

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL PHYSICS

KULEUVEN AND UCLOUVAIN

ACCREDITATION • REPORT

FRAMEWORK FOR THE EUROPEAN APPROACH FOR QUALITY ASSURANCE OF JOINT PROGRAMMES

4 JUNE 2026



ROLF HEUSSER (CHAIR) • BARBARA VANDERSTRAETEN, ALAIN SERET,
KOEN WIJSMAN (PANEL MEMBER) • DAGMAR PROVIJN (SECRETARY)
• LIEN BEYLS (POLICY ADVISOR)



Table of contents

1	Executive summary	5
2	Assessment – Standards for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes	8
2.1	<i>Eligibility</i>	8
2.1.1	Status	8
2.1.2	Joint design & delivery	9
2.1.3	Cooperation Agreement	9
2.2	<i>Learning Outcomes</i>	10
2.2.1	Level	10
2.2.2	Disciplinary field	11
2.2.3	Achievement	11
2.2.4	Regulated Professions	12
2.3	<i>Study Programme</i>	13
2.3.1	Curriculum	13
2.3.2	Credits	14
2.3.3	Workload	14
2.4	<i>Admission and Recognition</i>	15
2.4.1	Admission	15
2.4.2	Recognition	16
2.5	<i>Learning, Teaching and Assessment</i>	16
2.5.1	Learning and teaching	16
2.5.2	Assessment of students	17
2.6	<i>Student Support</i>	18
2.7	<i>Resources</i>	19
2.7.1	Staff	19
2.7.2	Facilities	20
2.8	<i>Transparency and Documentation</i>	21
2.9	<i>Quality Assurance</i>	22
3	Final judgement	24
4	Assessment procedure	25
5	Overview of the assessments	26
	Annex 1: General information on the programme	27
	Annex 2: Programme-specific Learning Outcomes	28
	Annex 3: Composition of the panel	30
	Annex 4: Schedule of the site visit	31
	Annex 5: Documents reviewed	32
	Annex 6: List of abbreviations	33

1 Executive summary

The Master of Science in Medical Physics is a 120 ECTS joint master programme offered by Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KU Leuven) and Université catholique de Louvain (UCLouvain), with KU Leuven acting as coordinating institution. The programme is delivered across Leuven Arenberg, Leuven Gasthuisberg, Louvain-la-Neuve and Woluwe. It is taught in English in Option 1 and in English and French in Option 2. The programme was first delivered in the academic year 2022-2023 for students from KU Leuven and from 2023-2024 onwards for students from both institutions. It was established as the joint successor to earlier medical-physics-related programmes at both universities and is closely connected to the Belgian regulated professional pathway in medical radiation physics.

Based on the written materials and the discussions during the site visit, the panel established that the Master of Science in Medical Physics is compliant with each of the nine standards of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes.

According to the panel, the programme features several strong points that altogether warrant a positive accreditation decision. The legal, academic and organisational basis of the programme is strong. KU Leuven and UCLouvain are both entitled to offer the programme and award the joint degree within their respective higher education systems, and the cooperation between the institutions is formalised in a comprehensive agreement. The programme is not only a formal partnership on paper, but a genuine joint endeavour carried by committed academic, clinical and administrative actors.

The learning outcomes are clearly formulated at master level and do justice to the disciplinary domain and regulated-profession context of the programme. They combine medical and biomedical knowledge, radiation physics, legal and safety aspects, specialised techniques in radiology, nuclear medicine and radiotherapy, research skills, professional judgement and communication in multidisciplinary environments. The panel found that the intended learning outcomes are well aligned with the curriculum and that their achievement is demonstrated through the curriculum map, thesis work, internships, discussions during the site visit and early graduate trajectories.

The curriculum is coherent and educationally sound. It combines fundamental scientific knowledge, medical-oriented courses, specialised medical physics, safety and ethics, internships and the master thesis. The clinical internships and the master thesis give the programme a distinctive academic-professional profile and connect students with real clinical, technological and research environments. The European Credit Transfer System is applied transparently, and the programme actively monitors workload and study feasibility.

The admission and recognition arrangements are appropriate for the level and interdisciplinary nature of the programme. The programme combines direct admission routes, preparatory programmes and case-by-case assessment for students from other relevant backgrounds. The panel appreciates the joint handling of admissions by both institutions and the efforts made to clarify preparatory routes for applicants.

The programme adopts a relevant and varied approach to learning, teaching and assessment. Lectures, practical sessions, visits, internships, thesis work and assignments are used in ways that correspond with the intended learning outcomes. Assessment methods are varied and

include written and oral examinations, reports, presentations, skill tests, internship assessment and the master thesis. The panel particularly values the structured assessment of the master thesis, the attention to feedback and the safeguards for consistent assessment within the joint programme.

Students can rely on support at both programme and institutional level. The programme directors, ombudspersons, student representatives and broader support services of both universities contribute to the student support system. The panel also considers the staff and facilities to be clear strengths of the programme. The staff base is broad, qualified and committed, while the clinical, technological and research facilities available across both universities and their university hospitals provide students with a rich learning environment.

The programme provides substantial information through the programme guide, blueprint, ECTS files, course pages, information sessions and digital platforms. Quality assurance is organised through KU Leuven's COBRA framework as coordinating institution and involves programme committee discussions, student evaluations, stakeholder input, alumni feedback and action planning. The panel appreciates that the programme has taken earlier recommendations on board and is moving from a formal quality assurance system towards a more visibly shared quality culture.

In addition to these programme strengths, the panel sees several points for further enhancement. The first concerns the sustainability and organisation of clinical internship and supervision capacity. Internships are a distinctive strength of the programme and contribute substantially to its academic-professional profile, but they also depend on finite clinical capacity and on the availability of qualified supervisors. The panel also notes that internship organisation differs between hospital sites and disciplines, partly because it is embedded in local clinical workflows. The panel therefore encourages the programme and its partners to continue monitoring student intake, internship availability, supervision capacity, timing, learning goals and assessment carefully, and to further develop realistic strategies for broadening and safeguarding the internship network.

A second point for attention concerns the practical organisation of the joint programme across four campuses and several digital and institutional platforms. The panel acknowledges the measures already taken, such as the "1 campus, 1 day" principle, the two programme options, recording and livestreaming where appropriate, and the creation of a common Toledo community. Nevertheless, the distributed organisation continues to affect the daily student experience, especially in relation to scheduling, mobility, the interaction between internships and taught components, and the use of different platforms. The panel encourages the programme to continue translating its strong formal jointness into an increasingly seamless practical student experience.

A third area for enhancement concerns the clarity and visibility of information and support routes for students. The panel found that a broad support landscape is available at both programme and institutional level and that students generally receive help once they raise a question. At the same time, students do not always find it easy to know where relevant information or support can be found, particularly in a joint, multi-campus and multilingual environment. The panel therefore encourages the programme to further streamline student-facing information across platforms, languages and institutional channels, with particular attention to international students and students with specific support needs.

