The study programme is obliged, on request, to inform the co-user study programmes about the results of evaluations and, if applicable, about the advice on improvement actions.
4. Other courses in which, over a number of years, more than half of the participants are students from one study programme, fall under the primary evaluation responsibility of that study programme. Co-user study programmes will be informed about the results of evaluations and improvement actions that are intended or have been taken.
5. For courses without a clear primary user, the responsibility must be taken by the study programme with which the main member of teaching staff is most associated, as evidenced by his/her other teaching. In that case too, the study programme concerned is obliged to inform the other study programmes about the results of evaluations.
6. Every relevant Programme Committee is entitled to receive all the collected information relating to the courses used by students in the study programme. It is also the responsibility of each Programme Committee to consider whether the shared courses in the programme contribute to a curriculum aimed at achieving the learning outcomes (programme evaluation).
7. If a study programme requires the learning objectives or structure of a course to be changed, the Programme Board must contact the other study programmes that also use the course, to discuss this.

2.3.3. Faculty core curriculum

Evaluation of courses belonging to the Faculty's core curriculum is the responsibility of the Standing Committee for Education, which acts as the PC for these courses. The Committee gives advice on individual courses, but also on the delivery, quality and objectives of the Faculty core curriculum in the broad sense.

2.3.4. Honours teaching / Humanities Lab

In the context of quality assurance, courses and other study components offered within the Faculty's Honours College (Humanities Lab) fall under the responsibility of a specially appointed Programme Committee. This Committee gives advice to the Programme Board of the Humanities Lab. In addition to evaluations at the course level, the Committee also provides for periodic evaluation of the entire Humanities Lab.

Supra-faculty teaching offered by our Faculty in the form of Honours Classes and contributions to the Leiden Leadership Programme falls under the responsibility of the University-level Honours Academy.

2.3.5. Expertise Centre for Academic Skills

The education offered by the Expertise Centre for Academic Skills (Expertisecentrum Academische Vaardigheden/EAV) is to a greater or lesser extent integrated within the programme components of various study programmes. The EAV modules are integrated within the study programmes in different ways. If the EAV modules are largely separate from other courses offered by the study programme in the area of academic skills, the EAV modules are evaluated separately. If the EAV modules are only part of a larger package of skills education in a specific period within a study programme, the relevant PC makes an arrangement with the EAV about the method of evaluation.
The Standing Committee for Education acts as the Programme Committee for the EAV education, and gives advice on it to the Vice-Deans (cc. Head of the Teaching and Student Affairs [OSZ] department).

2.3.6. Education of national research schools

Within our research master's programmes, 10 EC of the curriculum are filled by education offered by national research schools and Leiden Global. Because these programme components are a part of the curriculum, and in some cases a compulsory part of the curriculum, the study programmes have an indirect responsibility for the quality and quality assurance of this education. For instance, they must also be accountable for it during programme visitations (accreditation 'assessments').
Programme Committees must therefore periodically obtain information about the quality of this education and their students' experiences within it. They can do this by, for example, requesting evaluation reports produced by the research schools or, in exceptional cases, by conducting their own evaluation among the students.

3. Evaluations at the programme level

3.1. Programme evaluations (conducted by the study programme)

3.1.1. Methods of programme evaluation

General
The Faculty does not have a mandatory format for programme evaluations. However, sample questionnaires that can be used for this purpose are available (see Appendix 4). The study programmes are advised to tailor the design of the programme evaluations to the current situation, specific questions and objectives that are relevant at a particular point in time. They should also consider what information they can already derive from the course evaluations, the National Student Survey (NSE, see also 3.2.3.), or other evaluations that have already been conducted. The programme evaluation can be rather different for each study programme. For example, currently relevant questions could relate to curriculum changes that have been made and on which feedback is desired; or there may be NSE results that require further explanation.

Programme evaluations can either cover the entire study programme or focus on separate years of the study programme. When they cover the entire study programme (or the last year of the study programme), not only current students but also recently graduated alumni can be asked to participate.

The Educational Advice and Quality Assurance (O&K) Team can advise the Programme Committee on designing the programme evaluation.

Quantitative versus qualitative
As in the case of course evaluations, a choice must be made for programme evaluations between a qualitative or quantitative evaluation method. The decisive consideration is usually the number of students who are expected to participate in the evaluation. The Faculty guideline is to choose a quantitative questionnaire for groups of more than 15 students, with closed-ended questions and responses on a five-point scale. A few open-ended questions can be added to this. For smaller groups, we advise that a qualitative questionnaire with open-ended questions is used. The study programme can vary from this guideline, if it has good reasons. For instance, because the NSE already provides much information based on closed-ended questions, the study programme can decide to also present large groups of students with a few open-ended questions, asking for more details about particular NSE themes that require extra attention.

A questionnaire with closed-ended questions can be followed later, if so wished, by a short questionnaire containing open-ended questions. For instance, students can be asked to give more detail about what exactly was wrong with topics that received a low score on the closed-ended questions. However, this kind of two-stage evaluation requires extra time and effort.

Collection of qualitative information
Collection of qualitative information can take place orally or in writing, in groups or individually. Which method is best or most efficient depends on such matters as the context of the course or study programme, etc.

Exit survey / exit interview
To supplement the programme evaluation, the study programme can also conduct an exit survey when students leave (via a panel discussion / individual interview or questionnaire). Exit interviews / surveys can yield important information, especially for smaller study programmes where the number of respondents in programme evaluations is low, or too low. The Faculty is currently developing formats for an exit questionnaire and structured and semi-structured interviews. It is also looking for a good way to include administering an exit questionnaire in the formal procedure surrounding graduation.

Evaluation of assessment
In study programmes that as yet do not have structural evaluation of the assessment of individual courses (for example, because the evaluation usually takes place before the assessment), evaluation of assessment must be an emphatic part of programme evaluations. Interim evaluations specifically focusing on assessment can be used, if so wished.

Because the PC has a clear picture of the total evaluation package of a study programme, and also has good knowledge of the practical process of conducting evaluations among students, the assessment evaluation is conducted under the responsibility of the PC. However, the Board of Examiners has final responsibility for the quality control and assurance of assessment. The PC therefore reports and gives advice on assessment to the Board of Examiners. The Board of Examiners can also ask the PC to conduct an evaluation specifically focused on assessment.

Programme evaluation among teaching staff
Programme evaluation among teaching staff of the study programmes is not institutionalised. On the other hand, a certain amount of oral feedback often takes place from teaching staff to the study programme, or between teaching staff themselves (in the PC, other committees, study programme / staff meetings, or in the corridors). Sufficient coordination between teaching staff and specialisation coordinators, and programme evaluation by teaching staff are explicitly recommended by many visitation committees ('assessment panels').

