

# FACT SHEET

## NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY 2015



UNIVERSITEIT  
VOOR  
HUMANISTIEK

Compared to national average of universities and compared to last year.

Your study programme in general

2015  
**4.29**

2014  
**4.26**

The general atmosphere in your study programme

2015  
**4.60**

2014  
**4.64**

Would you recommend your programme to friends, family or colleagues?

2015  
**4.48**

2014  
**4.46**

response=33.1%,  
n=185

### STUDENT SATISFACTION REGARDING THE 17 THEMES in comparison with last year and compared to national average of universities.



CONTENT		
2015	2014	national avg
4.17	4.15	The level of your study programme
3.99	3.97	The degree to which the content of your study programme meets your expectations
3.84	3.94	The match between your prior education and your study programme
4.24	4.30	The degree to which you find your study programme to be stimulating
4.01	4.01	The match between the content of your study programme and current developments
3.82	3.78	The coherence between the various components of your programme
3.97	4.03	The methods used in your study programme
3.48	3.36	The scope provided to you to tailor your own programme
4.01	4.06	The intrinsic quality of the study materials
3.67	3.63	The match to your work experience
3.71	3.38	The degree to which you can apply what you learn in your work situation

GENERAL SKILLS		
2015	2014	national avg
4.54	4.52	Learning to have a critical attitude
3.87	3.94	Problem-solving skills
3.93	4.04	Substantiating conclusions
4.42	4.46	Communication skills (e.g. oral presentations, conversation skills)
4.21	4.24	Collaboration with others
3.91	3.93	Argumentation / reasoning skills

SCIENTIFIC SKILLS		
2015	2014	national avg
4.15	3.99	Analytical thinking
3.87	3.80	The critical assessment of scientific work
3.53	3.55	Writing scientific papers
3.78	3.81	Research methods and techniques
3.92	3.85	Conducting research

CAREER PREPARATION		
2015	2014	national avg
3.82	3.71	Acquiring skills for professional practice
3.83	3.84	The practical focus of your study programme
3.68	3.65	The link to professional practice (e.g. work placements/internships, guest speakers)

ACADEMIC GUIDANCE/ COUNSELLING		
2015	2014	national avg
4.03	3.99	The opportunity for receiving guidance/counselling
3.88	3.86	The quality of the guidance/counselling offered
3.61	3.72	The degree to which your study programme shows initiative in providing support or guidance

LECTURERS		
2015	2014	national avg
4.40	4.42	Your lecturers' expertise
3.76	3.86	Your lecturers' didactic qualities
4.07	4.06	The accessibility of lecturers outside contact hours
4.22	4.22	The lecturers' sense of involvement with their students
3.93	3.94	The quality of guidance provided by lecturers
3.79	3.81	The quality of feedback provided by lecturers
4.21	4.31	The degree to which lecturers are inspiring
3.94	4.02	Lecturers' understanding of the field of professional practice

TESTING AND ASSESSMENT		
2015	2014	national avg
3.77	3.76	The clarity of the assessment criteria
3.91	3.90	The link between testing and assessment and the content of the study programme
3.98	3.98	The quality of assessment of knowledge and understanding
3.75	3.77	The quality of skills assessment

STUDY INFORMATION		
2015	2014	national avg
3.76	3.75	The information on your study progress
3.66	3.70	The information on rules and procedures
3.32	3.31	The information on the structure of the programme
3.56	3.20	The timely publication of results and assessments

PROGRAMME SCHEDULES		
2015	2014	national avg
4.17	3.99	The timely publication of programme schedules
4.01	3.74	The timely notification of schedule changes

STUDY LOAD		
2015	2014	national avg
3.65	3.59	The distribution of the study load over the academic year
3.90	3.93	The feasibility of deadlines
3.87	3.77	The ability to take the desired course components without encountering a delay
3.46	3.26	The degree to which credits (ECs) correspond to the actual study load

GROUP SIZE		
2015	2014	national avg
4.10	4.05	The group size for tutorials
4.35	4.18	The group size for lectures
4.32	4.37	The ratio of small-scale to large-scale teaching activities in your study programme

# DETAILED REPORT



INTERNSHIPS AND STUDY PROGRAMME		
2015	2014	national avg
4.08	3.73	The quality of the internship supervision you received from your study programme
3.60	3.38	The preparation for the internship you received from your study programme

INTERNSHIP EXPERIENCE		
2015	2014	national avg
3.94	4.35	The supervision you received at your internship company, institute or agency
4.14	4.81	What you learned during your internship
3.76	3.96	The link between your internships and the rest of your study programme

STUDY FACILITIES		
2015	2014	national avg
3.76	3.58	The suitability of the classrooms
3.51	3.24	The suitability of workplaces (e.g. computers, study rooms of sufficient quality)
3.41	2.92	The availability of workstations (e.g. sufficient number of workstations)
3.83	3.53	The library / media centre
3.57	3.16	The IT facilities
3.69	3.61	The digital learning environment

QUALITY CARE		
2015	2014	national avg
3.86	3.97	Teaching evaluations held among students
3.06	3.21	Information on the results of teaching evaluations
3.41	3.33	The way your study programme uses the results of teaching evaluations
3.70	3.43	The way your study programme responds to complaints and problems

STUDY ENVIRONMENT		
2015	2014	national avg
4.61	4.53	The accessibility of your institution
3.74	3.76	The restaurant/catering facilities at your institution
4.65	4.58	The bars, pubs, restaurants etc. in the city where you're studying
4.56	4.55	The cultural scene in the city where you're studying
3.10	3.00	The sports/exercise facilities offered by your institution

HOUSING		
2015	2014	national avg
2.61	2.41	The availability of housing in the city where you're studying
2.31	2.18	The affordability of housing in the city where you're studying

1.00 Score significantly HIGHER compared to last year

1.00 NO significant difference compared to last year

1.00 Score significantly LOWER compared to last year

Significantly HIGHER compared to national avg

Significantly LOWER compared to national avg

NO significant difference compared to national avg