Finally, the panel encourages the programme to continue developing its shared quality culture and its structured dialogue with stakeholders. The quality assurance basis is solid and the programme has clearly taken earlier recommendations on board, for instance in relation to programme profiling, clarification of preparatory routes, reduction of day-to-day student mobility, expansion of the internship network and further operationalisation of quality assurance. The next step is to make feedback loops more visible to students and other stakeholders, to use management information even more deliberately for steering, to give alumni a more formal and systematic role in programme development, and to make information on professional-field needs and career routes in hospitals, industry, research and regulatory bodies more visible to students.

The panel identifies these points as important enhancement priorities for the coming period and as the obvious next steps in the further enhancement of a programme that already shows internationally acceptable quality. While they do not prevent the programme from meeting the standards, they require continued strategic attention from the programme and its partners, in particular because they relate to the sustainability, stakeholder alignment and day-to-day student experience of the joint programme. In sum, the panel's overall assessment of the Master of Science in Medical Physics is positive.

The Hague, 4 June 2026

On behalf of the expert panel convened to assess the Master of Science in Medical Physics,

Dr. Rolf Heusser
(panel chair)

Dr. Dagmar Provijn
(secretary)

2 Assessment – Standards for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes

2.1 Eligibility

The panel assesses the Eligibility standard as compliant.

2.1.1 Status

The institutions that offer a joint programme should be recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. Their respective national legal frameworks should enable them to participate in the joint programme and, if applicable, to award a joint degree. The institutions awarding the degree(s) should ensure that the degree(s) belong to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.

The Master of Science in Medical Physics is a 120 ECTS joint master programme offered by Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KU Leuven), as coordinating institution, and Université catholique de Louvain (UCLouvain). The programme was first delivered in the academic year 2022-2023 for students from KU Leuven and from 2023-2024 onwards for students from both institutions. It was created to replace earlier medical-physics-related programmes at both universities, notably the Advanced Master Medische Stralingsfysica at KU Leuven and the specialised track in medical physics within the UCLouvain Master of Physics. The dossier makes clear that the present programme should therefore be understood not as an isolated initiative, but as the outcome of a longer interuniversity trajectory in medical physics education in Belgium.

KU Leuven is a recognised university within the higher education system of the Flemish Community and is legally entitled, on the basis of Article II.172 of the Flemish Code of Higher Education, to organise joint programmes and to award joint or double degrees. UCLouvain is a recognised university within the higher education system of the French Community / Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles, with its degree-awarding powers and its ability to organise joint programmes grounded in the Decree of 7 November 2013 defining the higher education landscape and the academic organisation of studies, as amended for this programme by the Decree of 6 July 2023. The dossier therefore provides a sufficiently precise legal basis for the programme and for the joint degree awarded by both institutions.

The panel also notes that the programme is explicitly embedded in a regulated professional context. According to the self-assessment report, the programme is designed around the Royal Decrees of 9 and 13 February 2020 amending the Royal Decree of 20 July 2001, and is presented by the programme as the Belgian answer to both national requirements and the broader European directive 2013/59/Euratom concerning ionising radiation exposure. In this sense, the programme serves a clear public and professional purpose within the Belgian context.

The panel considers the legal and organisational basis of the programme to be strong. It appreciates the fact that the programme is clearly grounded in the relevant higher education frameworks of both the Flemish and the French Community, that the joint degree is properly embedded in those systems, and that the programme serves a clear regulated-profession

need in Belgium. The dossier also makes visible that the programme is the result of a longer historical development in medical physics education rather than a stand-alone initiative.

2.1.2 Joint design & delivery

The joint programme should be offered jointly, involving all cooperating institutions in the design and delivery of the programme.

The dossier and the site visit show that the programme is jointly designed and delivered. All programme-specific courses are taught by an interuniversity team of lecturers, while 40 ECTS (of 120 ECTS) core or supporting courses are borrowed from other faculties at KU Leuven or UCLouvain. The programme is taught across four campuses: Leuven Arenberg, Leuven Gasthuisberg, Louvain-la-Neuve and Woluwe. The hospitals UZ Leuven and Cliniques universitaires Saint-Luc are not only relevant practice settings for internships and theses, but are also part of the substantive rationale of the programme, together with the jointly operated proton therapy centre PARTICLE.

Jointness is visible in multiple dimensions: common admissions handling, a joint programme committee, a shared quality assurance approach, access to internship opportunities at both university hospitals, and the possibility for master thesis topics to be offered by supervisors from either institution or, where appropriate, from outside the institutions with local co-supervision. The site visit confirmed that this jointness is not merely formal. Programme management, staff and administrative actors repeatedly described the programme as a shared endeavour that took years of preparation and coordination, and the panel found this borne out in the actual functioning of the programme.

At the same time, the panel notes that the four-campus setting remains a real operational challenge. The programme has responded to this by adopting a “1 campus, 1 day” principle for scheduling wherever possible, by allowing students to choose between two options that concentrate a substantial part of the curriculum closer to their place of study or residence, and by using recording or livestreaming when borrowed courses cannot be scheduled more favourably. These measures are meaningful, but the student experience shows that the practical implications of the multi-campus model have not disappeared.

The panel further values the degree of practical jointness that is visible in governance, curriculum delivery, internships, thesis opportunities and quality assurance. The programme is clearly more than a paper consortium. At the same time, the panel notes that the multi-campus reality continues to shape the daily student experience and requires ongoing coordination. These points do not detract from the panel’s positive assessment of the standard, but they remain relevant from an enhancement perspective. The panel therefore encourages the programme to continue translating its strong formal jointness into an increasingly seamless practical student experience.

2.1.3 Cooperation Agreement

The terms and conditions of the joint programme should be laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement should in particular cover the following issues:

- *Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme;*
- *Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.);*
- *Admission and selection procedures for students;*

- *Mobility of students and teachers;*
- *Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.*

The cooperation agreement is sufficiently comprehensive. It sets out the purpose of the programme, registration arrangements, applicable legislation and internal rules, the composition and responsibilities of the Steering Committee, the duties and obligations of both universities, examination arrangements, the denomination of the degree, the location of teaching, staffing, quality assurance, insurance, personal data processing, dispute settlement and annexes concerning the joint programme, applicable regulations, diploma template and financial provisions. The agreement also clarifies the division of operational responsibilities between KU Leuven and UCLouvain.

The Steering Committee established under the agreement is broadly composed and includes academic representatives, administrative staff, teaching assistants and student representatives from both institutions. Its remit covers policy and operational aspects of the programme, permanent monitoring of the curriculum, monitoring of consistency and quality, quality assurance, decisions on admissions and exemptions, and the organisation of the representative examination committee. In the panel's view, this agreement and the structures it establishes provide a sufficiently robust operational framework for a joint programme of this kind.