3.1.2. Frequency and timing of programme evaluation
Programme evaluations are preferably conducted *once every three years*, for example in preparation for the programme accreditation visitation and the midterm review. The results of the evaluation, and the improvement plans formulated in response to this by the study programme, will preferably be available in advance of writing the self-evaluation report for the visitation, or the information dossier for the midterm review.

3.2. Special programme evaluations

3.2.1. Minor Survey

Minor education is evaluated at two levels. First, individual course evaluations are conducted, and the results included in the 'small' quality assurance cycle within the study programme that is responsible for the courses concerned. Second, the 'Minor Survey' is conducted each year at the end of the academic year. The purpose of this survey is to obtain feedback at the programme level (the whole minor package) and/or at the level of all the minors offered by the Faculty. The University provides a set of questions for this survey, which is administered digitally. On the basis of this Minor Survey, the Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching (ICLON) produces (EvaSys) reports for each minor (if there are sufficient respondents) and each faculty.

The evaluation report of an individual minor (if available) is submitted to the Programme Committee of the responsible study programme. The Standing Committee for Education receives the Faculty-wide, 'supra-minor' report.

3.2.2. Periods of study abroad

A period of study abroad, consisting of a set of courses followed in a foreign institution, is categorised as a (*sub-)programme*. Study programmes that offer a *structural* period of study abroad must periodically (*at least once every two years*) hold an evaluation of it among the students, or periodically obtain the evaluation report of the institution that offers the education.

The Faculty is currently developing an evaluation format for periods of study abroad, which can be used to ask students about their experiences with the curriculum itself and with the organisational and logistic preparation and support of their stay abroad. The PC assesses the results of these evaluations. The results are also sent to the Humanities International Office (Teaching and Student Affairs [OSZ]), so that it can monitor the general preparation and organisation of periods of study abroad, and make improvements in them where necessary.

3.2.3. National Student Survey (NSE)

The NSE (Nationale Studenten Enquête) is administered every year to all bachelor's and master's students of Leiden University. The NSE asks questions about many aspects of the study programme, and also ends with a free-text field in which students can state their wishes / ideas for improvement. For the study programmes, the NSE is an important form of programme evaluation, and the Annual Programme Report also contains a reflection on its results. The Programme Committee therefore discusses the NSE results each year, and formulates advice on the basis of them. For a few - small - study programmes in the Faculty of Humanities, however, the number of respondents is too low to use the NSE as a valid and reliable source of information.

Appendix 7 gives an overview of the average scores for the various NSE themes in our University and in the Netherlands. The scores of the Humanities study programmes can be compared with these.

3.2.4. International Student Barometer (ISB)

The ISB is an annual survey of the satisfaction of international students. Worldwide around 200 educational institutions in 17 countries take part. Leiden University participates once every two years. The ISB consists of four parts: (1) Learning, (2) Living, (3) Support and (4) Arrival. Results are presented, analysed and incorporated in the quality assurance cycle at the Faculty level. Results are only available for individual study programmes if the response is sufficiently high. In the ISB 2016, this was only the case for the BA International Studies.

3.2.5. Job Market Survey of Alumni of FGW and National Alumni Survey

Once every four or five years, the Humanities Career Centre (Teaching and Student Affairs [OSZ]) conducts a Job Market Survey of bachelor's and master's alumni of our Faculty. Some of the questions in this survey ask them to look back on their study programme(s), and in that sense can be regarded as a programme evaluation. Alumni are asked, for instance, which elements during their study programme(s) contributed, in their opinion, to their career. They are also asked how the skills needed for their career compare with the skills developed during the study programme. All the responses are clustered in eight study-programme clusters. A separate report is produced for study programmes where the response is sufficiently high.

The National Alumni Survey (Nationale Alumni Enquête, NAE, formerly the 'WO-Monitor') is a national survey of all master's students who have recently graduated from Dutch universities. The survey takes place every two years. The results offer insight into the link between the master's programme and the job market.

For both the Faculty's Job Market Survey and the National Alumni Survey, in many of the Faculty of Humanities' master's programmes the absolute number of respondents is unfortunately too low to enable reliable reports and conclusions for individual study programmes. Study programmes with a sufficiently large response will incorporate them in their quality assurance. The 'supra-programme' results of these alumni surveys are in any case incorporated in the Faculty's quality assurance cycle.

3.2.6. Survey of the consumer field

In addition to surveying alumni, consulting the 'consumer field' (the future employers of our students) can also often provide valuable feedback on our study programmes, and particularly on the learning outcomes, and insight into the wishes of the job market. For Humanities, however, the consumer field is extremely diverse and diffuse, which makes it difficult to obtain meaningful feedback at the level of individual study programmes. Nevertheless, this survey gives some idea of the wishes of the broad professional field in relation to Humanities study programmes in general.

The Faculty is giving consideration to conducting such a survey of the consumer field in future once every six years (via the Humanities Career Center), either Faculty-wide or per cluster/domain. Where possible, we will seek to collaborate with sister faculties in the Netherlands. A few study programmes already work with an Advisory Council, and positive experiences with this are shared within the Faculty.

3.2.7. Midterm reviews and programme visitations

Programme evaluation also takes place by means of midterm reviews and accreditation visitations conducted by an 'assessment panel' of external peers / professionals. Frameworks and protocols for these programme evaluations have been established by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders NVAO (visitations) and the University itself (midterm reviews). These audits are included in the quality cycle of the study programmes and the Faculty. More information on them can be found in the Guide to Teaching Quality Assurance in the Faculty of Humanities.

4. Follow-up of teaching evaluation

4.1. Reporting and interpretation of course evaluations

Reports
Quantitative evaluations are processed by the Leiden University Graduate School of Teaching (ICLON) via the EvaSys software to produce numerical reports. These reports may be supplemented with students' written responses to any open-ended questions that were added. Qualitative evaluations are assessed by the Programme Committee, which uses them as the basis for formulating a report or advice, showing in any case what the strengths were, and what points could be improved.

Interpretation of quantitative EvaSys reports

A quantitative evaluation has an indicative value: the scores indicate *that* something can be going on in the positive or negative sense, but usually do not say exactly *what* it is. Teaching staff and study programmes can make targeted improvements only if they receive not simply the scores but also more specific, qualitative information. This is usually provided by the comments written by students in response to a few open-ended questions in the questionnaire.

Interpretation of qualitative evaluations

Qualitative evaluations do not yield *scores*, but inventorise the *opinions* of students about specified points for attention or evaluation aspects in the teaching (such as didactics, study load, difficulty level). These opinions are then summarised in a report or advice for each aspect, so that the reports are qualitatively comparable. The value of the information obtained lies in the critical weighing of the different opinions that emerge (primarily by the Programme Committee, but also by teaching staff, the Programme Board and possibly by the relevant managers). In this context, it is important to ensure that comments given only once or twice do not receive disproportionate attention. On the basis of this consideration, the decision is taken whether or not to take action.

4.2. Reporting and interpretation of programme evaluations

As in the case of course evaluations, programme evaluations can be quantitative or qualitative. Quantitative questionnaires can be processed by ICLON via EvaSys to produce numerical reports, which may be supplemented with students' written responses to open-ended questions. With qualitative evaluations, the PC itself writes a structured report containing a summary of the most important responses given by the students, comparable to the method used with qualitative course evaluations.

Advice on interpreting the results – just like advice on developing programme evaluations – can be obtained from the Educational Advice and Quality Assurance (O&K) Team.

4.3. Functioning of the Programme Committee

The PC must be able to give sufficient attention to the results and follow-up of different kinds of evaluations. It must also give attention to evaluating the method of implementing the CER, and to advising on curriculum changes, Annual Programme Reports, Action Plans, and so on. This means that a PC must hold regular meetings; the average for PCs in the Netherlands is *7 times a year*.

When assessing course evaluations, the PC also looks at the report of the previous evaluation of that course (e.g. from the previous year) and checks whether follow-up of the previous recommendations / action points has taken place. The PC ensures that its report or advice on a course evaluation or programme evaluation contains explicit improvement points for the future.

In this regard, the study programme chooses one of the following two options:
1. The PC makes *recommendations*, which are then translated by the course coordinator or the Programme Board into *action points* (or Action Plan). The course coordinator or Programme Board can also add (nuancing) responses. Or:
2. The PC describes *action points*, but only definitively formulates them after communicating with the relevant teaching staff / course coordinator or Programme Board about them, and reaching agreement.

If the teaching evaluation reveals points for attention in the assessment of the study programme, the PC will report on these to the responsible Board of Examiners.

The Faculty provides a *Manual for Programme Committees* to support their functioning. The University has also developed a Small Private Online Course (SPOC) for the purpose of instructing and training existing and new members of Programme Committees.

4.4. Follow-up by Faculty Board, Programme Board, Board of Examiners and managers

The Faculty Board incorporates 'supra-programme' points for attention from teaching evaluations in the Faculty's quality assurance cycle, linked to the annual Faculty Education Agenda.

The Programme Board incorporates the results of the most important teaching surveys / reports, and the PC advice on them, in the quality assurance cycle linked to the Annual Programme Reports.

Whenever teaching evaluation reveals 'supra-course' points for attention in the assessment, the Board of Examiners incorporates them in the quality assurance cycle linked to the Annual Report of the Board of Examiners. Where necessary, the Board of Examiners will contact individual examiners.

Results of course evaluations are shared with the relevant teaching staff and (via the Institute Board) with their managers. For this purpose, the Institute Board periodically receives from Teaching and Student Affairs (OSZ) the EvaSys reports of that institute's courses. If the evaluation results relate to the teaching of a full professor, they will also be made available to his/her manager, the Dean, once the Dean asks for them. The manager will use the evaluation results to form a judgement about the teaching, or the performance of the teaching staff member / full professor. He/she can speak directly to the teaching staff member about this, or can raise it for discussion in the Performance & Development Interview (Resultaat- en Ontwikkelgesprek, ROG). If applicable, the teaching staff member will also bring available reports and advice from the PC to the manager's attention, for the purpose of the ROG. The manager can introduce more general advice and suggestions about the teaching to the Programme Board and/or Programme Committee.

The Faculty will further scrutinise the routing / procedures of evaluation results in relation to ROGs, and consider how greater clarity, harmonisation, efficiency and effectiveness can be achieved. The next update of this Teaching Evaluation Framework (~autumn 2018) will offer more clarity about this.

4.5. Inspection and publication of evaluation data

Many people are involved at different levels in delivering teaching, in teaching evaluation and in implementing improvement plans. A variety of reports, advice and Action Plans are also generated in the process of teaching quality assurance. This raises the question as to which of the people involved must be able to inspect which documents, in order to fulfil their responsibilities in quality assurance. Aspects of privacy (of the teaching staff or students concerned) are naturally another important consideration here.

Mention was made earlier in this document of the interactions between educational or administrative bodies and the documents that are exchanged for inspection in this context. Appendix 8 contains an overview showing which evaluation and quality assurance documents must be available to the most important relevant educational bodies.

4.6. Feedback to students

Students are eager to be informed about evaluation results and the way in which they are used. They are most interested in the improvements that are introduced on the basis of evaluations and aspects that are retained because students are satisfied with them.

The Programme Board is responsible for providing feedback on teaching evaluation to students in a study programme. The Programme Committee supports the Board in this, and teaching staff can also play an important role. The PB and PC in consultation establish what is communicated to the students on the basis of teaching evaluations, how this is done, and who (PB, PC, teaching staff member) plays what role in this. Particular attention must be given here to the actions that are taken in response to evaluation results. The Manual for Programme Committees contains 'good practices' for the various ways in which contact can be maintained with the groups of students and teaching staff represented, including for feedback on evaluations. Examples of these good practices are: use of social media, organising information sessions, or messages on Blackboard.

Teaching staff themselves can tell students what changes they have made in a course on the basis of evaluation by previous students. They can do this orally during one of the contact hours, but also in a short text at the beginning of a course manual or reader, or on Blackboard, for example. Students will then know that their feedback actually receives the attention of the teaching staff member, and where necessary leads to change.

The Faculty considers it important that at least the following reports are available (online) for inspection by students:

Under the responsibility of the Faculty Board:
1. Annual NSE scores of the Faculty
2. Annual Faculty Education Agenda

Under the responsibility of the Programme Board:
3. Annual NSE factsheet of the study programme
4. Annual Programme Report

5. PC and/or PB reports based on periodic programme evaluations
6. PC and/or PB reports based on periodic evaluations relating to theses and internships
7. If available: six-monthly or annual 'supra-course' reports based on multiple course evaluations

The reports in 5, 6 and 7 may also be summaries, possibly anonymised, or other kinds of short communications, which inform the students of the study programmes in outline about the most important evaluation results and the advice and/or actions arising from them.

With regard to evaluation reports or PC reports concerning individual courses, the Programme Committee and/or the student members of the PC can consider internal publication of quantitative reports for the students; that is to say, without responses to open-ended questions.

The initiatives taken by the Faculty Board in response to teaching evaluation are also announced periodically.

A 'rule of thumb' for feedback to students is that points for attention arising from evaluations should not be directly traceable to individual people (neither students nor teaching staff). In the communication about evaluation results, the anonymity or privacy of students and teaching staff must be guaranteed, if possible.

Finally, the Guide to Teaching Quality Assurance in the Faculty of Humanities and this Teaching Evaluation Framework of the Faculty of Humanities are published on the Faculty website.