The discussions during the site visit did not raise immediate concerns about the financial arrangements of the programme. The panel notes that the cooperation agreement includes financial provisions and that the programme is embedded in the regular institutional and faculty planning of the partner universities. This supports the panel's view that the organisational framework is adequate, while continued attention to resources remains relevant in view of possible growth and the pressure on clinical supervision capacity.

The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Eligibility.

2.2 Learning Outcomes

The panel assesses the Learning Outcomes standard as compliant.

2.2.1 Level

The intended learning outcomes should align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), as well as the applicable national qualifications framework(s).

The programme's learning outcomes are articulated through a set of domain-specific learning outcomes and a more detailed set of twenty-one programme-specific learning outcomes structured according to the five categories derived from the Dublin descriptors: knowledge and insight, applying knowledge and insight, developing an opinion, learning skills, and communication. The self-assessment report explicitly maps these programme-specific learning outcomes to the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area and to the relevant national qualification frameworks. On that basis, the panel is

satisfied that the intended learning outcomes are formulated at the appropriate level for a second-cycle programme.

The panel also notes that the domain-specific learning outcomes were reviewed through a process organised by VLUHR and approved on 20 January 2022. In the French Community no separate common frame of reference was required at this stage because no other comparable initial master was being organised. The dossier nevertheless indicates that, should such a common frame become necessary later, the same learning outcomes would be proposed there as well. This supports the view that the level and framing of the outcomes are appropriately grounded.

2.2.2 Disciplinary field

The intended learning outcomes should comprise knowledge, skills, and competencies in the respective disciplinary field(s).

The learning outcomes reflect a programme with a strong and recognisable disciplinary profile. They combine medical and biomedical knowledge, fundamental sciences related to ionising and non-ionising radiation, legal aspects relevant to medical radiation physics, specialised techniques across radiology, nuclear medicine and radiotherapy, research skills, decision-making in radiation protection, insight into clinical questions, and communication in multidisciplinary environments. The panel also notes that the outcomes are not limited to immediate hospital practice, but extend to industry, governmental institutions and scientific research.

The programme's profile is therefore broad, but not vague. At the same time, the panel recognises the tension, already noted in the earlier review and again discussed during the site visit, between the broader title "Medical Physics" and the programme's particularly strong orientation towards medical radiation physics as defined in Belgian regulation. The panel considers this a legitimate profile choice, provided it remains transparent to students and stakeholders. The programme has clearly taken steps in that direction through its blueprint, programme guide and information sessions.

The panel also notes that the programme opens routes towards clinical practice, industry, governmental or regulatory bodies and research. The discussions during the site visit nevertheless showed that students and alumni would benefit from continued clarity about these different routes and about future needs in the professional field, especially because the programme is strongly associated with the Belgian hospital-based recognition pathway.

2.2.3 Achievement

The programme should be able to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

The dossier provides several lines of evidence that the intended learning outcomes can be achieved and are being achieved. Appendix 2 presents a curriculum map showing that each learning outcome is covered by multiple courses, internships and/or the master thesis. The sample work reviewed by the panel, in particular thesis work, supported the panel's view that students can integrate disciplinary knowledge, research skills, professional judgement and communication. The discussion with students and alumni during the site visit confirmed that students recognise the intended outcomes in the actual curriculum and can relate them to

their learning experience, while alumni information indicated that graduates move into pathways commensurate with the programme's ambitions, including clinical practice after the postgraduate certificate, doctoral trajectories and industry positions.

The panel further notes that the programme itself identifies the master thesis as the most integrative component in relation to the achievement of learning outcomes. The thesis encourages students to bring together disciplinary knowledge, research skills, professional judgement and communication. Although the programme is still relatively young and the number of graduates remains limited, the evidence from the curriculum map, student work, discussions during the site visit and early graduate trajectories converges sufficiently to support a positive judgement under this criterion.

The panel therefore regards the evidence for achievement as sufficiently varied and credible. At the same time, it sees continued value in ensuring that the programme remains transparent about its specific profile within the broader field of medical physics and attentive to future developments, including international and innovation-related developments. These are points of ongoing reflection rather than grounds for doubt about compliance.

2.2.4 Regulated Professions

If relevant for the specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC, or relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive, should be taken into account.

The panel notes that the minimum agreed training conditions specified in Directive 2005/36/EC are not directly applicable to this programme. At the same time, the programme is explicitly linked to the Belgian regulated professional pathway of the expert in medical radiation physics. The self-assessment report explains that the programme is designed around the Royal Decrees of 9 and 13 February 2020 amending the Royal Decree of 20 July 2001 and in accordance with Directive 2013/59/Euratom concerning ionising radiation exposure. The Royal Decree of 13 February 2020 defines the minimum qualification requirements for the certified expert in medical radiation physics, including at least 60 ECTS in specified domains and a full-time-equivalent clinical internship of one calendar year in radiotherapy, radiology or nuclear medicine.

The dossier further explains that at least two months of this clinical internship must be part of a university programme and be performed in the context of the university hospital where the academic supervisor carries out clinical activities. These two months are included in the two internships within the Master of Science in Medical Physics; the remaining ten months are included in the postgraduate certificate offered separately by KU Leuven and UCLouvain. The Federal Agency for Nuclear Control determines the topics to be covered by the internship, and the final internship report forms part of the file submitted to FANC's Medical Jury. The panel therefore considers that the regulated-profession dimension has been appropriately taken into account. This orientation gives the programme a clear public and professional relevance, while the distinction between the master's programme and the

subsequent postgraduate certificate remains important for understanding the profile of the programme.

The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Learning Outcomes.

2.3 Study Programme

The panel assesses the Study Programme standard as compliant.

2.3.1 Curriculum

The structure and content of the curriculum should be fit to enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

The curriculum is organised into five thematic groups: Physics, Mathematics and Chemistry; Medical-oriented courses; Medical Physics; master's thesis and Internships; and Safety and Ethics. This structure gives the programme a clear internal logic. Fundamental scientific knowledge and medical basics are combined with specialised courses in radiology, radiotherapy and nuclear medicine, while the thesis and the two internships connect research and professional practice. The curriculum overview included in the dossier further visualises several learning paths through the programme and makes explicit the range of possible outflows, including postgraduate training, doctoral work, hospital practice, industry and government agencies.

Students choose at the start between Option 1, where all courses are taught in English, and Option 2, where some UCLouvain courses are taught in French. Although the exact number of ECTS in equivalent borrowed courses may vary slightly between both options, the intended learning outcomes are the same. The site visit made clear that the curriculum is experienced as coherent and meaningful and that the internships in particular are seen as a distinctive advantage, even by those who do not primarily aim for a hospital career. The panel also notes that the curriculum is clearly shaped by the Royal Decree requirements, while still leaving room for broader scientific and professional pathways.