4.7. Archiving

There are statutory provisions regarding the retention periods for written regulations, decisions, reports, advice and so on in higher education. In addition, the accreditation cycle especially determines how long it is advisable to keep archived documents. The retention periods for the most important documents relating to teaching evaluation are given below:

Document	Retention period	Retained by?
Filled-in (quantitative) evaluation forms	1 year*	Teaching and Student Affairs (OSZ) (Onderwijsadministratie)
Filled-in (qualitative) evaluation forms with open-ended questions	3 years*	PC
EvaSys evaluation reports	6 years	OSZ (Educational Advice and Quality Assurance (O&K))
NSE results and results/reports of other (external) evaluations	6 years	OSZ (O&K)
PC evaluation reports	6 years	PC
PC minutes/reports (incl. decisions)	6 years	PC
PC advice to Programme Board or Faculty Board	6 years	PC
Annual Programme Reports and Faculty Education Agenda	6 years	OSZ (O&K)

* The difference between the two retention periods arises from the fact that quantitative evaluation forms (including responses to open-ended questions) are also included in EvaSys reports, and are therefore retained for longer.

5. Appendices

14

1. Course evaluation:
    a. Standard questionnaire (quantitative, closed-ended questions)
    b. Example of questionnaire (qualitative, open-ended questions)

2. Thesis evaluation:
    a. Questionnaire, without thesis seminar
    b. Questionnaire, including theis seminar

3. Internship evaluation: questionnaire

4. Programme evaluation:
    a. Quantitative questionnaire
    b. Qualitative questionnaire

5. Evaluation of minor programmes: university's standard questionnaire

6. Course evaluation: procedures
    a. Paper procedure (in Dutch)
    b. Digital procedure (in Dutch)

7. NSE scores: Leiden University and national outcomes

8. Communication and perusal of documents related to evaluation and quality assurance

Appendix 1a

Course evaluation: standard questionnaire [quantitative, closed-ended questions]

Except for questions 1, 11 and 15 a Likert-scale of 1-5 applies, <1 = totally disagree ... 5 = totally agree>

1. Your overall rating of this course on a scale from 1 to 10 (Dutch grading scale) is: <1 ... 10>

2. At the beginning, it was made sufficiently clear what you could expect of this course. (This includes written (e-prospectus/blackboard) and oral information on: content, learning goals, programme, literature, forms of assessment)

3. You find the content of the subject matter interesting.

4. The lecturer(s)/instructor(s) in this course teach(es) well.

5. The course/instructor stimulates you to actively process and apply the course contents.

6. The instructor(s) provide(s) useful feedback on presentations, assignments and assessments (including: contents, structure, grammar, presentation skills, etc.)

7. The course materials (literature, video, podcast, Blackboard, etc.) are well matched to what you should have mastered at the end of the course.

8. The instructional methods (lecture, seminar, practical/lab work, etc.) are well matched to what you should have mastered at the end of the course.

9. This course offers effective support for your learning process by using a balanced mix of digital and non-digital instructional methods, both during and outside lectures.

10. The assessments (method and contents) are well matched to what you should have mastered at the end of the course.

11. In terms of difficulty, the course is: <1 = too easy ... 3 = fair ... 5 = too difficult>

12. The overall organisation of this course is good. (Including such aspects as: provision of information, timetabling, preparation of classes by instructor, etc.)

13. The internal cohesion of the course is clear.

14. The course fits in well in the overall degree programme thus far.

15. Compared to the prescribed study load (1 EC = 28 hours including contact hours), the actual study load of this course is: <1 = too light ... 3 = in proportion ... 5 = too heavy>

Additional questions for English taught master's and bachelor's programmes

8. Differences between students with respect to the level of relevant (prior) knowledge do <u>not</u> affect the quality of teaching in this course negatively.

9. Differences between students with respect to language proficiency do <u>not</u> affect the quality of teaching in this course negatively.

10. Your proficiency in English was sufficient to participate in this course without problems.

11. If the course is taught in English: The lecturer's proficiency in English is sufficient.

Concluding open questions (in all course evaluations)

12. Can you list some strong points of this course? (Preferably name only few points with a brief explanation, instead of many points without explanation)

13. Can you list some points that need improvement? Do you have anything else to add? (Preferably name only few points with a brief explanation, instead of many points without explanation)

Appendix 1b

Course evaluation: Example of a qualitative questionnaire [open-ended questions]

1. What is your overall rating of this course on a scale from 1 to 10 (Dutch grading scale)?

2. What do/don't you find attractive/interesting about the *subject matter*?

3. What is your opinion of the teaching skills of the lecturer(s)/instructor(s) (including: clear explanations, inspiring, well-structured, clear speech, useful feedback, etc.)

4. How do(es) the instructor(s) stimulate you to actively process and apply the course contents? (including: (group) assignments, oral presentations, etc.)

5. What is your opinion of the course materials (course manual, literature, Blackboard, etc.) as effective support for your learning process?

6. Does this course use a good mix of digital and non-digital instructional methods, during and/or outside lectures? What do you think of this in terms of effective support for your learning process?

7. What is your opinion of the quality of (interim) assignments/assessments? Are they well matched to the course content and learning objectives?

8. What is your opinion of the difficulty of the course? ((far) too easy, fair, (far) too difficult)

9. What is your opinion of the cohesion and structure of this course?

10. Do you think this course fits in well in the overall degree programme thus far? (including: right level, meaningful/-less repetition, logic continuation of previous courses, right place in the curriculum, etc.)

11. What do you think of the prescribed study load (1 EC = 28 hours including contact hours) in comparison with the actual study load of this course?

12. Can you list (additional) strong points of this course, or points of improvement? (Preferably name only few points with a brief explanation, instead of many points without explanation)

Appendix 2a

Thesis evaluation: Example of a questionnaire (thesis seminar *not* included)

Questionnaire on the guidance and assessment of the thesis/final project

[unless stated otherwise the answering categories are: totally disagree – disagree – neutral – agree – totally agree]

1. Compared to the number of credit points (1 EC point = 28 hours), the workload of the thesis was:
   [much too heavy – too heavy – okay – too light – much too light]

2. My supervisor provided me with regular feedback during the process.

3. The assessment process was sufficiently clear to me and assessment was accompanied by clear feedback.

4. What are the strengths of the thesis supervision and assessment? [open answer]

5. In which ways could the thesis supervision and/or assessment be improved? [open answer]

6. The thesis seminar and writing of the thesis sufficiently addressed the competencies and skills that I have accumulated during the bachelor's programme (e.g. research skills, writing skills, learning skills, ability to give/receive feedback, planning and organization skills, et cetera).

7. Do you have any additional feedback or suggestions? [open answer]

Appendix 2b

Thesis evaluation: Example of a questionnaire (thesis seminar included)

[unless stated otherwise the answering categories are: totally disagree – disagree – neutral – agree – totally agree]

A. *General questions*

8. I am registered as a student in the bachelor's programme:
   - International Studies
   - South and Southeast Asian Studies
   - Arts, Media and Society/ Kunstgeschiedenis
   - Philosophy
   - Urban Studies
   - Linguistics
   - Other, namely ……..