The programme guide, blueprint and curriculum structure show that the programme seeks to balance regulatory anchoring with breadth. The panel values the fact that the curriculum includes not only technical and clinical components but also safety, sustainability, ethics and law. It also notes positively that the programme uses the internships and the master thesis to give students insight into real clinical and research environments. At the same time, the discussion with students and alumni during the site visit pointed to some overlap between courses, especially in introductory content, and to some unevenness in the visibility or workload of particular areas such as radiology. The panel does not consider this to undermine the coherence of the curriculum, but it remains a point for further refinement.

The panel considers the study programme to be well designed and educationally sound. It values the clear thematic structure of the curriculum, the meaningful progression from fundamentals to specialised and applied learning, and the way in which clinical internships and the master thesis give the programme a distinctive profile. The curriculum succeeds in

combining scientific, technical, clinical and ethical elements in a recognisable and coherent whole.

2.3.2 Credits

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly and the distribution of credits should be clear.

The programme amounts to 120 ECTS, which is appropriate for a second-cycle programme under the Framework. The dossier presents the curriculum in a transparent way, including ECTS per course and per thematic group. Appendix 3 and the programme guide make the overall allocation understandable. The panel therefore considers the application of ECTS to be generally sound.

At the same time, the panel notes, on the basis of the evidence reviewed, that some minor differences in credit allocation remain between equivalent or related borrowed courses, and that a few individual courses may still invite reflection on the proportionality of workload and credits. These are not major design flaws, but they are remnants of the programme's history and therefore suitable for further clean-up.

2.3.3 Workload

A joint bachelor programme will typically amount to a total student workload of 180-240 ECTS-credits; a joint master programme will typically amount to 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at second cycle level (credit ranges according to the FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified. The workload and the average time to complete the programme should be monitored.

The self-assessment report states that workload is monitored through standardised student evaluations, programme committee discussion, student and alumni consultations, and the broader COBRA framework. The report explicitly refers to workload as a recent topic in these consultations and explains that the programme committee is already examining whether some quality-assurance-related courses can be moved in order to improve the balance in the second year. The programme also indicates that about ten per cent of students have chosen to spread their curriculum over a longer period, often because workload was experienced as one of the main challenges.

The discussion with students and alumni during the site visit confirmed that workload is experienced as real, especially in the first year and where internships and courses interact. It also showed that the practical organisation of internships differs between hospital sites and disciplines. These differences are understandable because internships are embedded in local clinical workflows, but they can affect the ease with which students combine internships with taught components. Students also confirmed, however, that internships are valued so strongly that they do not frame them as expendable but rather as components that need careful organisation. The panel therefore reads workload not as a sign of structural curricular unsoundness, but as a legitimate point of continued monitoring in a demanding programme with heterogeneous intake and substantial professional ambitions.

The panel also appreciates that the programme has continued to refine its organisation in response to experience and feedback. Minor ECTS inconsistencies, some content overlap and the need for continued workload monitoring remain valid enhancement points, but they do

not call into question the basic soundness of the programme. The dossier shows a curriculum that is already functioning credibly and that is still being actively fine-tuned. These matters are being monitored through evaluations and programme committee follow-up and do not currently affect the programme's ability to enable students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel therefore concludes that the standard is met.

The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Study Programme.

2.4 Admission and Recognition

The panel assesses the Admission and Recognition standard as compliant.

2.4.1 Admission

The admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate in light of the programme's level and discipline.

The admission framework is clear and reflects the interdisciplinary nature of the programme. Direct admission is foreseen for students with a Bachelor of Physics, while students from other relevant backgrounds, such as engineering sciences, chemistry, industrial engineering with nuclear technology, or bio-science engineering, may be admitted with a limited preparatory programme. Other backgrounds can be considered through a more extensive preparatory pathway determined on a case-by-case basis. In addition, the dossier describes an abridged route of around 60 to 63 ECTS for students who have already completed a KU Leuven Master of Physics or Master of Biomedical Engineering with the option Medical Physics, and comparable cases are assessed individually.

The panel notes positively that admissions are handled jointly by the admissions offices of both universities and by the two programme directors in consensus. The site-visit presentation further clarifies that the most common preparatory cases are now listed on the website and that applicants who do not meet the direct-entry profile are systematically reviewed and informed in their acceptance letter about the detailed preparatory programme required. This reflects a serious effort to combine openness to different backgrounds with a fair and academically responsible entry into the programme.

At the same time, the panel also notes, on the basis of the self-assessment report and the discussions during the site visit, that the practical administrative handling has not always been fully smooth in the early years of the programme. Issues arose in relation to admissions approvals, publication of the programme guide and the interaction between the two institutional environments. The programme reports that these issues have been remedied and attributes them to the regrettable but understandable complexity of a new multi-campus joint programme. The panel accepts this explanation, while also considering that the student experience of clarity and predictability should remain an ongoing point of attention.

The panel considers the admission and recognition framework to be fundamentally sound. It appreciates the programme's willingness to work with diverse entry profiles without losing sight of the need for a fair starting point. The case-by-case approach, the use of preparatory

programmes and the more explicit communication of common pathways all point to a serious and maturing admissions culture.

2.4.2 Recognition

Recognition of qualifications and of periods of studies (including recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.

Recognition is applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention. Students may apply for exemptions on the basis of prior studies and/or relevant work experience, and the dossier indicates that such requests are considered by the programme committee according to the procedures of the coordinating institution. KU Leuven Admissions also maintains an extensive equivalence overview for degrees from top-ranked universities and requests more detailed documentation where necessary. In this way, recognition is embedded in a structured institutional framework rather than handled ad hoc.

The panel also notes that recognition and mobility are not identical matters. While the programme has a functioning recognition framework, outgoing mobility remains limited in practice because of the strong national-professional anchoring of internships and recognition trajectories. This does not undermine the recognition arrangements as such, but it does explain why mobility remains a more delicate issue than formal recognition.

The panel also finds the recognition framework to be adequate. At the same time, the student experience shows that administrative simplicity has not yet been fully achieved in every respect. This is understandable in a joint programme with two systems, and the practical complexity may be more visible for students who navigate both institutional environments intensively, including students in Option 2. Because the programme has clarified common preparatory routes and reports that early administrative issues have been remedied, the panel does not consider this to affect compliance with the standard. It therefore encourages the programme to continue simplifying the practical student experience of admission and registration wherever possible.

The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Admission and Recognition.

2.5 Learning, Teaching and Assessment

The panel assesses the Learning, Teaching and Assessment standard as compliant.

2.5.1 Learning and teaching

The programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve those. The diversity of students and their needs should be respected and attended to, especially in view of potential different cultural backgrounds of the students.

The teaching formats used in the programme are varied and deliberately linked to the subject matter and the intended learning outcomes. The self-assessment report distinguishes lectures, practical sessions, visits, internships, thesis work and a limited number of assignments, and even visualises their distribution across the programme in ECTS terms.

Lectures may take the form of direct teaching, flipped classes or hybrid multi-campus teaching. Practical sessions range from guided in-class exercises to larger laboratory projects that prepare students for their internships, thesis work and later professional practice.

The panel appreciates that the programme does not reduce teaching to traditional lectures alone. Internships and thesis work are explicitly positioned as learning environments in which students apply knowledge, develop judgement, acquire learning skills and communicate in multidisciplinary settings. Site visits within courses serve to connect students with facilities and stakeholders not otherwise directly present in the programme. The dossier also explains that teaching formats are announced at the start of the academic year and per course through Toledo or Moodle, and that the programme committee regularly discusses them with student input.

The discussions during the site visit confirmed that the educational team is engaged and approachable and that a variety of methods is indeed used. The panel also found that staff are supported through institutional professionalisation structures, including compulsory teaching assistant training at KU Leuven and the Louvain Learning Lab at UCLouvain. At the same time, the daily experience of teaching in a four-campus environment remains operationally complex. Hybrid teaching and recording are meaningful mitigations, but they do not fully remove the need for careful coordination, particularly in relation to borrowed courses and the overlap between internship periods and course participation.

2.5.2 Assessment of students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes. They should be applied consistently among partner institutions.

Assessment is embedded in the broader evaluation policy of the KU Leuven Faculty of Science and in the Regulations on Education and Examinations of the coordinating institution. According to the dossier, assessment formats are aligned with learning outcomes and teaching formats and take several forms, including written and oral exams, reports, presentations, skill tests and the final master thesis. The self-assessment report even quantifies the balance between these formats across the programme, showing that the programme does not rely on one single form of assessment.

The programme's explicit feedback orientation is a strength. The report states that KU Leuven has placed feedback at the centre of its evaluation policy in recent years and that this is reflected in both assessment design and communication. Continuous feedback is provided during project work and the thesis, while systematic feedback is attached to presentations, reports and skill tests. Feedback on written and oral examinations is generally discussed at course level rather than individually, although special requests can be accommodated. The standardised student questionnaire also includes explicit questions on alignment between assessment and intended learning.

The master thesis assessment is described in considerable detail. The final mark combines the judgement of the promotor on process and skills (50%), the evaluation of the manuscript by two independent readers not involved in the project (30%), and the thesis defence (20%). Appendix 4 provides a structured assessment roster that covers process, content, form and defence, including criteria on planning, scientific attitude, independence, problem solving,

HSE, originality and the correct use of GenAI. The site visit complemented this with a credible explanation of how AI use is addressed in practice, including declaration requirements, plagiarism checking, and the oral defence as an additional safeguard.

Internship assessment remains more compact and largely pass/fail in character, but the site visit clarified that Internship 1 is organised as a reflective observational period and Internship 2 as a more hands-on integration into clinical workflows. The panel considers the reflective reporting in Internship 1 to be appropriate for its observational purpose, and students regarded the pass/fail format as suitable for the nature of the internships. In the panel's view, the programme can therefore credibly explain why its internship assessment differs in form from thesis assessment. The remaining point of attention lies more in consistency and practical organisation across hospitals and platforms than in a lack of alignment with the programme's learning goals. The panel also notes that assessment arrangements are anchored in common regulations and in the joint governance structures of the programme. On the basis of the evidence reviewed, it did not find indications that assessment standards are applied differently between the partner institutions.

The panel considers this standard to be a strength of the programme. Teaching formats are varied, purposeful and broadly well aligned with the intended learning outcomes. The programme combines academic, technical and clinical learning in a convincing way and supports staff in keeping teaching formats and content up to date. Assessment likewise shows a credible range of methods and a strong feedback orientation.

The dossier is particularly helpful in showing that this variety is not incidental but part of a broader educational logic. The explicit description of teaching formats, the structured thesis assessment and the attention to feedback all contribute to the panel's positive view. At the same time, the daily student experience would still benefit from a more coherent digital and organisational environment, especially where multiple platforms and the overlap of internships and courses create friction. These are enhancement points relating to organisation and student experience, not signs of insufficient educational quality or inconsistent assessment practice. The panel therefore concludes that the standard is met. The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Learning, Teaching and Assessment.

2.6 Student Support

The panel assesses the Student Support standard as compliant.

The student support services should contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. They should take into account specific challenges of mobile students.

Student support is organised both at programme level and through the broader services of the two universities. According to the self-assessment report, the programme directors serve as direct contact points for student questions and introduce the programme and available services in dedicated information sessions at the start of the academic year at both institutions. Students are also welcome to contact the programme directors informally, including before applying. Ombudspersons are part of the first-line contact structure, and students are represented in the programme committee.

Beyond programme-level support, the dossier shows a broad institutional ecosystem. At KU Leuven, the Faculty of Science supports students in matters such as the individual study

programme, agenda, lecture locations and examination scheduling, and offers financial support for mobility between campuses. KU Leuven-wide services include STUVO, Student Health Care and Well Being, Pangaea for international students, dedicated support for student-parents and arrangements for students with disabilities or specific support needs. At UCLouvain, housing support is organised through the Housing Service and broader welfare, health and financial support through the Student Support Service, with tailored activities for international students, family-related support and accessibility-oriented support where needed.

The panel considers this broad support landscape a clear strength. The dossier and the discussions during the site visit indicate that students generally receive help once a question is raised and that the programme leadership is approachable. At the same time, the discussion with students during the site visit showed that students do not always find it easy to know where relevant information or support is located, particularly in a multi-campus and multi-platform setting. The Toledo community created from 2025-2026 onwards is a meaningful response to this issue, but it is still in the process of being fully populated and embedded.

The panel considers the student support system to be adequate and sufficiently broad. It values the fact that support is available both through the programme itself and through the extensive infrastructures of both universities. The dossier also shows that mobility-specific support, including travel reimbursement and international student services, is explicitly recognised as necessary in a joint multi-campus programme.

At the same time, the student experience suggests that the main challenge is no longer the absence of support but the clarity and visibility of access routes to that support. The programme has recognised this itself and has already taken steps to address it. Because support is available through both the programme and the institutions, and because students generally receive help once a question is raised, the panel regards this as an issue of accessibility and visibility rather than adequacy. It therefore encourages the programme to continue improving the visibility, accessibility and coherence of student support in the daily experience of students.

The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Student Support.

2.7 Resources

The panel assesses the Resources standard as compliant.

2.7.1 Staff

The staff should be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme.