9. My thesis supervisor is/was: *(should you, in view of anonymity, prefer not to mention the name of your supervisor, please leave blank)*

10. I am registered as a:
    - Full time student
    - Part time student

11. I took part in the thesis seminar organised by:
    - my own bachelor's programme
    - the Expertisecentrum Academische Vaardigheden (faculty's seminar)

12. I took part in the thesis seminar during:
    - the first semester
    - the second semester
    - the first and second semester

13. I have finished my thesis at this moment [yes/no]

B. *Thesis seminar*

14. The (learning) goals of the thesis seminar were clear to me from the information that was given in advance.

15. The teaching methods used (tutorial, assignments, presentations, et cetera) were suitable for the goals of the thesis seminar.

16. The course material was helpful (think of: reader, workbook; readability, clarity of set-up, et cetera).

17. Blackboard effectively supported the thesis seminar.

18. The thesis seminar met my needs and expectations.

19. The thesis seminar has helped me to finish my thesis within the given time.

20. The thesis seminar has contributed to the quality of my thesis.

21. The lecturer(s) taught the thesis seminar well (think of: interesting, stimulating, comprehensible, clear, structured, accessible, et cetera).

22. What are the strengths of the thesis seminar? [open answer]

23. In which ways could the thesis seminar be improved? [open answer]

C. *Thesis supervision and assessment*

24. Compared to the number of credit points (1 EC point = 28 hours), the workload of the thesis was:
[much too heavy – too heavy – okay – too light – much too light]

25. My supervisor provided me with regular feedback during the process.

26. The assessment process was sufficiently clear to me and assessment was accompanied by clear feedback.

27. What are the strengths of the thesis supervision and assessment? [open answer]

28. In which ways could the thesis supervision and/or assessment be improved? [open answer]

D. *Relationship between thesis seminar and thesis supervision*

29. There was sufficient coherence between classes and assignments belonging to the thesis seminar on the one hand and individual thesis writing and thesis supervision on the other hand.

E. *In conclusion*

30. The thesis seminar and writing of the thesis sufficiently addressed the competencies and skills that I have accumulated during the bachelor's programme (e.g. research skills, writing skills, learning skills, ability to give/receive feedback, planning and organization skills, et cetera).

31. Do you have any additional feedback or suggestions? [open answer]

Appendix 3

Internship evaluation: Example of a questionnaire [closed-ended questions]

To be filled out by the student and sent to the coordinator after finishing the internship/traineeship.

Name of the student   :
Email   :
Student number   :
Title of internship   :
Starting date internship   :
Project supervisor (Leiden)   :

Institution/organization/department   :
Project supervisor   :
Telephone   :
E-mail   :

[answers below: Totally disagree, Partially disagree, Mostly agree, Totally agree, Not applicable]

1. My supervisor provided me with sufficient feedback.

2. I was stimulated to suggest, on the basis of my results/work, avenues for further work/ exploration.

3. I participated regularly in work discussions/ meetings/ visits (also in relation to the work of others).

4. I had time and received support to undertake research as indicated in the internship project proposal

5. There was sufficient opportunity to confer with colleagues on scientific/academic aspects of my work.

6. There was sufficient opportunity to confer with colleagues on societal, ethical or other aspects of my work.

7. I felt like a full-fledged member of a working team.

8. This traineeship gave me the opportunity to learn new skills and/or further develop existing skills.

9. The content of my internship was in accordance with the project description.

10. My learning goals of this internship have been achieved.

11. What are the strengths of this internship/traineeship? [free text]

12. What points do you see for improving this internship/traineeship? [free text]

Bijlage 4a

Programme evaluation: Example of a questionnaire [quantitative, closed-ended questions]

Please note that the National Student Survey (NSE) also serves as a programme evaluation with closed-ended questions. When developing your own programme questionnaire please make sure that you do not ask for information that may already be provided by the NSE outcomes. The NSE questionnaire is available online.

[unless stated otherwise the answer categories are: strongly disagree – disagree – neutral – agree – totally agree]

1. **I am registered as a:** \<full time student\> \<part time student\> \<guest student/contact student/auditing student\>

2. **I am registered as a:** \<Bachelor's student\> \<Pre-Master's student\> \<Master's student\> \<Research Master's student\>

3. **Only applicable to bachelor's programmes:** What is your plan after having obtained your bachelor's degree?
   1 = Continue with a subsequent, general master's programme in Leiden
   2 = Continue with a professional master's programme in Leiden
   3 = Continue with a two-year research master's programme in Leiden
   4 = Continue with a two-year educational master's programme in Leiden
   5 = Continue with a master's programme elsewhere in the Netherlands
   6 = Continue with a master's programme abroad
   7 = Look for a job
   8 = I don't know (yet)

If you would like to specify or nuance your score for one or more of the following questions by means of a written comment (please refer to the hints between brackets), you can do so in the three final open questions (strengths, weaknesses, other remarks). **This will be greatly appreciated.**

4. I am satisfied with my progress in acquiring knowledge, insights and skills through the past year's study programme.

5. Thanks to the past year's study programme, I have become more independent in acquiring knowledge, insights and skills.

6. **When answering this question, consider that the study programme is based on your fulltime availability (at least 40 hours per week) for the programme:** In relation to 60 ECTS (= 42 work weeks of 40 hours) given for a study year, the efforts that were expected from me in the last year were:
   \<1 = too light ... 3 = in proportion ... 5 = too heavy\>

7. The cohesion among the courses of the past study year was good (e.g. courses build on previous courses; a course does not contain unnecessary repetition of previously taught subject matter, and so on).

8. Thanks to the past year's study programme, I have made progress in my command of:
   a. ICT-skills
      \<1 = strongly disagree ... 5 = strongly agree\>
   b. Oral presentation skills
      \<1 = strongly disagree ... 5 = strongly agree\>
   c. Writing skills
      \<1 = strongly disagree ... 5 = strongly agree\>
   d. Research skills (including library skills)
      \<1 = strongly disagree ... 5 = strongly agree\>
   e. Cooperation skills
      \<1 = strongly disagree ... 5 = strongly agree\>

9. Any peaks in the activities that were requested from me during the past year's study programme were not so high that the preparation for particular lectures, papers, test assignments and/or examinations was jeopardised.

10. I did not lose study time caused by the regular study programme of the past year (e.g. inadequate scheduling, poor provision of information, incapable peaks in the study load which led to you having to drop a particular course or exam, and so on).

11. **Only for first-year (bachelor's) evaluation:** I experienced the first-year mentorship as useful.