The programme can rely on a substantial and relevant staff base. The list of lecturers in Appendix 5 shows a broad educational team spanning both KU Leuven and UCLouvain, including staff with academic, clinical and ethical expertise. The self-assessment report states that staff have been selected on the basis of their knowledge, experience and qualifications relevant to the courses, the master thesis and clinical training supervision. The panel found

this credible during the site visit, where staff members came across as highly knowledgeable, committed and strongly connected to the programme.

The dossier also shows that staffing is supported institutionally. Teaching assistants at KU Leuven follow compulsory training, while UCLouvain organises a welcome day and links staff to the Louvain Learning Lab. Educational developers at KU Leuven support the programme both at programme level, for example in relation to COBRA and quality assurance, and at course level in the development of teaching and evaluation formats. This contributes to a professional environment that extends beyond the disciplinary expertise of individual teachers.

The panel nevertheless notes that the most delicate resource issue is not the general qualification of staff, but the sustainability of internship and thesis supervision. The site visit repeatedly underlined that clinical capacity is finite and that the programme cannot fully control inflow at master level. In the panel's view, this is a structural pressure point that deserves continued strategic attention, even though it does not presently undermine the adequacy of staffing.

2.7.2 Facilities

The facilities provided should be sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

The programme benefits from a rich set of facilities distributed across four campuses. KU Leuven Arenberg offers lecture rooms, hybrid teaching infrastructure and the Advanced Nuclear Teaching Laboratory, alongside library facilities. KU Leuven Gasthuisberg combines teaching infrastructure with the medical and clinical environment at the heart of the programme and provides a wide array of imaging and therapy infrastructures, including CT, MRI, SPECT and PET systems, radiopharmacy infrastructure, and the jointly operated proton therapy centre PARTICLE. UCLouvain provides parallel environments in Louvain-la-Neuve and at Saint-Luc in Woluwe, thereby expanding the range of available learning settings and the capacity of the programme.

The panel appreciates the fact that the distributed facility structure is not arbitrary but educationally meaningful. Students gain access to different technological environments, different clinical contexts and a wider range of research and practice opportunities than would be possible in a single-site programme. The discussion with students and alumni during the site visit also confirmed that this diversity of environments is generally valued. At the same time, the same distributed structure generates logistical complexity, especially where mobility, scheduling and internship capacity intersect. Even though the students indicated that they do not always get their preferred internship location, all students get the opportunity to do the internship in one of both hospitals and within their preferred discipline. The panel considers the resources available to the programme to be a clear strength. The staff base is broad, highly qualified and visibly engaged. The facilities are strong and exceptionally relevant to the field, with the proton therapy centre, imaging infrastructure and clinical environments providing the programme with a rich educational and research basis.

The strong sense of collegiality and shared ownership among staff further enhances the resource base of the programme.

The main point of attention lies in the sustainability of internship and supervision capacity if student numbers continue to grow. The programme is aware of this, and both the dossier and the site visit indicate that broadening the internship network is already being considered. The panel found no evidence that current staff or facilities are insufficient; the point concerns sustainability under growth scenarios. It therefore encourages the programme and its partners to continue developing realistic strategies in this area.

The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Resources.

2.8 Transparency and Documentation

The panel assesses the Transparency and Documentation standard as compliant.

Relevant information about the programme like admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures etc. should be well documented and published by taking into account specific needs of mobile students.

The dossier shows that the programme provides a substantial amount of relevant information. The programme guide presents the curriculum, application requirements and course information; the blueprint explains the rationale and profile of the programme; each course has its own page with information on content, scheduling, location, teaching and evaluation formats, lecturers, workload and prerequisites. At the start of the academic year, information sessions are organised and recorded so that all students receive the same basic information and have the opportunity to ask questions. Students also gain access to Toledo or Moodle, the KU Leuven intranet, KU Loket and, where relevant, the UCLouvain systems. The panel appreciates that the programme has clearly acted on the earlier request for greater transparency about its specific orientation in medical radiation physics. The dossier explicitly states that the blueprint serves precisely as a public explanation of the programme's rationale and profile. The site-visit presentation adds that this profile is systematically communicated in information sessions for prospective and new students. In this sense, the programme has made real progress since the 2022 review.

At the same time, the discussion with students during the site visit made clear that the practical information landscape remains more fragmented than desirable. Students still refer to difficulties in finding the right information quickly, especially on scheduling, admissions, thesis tutorial arrangements, reimbursement and the interaction between Toledo, Moodle and Teams. Some pages or support routes were described as confusing, untranslated or insufficiently merged, with Moodle being less accessible for students who do not normally use the UCLouvain environment. The panel also considers it important that practical information for international students and for students with disabilities or other specific support needs to be easy to locate within this broader information landscape. In addition, students and alumni would benefit from clearer information on career opportunities and professional-field needs across the hospital, industry, research and regulatory routes that the programme itself identifies. The panel therefore reads this standard as one where the

programme has already invested considerably, but where the student-facing coherence of the information environment still lags behind the amount of information formally available.

The panel considers the information base of the programme to be substantial and increasingly well developed. The programme guide, blueprint, ECTS files and digital learning environments together make a considerable amount of relevant information available. The panel also appreciates that the programme has clearly reflected on transparency as an issue and has already taken concrete steps such as the creation of a common Toledo community.

Nevertheless, the practical experience of documentation and information remains an enhancement area. The key issue is no longer whether information exists, but whether it can be found easily, consistently and in time by students in a joint, multi-campus and multilingual environment. This also applies to information that is particularly relevant for international students and for students with disabilities or other specific support needs. Because the programme has recognised this issue and has already taken steps such as the common Toledo community, the panel does not consider it to undermine compliance with the standard. It therefore encourages the programme to continue simplifying and streamlining the student-facing information environment across platforms, languages and institutional channels. The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Transparency and Documentation.

2.9 Quality Assurance

The panel assesses the Quality Assurance standard as compliant.

The cooperating institutions should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.

The programme's quality assurance is organised within the COBRA framework of KU Leuven as coordinating university. The self-assessment report explains that COBRA combines ongoing care for educational quality with periodic reflection in a four-year cycle based on programme blueprint, action plan, stakeholder dialogue, quantitative data, documented reflection and feedback into further actions. The programme committee is responsible for the quality of the programme as a whole and includes academic staff, supporting staff, teaching assistants and six students from both institutions. Appendix 7 shows that this committee is complemented by a subcommittee for analysing student-questionnaire feedback and by a deliberation committee that monitors student progress.

The quality assurance system also makes use of multiple data sources. These include student registration and progress data, standardised course evaluations, student and alumni consultations, lecturer reflection, annual meetings with programme lecturers, and consultations with the Belgian Hospital Physicists Association in relation to internships. The self-assessment report explicitly states that student evaluations are systematically reviewed by a subcommittee and the findings are reported to the full programme committee, with attention to possible action points. It also notes that consultations with students and alumni are organised by an educational developer to ensure confidentiality and lower the threshold for frank feedback. In the panel's view, these arrangements constitute a meaningful

management information base, although its use for steering and its visibility in the programme's enhancement narrative can still be strengthened further.

The panel considers these arrangements substantial and credible. The site visit gave a clearer picture of how they function in practice. The programme explained how short-term and long-term actions are discussed in the programme committee, how action plans are linked to the COBRA cycle, and how issues such as workload, clarification of preparatory routes, information provision through a common Toledo community and alumni feedback are translated into follow-up. The site-visit presentation also showed that the programme sees itself as moving "from QA system to quality culture" and that it is consciously trying to broaden reflection beyond formal box-ticking.

At the same time, the panel recognises that the quality culture of a young joint programme across two universities and multiple hospitals is still developing. This is also acknowledged by the programme itself. The main remaining challenge is therefore not the absence of a quality assurance system, but the further deepening of its shared character, the more systematic use of steering information, and the greater visibility of closed feedback loops to students and other stakeholders. The panel also sees value in continuing to create low-threshold feedback moments where students can speak freely about the programme experience, and in structuring external input more visibly, including input from hospitals, industry and regulatory bodies on professional-field needs, internship capacity and future developments. The alumni network, which is currently taking shape through feedback interviews and a LinkedIn group, is promising but still young.

The panel considers the quality assurance basis of the programme to be strong and trustworthy. It values the seriousness with which quality assurance is organised, the broad representation in the programme committee, the use of both qualitative and quantitative information, and the fact that the programme has clearly taken earlier recommendations on board. The dossier shows not only structures, but also a functioning practice of consultation, reflection and action.

The next step, in the panel's view, is not to build a quality assurance system from scratch, but to continue developing a visibly shared quality culture across institutions and hospitals, to use management information even more deliberately for steering, to make enhancement effects more visible to students, and to strengthen structured input from alumni and the professional field. The gradual formalisation of alumni involvement may become an important asset in this regard. Since these enhancement points are already visible in the programme's monitoring and follow-up structures, they do not call into question the basic robustness of the quality assurance arrangements. The panel therefore concludes that the standard is met. The above findings and considerations lead the panel to establish that the Master of Science in Medical Physics complies with the standard Quality Assurance.

3 Final judgement

The panel is positive about the Master of Science in Medical Physics, offered jointly by KU Leuven and UCLouvain. It concludes that the programme satisfies all standards of the Framework for the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes. The panel therefore advises a positive decision.

The programme rests on a strong legal, academic and organisational basis and is visibly carried by committed partners, staff and programme leadership. The panel particularly values the coherence of the curriculum, the alignment and achievement of the learning outcomes, the close connection with clinical practice through the internships, the excellent infrastructure, and the quality and commitment of the staff.

The panel has nevertheless formulated the following enhancement inspired recommendations, which may help the programme to further strengthen its joint endeavour:

- Continue translating the strong formal jointness of the programme into an increasingly seamless practical student experience, with sustained attention to scheduling, mobility and the specific complexity of Option 2.
- Safeguard the sustainability of internship and thesis supervision capacity, in particular if student numbers continue to grow, and further develop realistic strategies for broadening the internship network.
- Continue aligning the organisation and assessment of internships across hospitals and disciplines where possible, while preserving the educational value of the different clinical contexts.
- Further refine the curriculum by monitoring content overlap, minor ECTS inconsistencies, workload balance and the practical combination of internships with taught components.
- Continue clarifying admission, registration and administrative procedures for students from different entry backgrounds and institutional environments.
- Streamline the student-facing information environment across Toledo, Moodle, Teams and institutional websites, including information on schedules, examinations, reimbursement, support routes and specific provisions for international students and students with specific support needs.
- Make the different career perspectives more visible to students, including routes towards hospital practice, industry, research and regulatory or governmental bodies, and communicate more clearly about professional-field needs.
- Continue developing a visibly shared quality culture across the partner institutions and hospitals, including clearer feedback loops, more deliberate use of management information for steering, low-threshold student feedback opportunities, and more formal involvement of alumni and the professional field.

The panel considers that these recommendations require continued strategic attention from the programme and its partners, in particular because they relate to the sustainability and day-to-day student experience of the joint programme. However, they do not detract from the positive overall judgement. They should be understood as obvious next steps in the further enhancement of a programme that already demonstrates internationally acceptable quality across the standards of the Framework.

4 Assessment procedure

The assessment was carried out in line with the Framework for the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes – November 2020.

The panel prepared itself for the assessment on the basis of the Self-Assessment Report and annexes submitted by KU Leuven and UCLouvain.

The site visit took place on 27 and 28 April 2026 and included separate discussions with representatives of programme management, teaching staff, students and alumni, and the professional field, followed by a second dialogue with programme management. During the site visit the panel also received a presentation on the programme's development since the preliminary accreditation and the actions taken in response to the earlier recommendations. During the dialogue, the panel investigated the context of the joint programme and the cooperating institutions and collected the information required to reach a judgement on the quality of the programme.

During its closed deliberation after the site visit, the panel discussed all information obtained and translated this into a judgement per standard and for the programme as a whole. The panel reached its conclusions in full independence.

All information obtained led to the present panel report, which was circulated among the panel members. Their feedback was incorporated into this committee version of the report.

5 Overview of the assessments

The panel presents their assessments per standard, as outlined in chapter 2.

Standard	Assessment
1 Eligibility	Compliant
2 Learning Outcomes	Compliant
3 Study Programme	Compliant
4 Admission & Recognition	Compliant
5 Learning, Teaching & Assessment	Compliant
6 Student Support	Compliant
7 Resources	Compliant
8 Transparency & Documentation	Compliant
9 Quality Assurance	Compliant
Programme as a whole	Positive

Annex 1: General information on the programme

Institution	- Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (KULeuven) (coordination); - Université catholique de Louvain (UCLouvain)
Address, institution website	Oude Markt 13, 3000 Leuven, Belgium https://www.kuleuven.be/english Place de l'Université 1, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium https://uclouvain.be/en/index.html
Qualification	Master of Science in Medical Physics
(Additional) title	N.A.
(Parts of) field of study(s)	Sciences, Engineering, Medicine ISCED 0914 Medical diagnostics and treatment technology
Specialisations	No formal specialisations. Internship and later professional orientation may focus on: - Radiology - Radiotherapy - Nuclear medicine
Programme routes	- Option 1 (all courses in English) - Option 2 (some courses in French at UCLouvain) - Abridged programme (60–63 ECTS) for certain prior master backgrounds
Location where the programme is offered	- Leuven; - Louvain-la-Neuve - Brussel-Woluwe
Teaching language	- English (Option 1) - English and French (Option 2)
Study load (in credits)	120 ECTS

Annex 2: Programme-specific Learning Outcomes

Knowledge and insight

- 1) The student has the required knowledge to start the internship necessary to obtain the certification of expert in medical radiation physics according to the guidelines of the Federal Agency for Nuclear Control, (FANC), or to perform other functions related to medical radiation physics (in industry, government institutions, scientific research, applications, ...).
- 2) The student has a profound knowledge of the aspects of medical and biomedical sciences relevant to professional action within the context of medical radiation physics.
- 3) The student has a thorough theoretical and practical knowledge of and insight in the fundamental aspects of ionizing and non-ionizing radiation physics and of the legal aspects relevant to medical radiation physics.
- 4) The student has a profound knowledge of the techniques and mathematical methods (including ICT) related to the three specializations within medical radiation physics, and has in-depth knowledge of their own specialization.
- 5) The student has acquired the skills to get familiar with the most recent developments in a research domain of medical physics.