12. **Only answer if you have directly dealt with the study coordination department, and/or the coordinator of studies:** I am satisfied with the coordinators of study, and/or the coordinator of studies.

13. Are you satisfied so far with the assessment of courses in the past study year? If not, why not, or if so, why? Please specify which course(s). (E.g. the exam reflected the study material well; the exam questions were formulated clearly; the allotted time for the exam was sufficient, and so on. Please also mention which course assessments you preferred in particular). [open answer]

14. What are the strengths of the past academic year's education? List a few strengths with a short explanation rather than mentioning a lot of points with no explanation. [open answer]

15. What are the points of the past academic year's education that need improvement? List a few points with a short explanation rather than mentioning a lot of points with no explanation. [open answer]

16. Is there anything else you would like to add? [open answer]

Appendix 4b

Programme evaluation: Example of a questionnaire [qualitative, open-ended questions]

1. I am registered as a: \<full time student\> \<part time student\> \<guest student/contact student/auditing student\>

2. I am registered as a: \<Bachelor's student\> \<Pre-Master's student\> \<Master's student\> \<Research Master's student\>

3. **Only applicable to bachelor's programmes:** What is your plan after having obtained your bachelor's degree?
   1 = Continue with a subsequent, general master's programme in Leiden
   2 = Continue with a professional master's programme in Leiden
   3 = Continue with a two-year research master's programme in Leiden
   4 = Continue with a two-year educational master's programme in Leiden
   5 = Continue with a master's programme elsewhere in the Netherlands
   6 = Continue with a master's programme abroad
   7 = Look for a job
   8 = I don't know (yet)

4. Are you satisfied with your progress in acquiring knowledge, insights and skills through the past year's study programme?

5. Do you think that you, thanks to the past year's study programme, have become more independent in acquiring knowledge, insights and skills?

6. Are you satisfied with the sort of courses that were offered by the programme in the past year?

7. What do you think of the cohesion among the courses of the past study year? (e.g. courses build on previous courses; a course does not contain unnecessary repetition of previously taught subject matter, and so on).

8. **When answering this question, consider that the study programme is based on your fulltime availability (at least 40 hours per week) for the programme:** In relation to 60 ECTS (= 42 work weeks of 40 hours) given for a study year, what do you think of the efforts that were expected from you in the last year?

9. Are you satisfied with the progress you have made progress in your command of the following skills, thanks to the past year's study programme?
   a. ICT-skills
   b. Oral presentation skills
   c. Writing skills
   d. Research skills (including library skills)
   e. Cooperation skills

10. Are you satisfied with the assessment of courses in the past study year? If not, why not, or if so, why? Please specify which course(s). (E.g. the exam reflected the study material well; the exam questions were formulated clearly; the allotted time for the exam was sufficient, and so on. Please also mention which course assessments you preferred in particular).

11. Were any peaks in the activities that were requested from you during the past year's study programme so high that the preparation for particular lectures, papers, test assignments and/or examinations was jeopardised?

12. Did you lose study time caused by the regular study programme of the past year? (e.g. inadequate scheduling, poor provision of information, incapable peaks in the study load which led to you having to drop a particular course or exam, and so on).

13. **Only for first-year (bachelor's) evaluation:** Did you experience the first-year mentorship as useful?

14. **Only answer if you have directly dealt with the study coordination department, and/or the coordinator of studies:** Are you satisfied with the coordinators of study, and/or the coordinator of studies?

15. What are the strengths of the past academic year's education? List a few strengths with a short explanation rather than mentioning a lot of points with no explanation.

16. What are the points of the past academic year's education that need improvement? List a few points with a short explanation rather than mentioning a lot of points with no explanation.

17. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix 5

Evaluation of minor programmes: university's standard questionnaire [closed-ended]

General

1. What is your main study programme? (If you are following two programmes, please select the one in which you have made most progress so far.) [name of study programme]
2. Which minor did you follow? [name of minor]
3. How well did the minor programme fit into your regular timetable? [with a lot of difficulty (1) – very easily (5)]
     o Can you further enlarge on any timetable problems you encountered? [free text]
4. Were you faced with any substantial changes with respect to what you were led to expect on the basis of previously provided information? (For example regarding the order in which the courses were offered.) If so, please explain further. [yes/no]
     o I was faced with the following substantial changes: [free text]
5. Your gender: [m/f]
6. On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you grade your own input in the minor programme? [1-10]

The minor

8. In relation to the number of study credits awarded for this minor (30 ECTS = 840 study hours), I was required to do: [much too little (1) – much too much (5)]
9. In terms of level of difficulty, the study materials for this minor were:. [much too easy (1) – much too difficult (5)]
10. The goals of this minor were clear. [I totally disagree (1) – I totally agree (5)]
11. The various components of the minor were consistent with one another.. [I totally disagree (1) – I totally agree (5)]
12. The structure of the minor stimulated me to work independently with the study materials. [I totally disagree (1) – I totally agree (5)]
13. The testing of the minor components matched what was taught in the courses. [I totally disagree (1) – I totally agree (5)]
14. On a scale of 1 – 10, how would you grade this minor programme? [1 -10]
15. Were you given sufficient information about the minor? (If not, please explain.) [free text]
16. As a minor student, did you experience any problems in participating in the regular components of a study programme? (If so, please explain.) [free text]

In conclusion

17. Did you, or will you soon complete this minor? [yes / not yet, but I will soon / no, I will not complete this minor]
     o If you did not complete this minor, or haven't yet completed it, what are the most important factors involved? [free text]
18. How much room for electives does your study programme officially allow? [30 EC / 15 EC / other]
19. Are you satisfied with the amount of room for electives? [too little (1) – too much (5)]
20. What were in your experience the strengths of your minor? [free text]
21. What were in your experience the weaknesses of your minor? [free text]

Appendix 6a

Course evaluation: procedure for evaluation on paper (in Dutch)

Inleiding

Hieronder wordt beschreven hoe de (logistieke) route van de cursusevaluaties loopt en de archivering hiervan. Deze route is gebaseerd op een centrale onderwijsadministratie met diverse locaties en kan derhalve bij alle opleidingen worden toegepast. De evaluatie kan op twee manieren worden afgenomen: a. op papier; b. digitaal.

Papieren Evaluatie

	Actie	Actor	Deadline/ Termijn
1	Opstellen evaluatieplan voor het gehele academisch jaar	Opleidingscommissie	Uiterlijk 1 oktober
2	Aanleveren te evalueren cursussen met de docentnamen	Opleidingscommissie aan Onderwijsadministratie	Uiterlijk 6 weken voor het evaluatiemoment
3	Aanvragen evaluatieformulieren bij ICLON	Onderwijsadministratie	Uiterlijk 3 weken voor het evaluatiemoment
4	ICLON stuurt de evaluatieformulieren naar Onderwijsadministratie	ICLON	Uiterlijk 1 week voor het evaluatiemoment
5	Verdelen evaluatieformulieren naar docenten	Onderwijsadministratie	Uiterlijk 3 werkdagen voor het evaluatiemoment
6	Uitdelen evaluatieformulieren	Docent	Tijdens tentamen of laatste (werk) college
7	Innemen evaluatieformulieren en afleveren bij onderwijsadministratie	A. Bij laatste (werk) college: een aangewezen student B. Tijdens tentamen: de surveillant of examinator	Na evaluatiemoment
8	Controle of alle evaluatieformulieren zijn ingeleverd	Onderwijsadministratie	Na evaluatiemoment
9	Afleveren evaluatieformulieren bij studiepunt	Onderwijsadministratie	Na controle
10	Evaluatieformulieren opslaan	Studiepunt	Direct na aflevering
11	Evaluatieformulieren naar ICLON brengen voor verwerking	Studiepunt	Elke vrijdag voor 16.00 uur
12	Verwerken evaluatieformulieren	ICLON	

13	Rapportage opstellen	ICLON	Binnen 4 weken na evaluatie
14	Versturen rapportage naar functionele mailbox onderwijsadministratie en O&K	ICLON	4 weken na evaluatie
15	Ter beschikking stellen rapportage aan OC	Onderwijsadministratie	Binnen 5 werkdagen na ontvangst van ICLON
16	Ter beschikking stellen rapportage aan instituut t.b.v. leidinggevenden	Onderwijsadvies en Kwaliteitszorg	Iedere 1^e werkdag van de maand
17	Beoordelen evaluatierapportage. Evt. inwinnen nadere informatie van docent(en)	Opleidingscommissie	
18	Schrijven van advies en toesturen aan opleidingsbestuur	Opleidingscommissie	
19	OC-advies beoordelen, waar nodig (i.s.m. docent) opstellen van verbeteracties	Opleidingsbestuur	
20	Reactie op advies naar de OC	Opleidingsbestuur	Binnen 2 maanden na ontvangst OC-advies
21	Waar van toepassing doorvoeren van verbeteracties	Docent/Opleidingsbestuur	Voorafgaand aan eerstvolgend cursusaanbod
22	Resultaten uit cursusevaluaties meenemen in ROG met docent	Leidinggevende	
23	Archiveren ICLON-rapportage	Onderwijsadvies en Kwaliteitszorg	Minimaal 6 jaar
24	Archiveren formulieren	Onderwijsadministratie	Minimaal 1 jaar

N.B.: Voor cursussen en tentamens die na 17.00 uur plaatsvinden kunnen de formulieren worden afgegeven bij de huismeester in het Lipsius. Het studiepunt haalt de formulieren op bij de huismeester en communiceert met de onderwijsadministratie voor welke cursus er formulieren zijn ingeleverd. OSZ heeft dit afgesproken met het UFB.

Appendix 6b

Course evaluation: procedure for digital evaluation (in Dutch)

	Actie	Actor	Deadline/Termijn
1	Opstellen evaluatieplan voor het gehele academisch jaar	Opleidingscommissie	Uiterlijk 1 oktober
2	Aanleveren te evalueren cursussen met de docentnamen	Opleidingscommissie aan Onderwijsadministratie	Uiterlijk 6 weken voor het evaluatiemoment
3	Aanvragen digitale evaluatie klaarzetten door ICLON	Onderwijsadministratie	Uiterlijk 3 weken voor het evaluatiemoment
4	Aanleveren e-mail tekst voor uitnodiging en e-mailadressen studenten per cursus (inclusief datum van verzending)	Onderwijsadministratie	Uiterlijk 1 week voor het evaluatiemoment
5	Klaarzetten digitale evaluatie	ICLON	Uiterlijk 3 werkdagen voor het evaluatiemoment
6	Studenten uitnodigen en link sturen voor evaluatie	ICLON	Vanaf het moment dat de evaluatie open staat
7	Herinnering sturen aan studenten	ICLON	Na 1 week
8	Sluiten evaluatie	ICLON	Twee weken na openstelling
9	Verwerken evaluatie	ICLON	
10	Rapportage opstellen	ICLON	Binnen 4 weken na evaluatie
11	Versturen rapportage naar functionele mailbox onderwijsadministratie en O&K	ICLON	4 weken na evaluatie
12	Ter beschikking stellen rapportage aan OC	Onderwijsadministratie	Binnen 5 werkdagen na ontvangst ICLON
13	Ter beschikking stellen rapportage aan instituut t.b.v. leidinggevenden	Onderwijsadvies en Kwaliteitszorg	Iedere 1e werkdag van de maand
14	Zie stappen 17 t/m 22 in bijlage 6a	Zie stappen 17 t/m 22 in bijlage 6a	
15	Archiveren rapportage	Onderwijsadvies en Kwaliteitszorg	Minimaal 6 jaar

Appendix 7

Nationale Student Survey (NSE): average 'theme scores' for FGW, Leiden University, and The Netherlands (wo) – In Dutch

totalen voltijd en deeltijd (themascores)	Jaar	Respons (abs.)	Respons (%)	Inhoud	AlgemeneVaardigheden	WetenschappelijkeVaardigheden	VoorbereidingBeroepsloopbaan	Docenten	Studiebegeleiding	ToetsingBeoordeling	Informatievoorziening	Studierooster	Studielast	Groepsgrootte	StageEnOpleiding	StageErvaring	Studiefaciliteiten	Kwaliteitszorg	Studieomgeving**	Uitdagend onderwijs	Internationalisering	Huisvesting**
Totaal NL-Bachelor	2017	61326	36%	3,9	3,8	3,7	3,1	3,7	3,6	3,7	3,5	3,8	3,6	4,0	3,1	3,9	3,7	3,3		3,6	3,3	
Totaal LEI-Bachelor	2013	5038	36%	3,8	3,7	3,6	3,0	3,8	3,5	3,7	3,4	3,8	3,6	4,0	3,2	3,8	3,6	3,2	4,1			3,2
	2014	4341	29%	3,7	3,7	3,7	3,0	3,8	3,5	3,6	3,3	3,8	3,6	4,0	3,2	3,8	3,6	3,1	4,1			3,1
	2015	5564	35%	3,8	3,8	3,7	3,0	3,8	3,5	3,7	3,4	3,7	3,6	4,0	3,2	3,9	3,6	3,1	4,1			3,1
	2016	7576	46%	3,8	3,8	3,7	2,9	3,7	3,5	3,7	3,4	3,8	3,6	3,9	*	*	3,6	3,1	4,1			3,1
	2017	6582	39%	3,8	3,8	3,7	2,9	3,7	3,5	3,7	3,4	3,8	3,6	3,9	*	*	3,7	3,1	3,9	3,6	3,3	n.b.
Totaal FGW-Bachelor	2013	1236	37%	3,8	3,6	3,6	2,7	3,9	3,4	3,7	3,3	3,7	3,6	4,1	3,1	4,1	3,5	3,0	4,0			3,0
	2014	1164	29%	3,7	3,7	3,6	2,6	3,9	3,4	3,6	3,1	3,6	3,6	4,1	3,2	4,0	3,5	3,0	4,0			2,9
	2015	1513	34%	3,8	3,8	3,6	2,7	3,9	3,5	3,7	3,3	3,6	3,6	4,1	3,2	3,9	3,5	3,1	4,0			3,0
	2016	2148	45%	3,7	3,7	3,6	2,7	3,8	3,5	3,7	3,3	3,6	3,5	4,0	*	*	3,5	3,0	3,9			3,0
	2017	2048	41%	3,8	3,8	3,6	2,7	3,9	3,5	3,7	3,3	3,8	3,6	4,0	*	*	3,6	3,1	3,7	3,7	3,8	n.b.
Totaal NL-Master	2017	37026	34%	3,9	3,9	3,8	3,4	3,9	3,5	3,7	3,5	3,8	3,5	4,0	3,3	4,0	3,6	3,4		3,7	3,2	
Totaal LEI-Master	2013	2187	33%	3,8	3,8	3,8	3,2	3,8	3,3	3,6	3,3	3,6	3,4	4,0	3,2	4,0	3,5	3,1	3,9			2,9
	2014	1886	24%	3,7	3,7	3,7	3,1	3,7	3,3	3,5	3,2	3,7	3,4	4,0	3,2	3,9	3,5	3,1	4,0			2,9
	2015	2667	31%	3,8	3,8	3,8	3,2	3,8	3,3	3,6	3,3	3,6	3,4	4,0	3,2	4,0	3,5	3,1	4,0			3,0
	2016	3660	39%	3,8	3,8	3,8	3,3	3,8	3,4	3,6	3,3	3,7	3,4	3,9	3,2	4,0	3,5	3,1	4,0			2,9
	2017	3278	33%	3,8	3,9	3,8	3,3	3,8	3,4	3,7	3,4	3,8	3,4	3,9	*	*	3,6	3,2	3,9	3,6	3,1	n.b.
Totaal FGW-Master	2013	466	34%	3,8	3,8	3,8	2,7	3,9	3,3	3,7	3,1	3,5	3,5	4,1	2,9	4,1	3,4	3,0	3,9			2,6
	2014	397	26%	3,8	3,8	3,8	2,7	3,9	3,3	3,6	3,1	3,6	3,5	4,1	3,1	3,9	3,7	2,9	3,9			2,5
	2015	518	33%	3,8	3,9	3,8	2,7	4,0	3,3	3,7	3,2	3,6	3,5	4,1	3,0	4,1	3,5	3,0	3,9			2,6
	2016	679	41%	3,8	3,9	3,9	2,7	4,0	3,4	3,7	3,2	3,7	3,5	4,1	*	4,0	3,7	3,1	3,9			2,6
	2017	644	33%	3,9	3,9	3,9	2,7	4,1	3,6	3,8	3,3	3,9	3,5	4,0	3,1	4,2	3,6	3,2	3,9	3,9	3,5	n.b.

Appendix 8

Communication and perusal of documents related to evaluation and quality assurance

Course evaluation reports	OLC (programme committee)	OLB (programme board)	Board of Examiners	Teacher/ teaching staff	Teacher's manager	Standing committee for education	Faculty council	Faculty board
Quantitative (EvaSys) report including students' written responses to open-ended questions	x	Upon request	-	x	x	Only core curriculum courses	-	-
Students' written responses in qualitative course evaluations	x	Upon request	-	x	x	Only core curriculum courses	-	-
OC-reports and/or written advice based on quantitative or qualitative evaluation		x	Only related to testing/ assessment	x	x		x	Coure curriculum course Other courses: Upon request
Action points/improvement plans of teacher and/or programme board on the basis of course evaluation outcomes	x	x	-	x	x	-	-	Upon request
Action points/improvement plans of Board of Examiners on the basis of course evaluation outcomes	x	x		-	-	-	-	Upon request

Programme evaluation reports	OLC (programme committee)	OLB (programme board)	Board of Examiners	Teacher/ teaching staff	Teacher's manager	Standing committee for education	Faculty council	Faculty board
Quantitative (EvaSys) report, including students' written responses to open-ended questions	x	x	Only related to testing/ assessment	-	-	-	Upon request	-
Students' written responses in qualitative programme evaluations	x	x	Only related to testing/ assessment	-	-	-	Upon request	-
OC-reports and/or written advice based on quantitative or qualitative evaluation		x	Only related to testing/	-	-	-	x	-

			assessment					
Action points/improvement plans of teaching staff and/or programme board on the basis of programme evaluation outcomes	x	x	-	-	-	-	Upon request	-
Action points/improvement plans of Board of Examiners on the basis of programme evaluation outcomes	x	x		-	-	-	-	-
NSE factsheet (and report)	Only own programme	x	Only own programme	-	-	Only report at faculty level	Only report at faculty level	Only report at faculty level
Report of the minor evaluation	Only own minor (if available)	Only own minor (if available)	-	Minor coordinator	-	Only report at faculty level	Only report at faculty level	Only report at faculty level
Reports of evaluation of study abroad	x	x	-	-	-	-	-	-
Reports of (faculty's) evaluation among alumni	x	x	-	-	-	Only report at faculty level	Only report at faculty level	Only report at faculty level

Reports related to quality assurance in general	OLC (programme committee)	OLB (programme board)	Board of Examiners	Teacher/ teaching staff	Teacher's manager	Standing committee for education	Faculty council	Faculty board
Annual report of the OLC (if available)		x	Upon request	-	-	-	x	Upon request
Annual Programme Report	x		X	-	-	-	-	x
Annual report of the Board of Examiners	x	x		-	-	-	-	x
Annual report of Humanities Lab	x (OLC Hum Lab)		x (Board of Ex. Hum Lab)	-	-	-	?	x
Annual reports of the Faculty (Facultaire Onderwijsagenda)	-	x	-	-	-	x	x	

Appendix 9

Hyperlinks to relevant information, websites, advice

- Gids Kwaliteitszorg FGW (online available in English in the near future)
- Manual for programme committees
- Nationale Studenten Enquête (National Student Survey, NSE)
- Database eduactional committees FGW (members and advisors of educational boards and committees, In Dutch)
- Qualtrics is software designed to set up, process and analyze all kinds of (complex) online surveys.

Team Eduactional advice and quality assurance (Onderwijsadvies en -kwaliteitszorg, O&K): for questions and remarks in relation tot his Teaching Evaluation Framework, questions about evaluation of teaching in general, programme committes, etc.: oenk@hum.leidenuniv.nl