Applying knowledge and insight

- 6) The student has the skills and insight to take the following steps in their own (both fundamental and clinical) scientific research, to solve advanced problems from medical radiation physics, embedded in a research group:
 - a. To define a research topic, formulate a research question and adjust it during the research;
 - b. To consider and plan an appropriate experimental and/or theoretical solution procedure;
 - c. To carry out and implement a risk analysis of the experiments to be carried out;
 - d. To carry out a scientific study independently and accurately, with attention to originality and creativity;
 - e. To process and evaluate/interpret the data found (statistically) with a critical-scientific attitude;
 - f. All this taking in account the appropriate ethical rules of conduct within the discipline.
- 7) The student possesses the skills to make people in their environment (both laymen and colleagues) aware of the importance of radiation protection and quality control, and is able to communicate this to the medical team.
- 8) The student can identify and apply the imaging and treatment techniques specific to medical physicists in the hospital environment.
- 9) The student has insight into clinical questions.

Developing an opinion

- 10) The student can look up professional literature, also in foreign languages, assess its validity, and use it for research and development purposes.
- 11) The student can independently process, critically interpret and comment on the results of both their own research and literature research in light of a specific research question.

- 12) The student has a good knowledge of the ethical aspects of research in medical radiation physics and is able to act accordingly. They can participate in a social debate.
- 13) The student can identify the essence of a situation and draw up a working model for this. They can design experimental and/or theoretical procedures to study contemporary research problems in medical radiation physics and to improve existing solutions.
- 14) The student is able to take decisions about radiation protection independently and with a sense of responsibility.
- 15) The student has insight into the detection of technical errors in equipment and/or procedures in medical radiation physics and can estimate the consequences thereof.

Learning skills

- 16) The student is able to explore new domains in the field through independent study and get acquainted with new insights, results and methods.
- 17) The student is able to conduct research and tackle scientific problems, paying attention to originality and creativity.
- 18) The student has (acquired) an attitude of lifelong learning, both as to knowledge and skills.

Communication

- 19) The student has acquired the necessary attitudes and skills to participate as a team player in a multidisciplinary professional environment.
- 20) The student is able to report, communicate and present the results of their own research, both in writing and orally to national and/or international colleagues and to a wider audience, taking into account the ethical rules.
- 21) The student can take a reasoned position and defend this orally to peers and experts and communicate this in writing to the general public.

Annex 3: Composition of the panel

The composition of the panel that assessed the quality of the Master of Science in Medical Physics of KU Leuven and UCLouvain was as follows:

- Dr. Rolf Heusser, MD, MPH (*chair*), International QA expert, Former director of the Swiss Accreditation and QA Agency in Higher Education, Former president of European Consortium for Accreditation in Higher Education, Swiss School of Public Health/University of Zurich, Switzerland;
- Prof. dr. ir. Barbara Vanderstraeten (*panel member*), Associate Professor of Medical Physics at Ghent University & Medical Physics Expert Radiotherapy at UZ Gent, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Alain Seret (*panel member*), Professor Physics and Radiophysics in Medical Imaging, former Medical Physics Expert in Nuclear Medicine, Université de Liège, Belgium;
- Koen Wijsman, MD, MSc (*student panel member*), MSc in Medicine, MSc in Healthcare Management, Member of ESU's Quality Assurance Experts Pool, PhD Candidate in Artificial Intelligence for Medical Imaging at Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands.

The panel was assisted by:

- Lien Beyls, policy advisor Flanders NVAO, process coordinator;
- Dagmar Provijn, policy advisor Flanders NVAO, secretary.

All panel members and the process coordinator/secretary have signed NVAO's code of deontology.

Annex 4: Schedule of the site visit

The site visit by the panel to the programme was conducted on 27 and 28 April 2026 as part of the external assessment procedure regarding the Master of Science in Medical Physics of KU Leuven and UCLouvain. The schedule was as follows:

27 April 2026 – campus Gasthuisberg UZ Leuven

Time	Meeting
17:10 – 18:00	Visit to NeuroExplorer and Medical Imaging Research Center
18:00 – 19:00	Visit to PARTICLE Proton Therapy Center

28 April 2026 – Department of Physics and Astronomy KU Leuven

Time	Meeting
08:45 – 10:15	Session 1 – Representatives of the programme management (academic & non-academic)
10:45 – 11:45	Session 2 – Teaching staff
13:30 – 14:30	Session 3 – Students and alumni
14:45 – 15:30	Session 4 – Professional field
16:00 – 16:30	Session 5 – Second dialogue with programme management
17:30 – 18:00	Concluding dialogue

Annex 5: Documents reviewed

During the site visit the programme management presented the following documents:

Information file

- Self-Assessment Report (26 November 2025)

Annexes to the information file

- Appendix 1 - Cooperation agreement between KU Leuven and UCLouvain
- Appendix 2 - Mapping between the curriculum and the learning outcomes
- Appendix 3 - Structure of the program with logical sequence
- Appendix 4 - Master's thesis evaluation form
- Appendix 5 - List of all lecturers and link to their online CV
- Appendix 6 - Student questionnaire
- Appendix 7 - Committees
- Appendix 8 - Reports from the different consultations of the stakeholders, contributing to the COBRA exercise for the Master of Science in Medical Physics

Documents made available during or leading up to the dialogue

- Presentation on the programme's development since the preliminary accreditation (site visit, 28 April 2026)
- Workflow procedure for a smooth alignment of the admission and registration process
- Admission review sample
- Reflection report and programme action plan
- Internship report: Radiotherapy in Gasthuisberg (internship 1)
- Internship report: Radiotherapy in Gasthuisberg (internship PG)
- Internship report: Radiotherapy in Saint-Luc (internship 1)
- Internship report: Radiotherapy in Gasthuisberg (internship 2)
- Internship report: Nuclear Medicine in Saint-Luc (internship 2)
- Internship report: Nuclear Medicine in Saint-Luc (internship 2)
- Internship report: Radiotherapy in CH Mouscron (internship 2)
- 3 Master theses and evaluation reports

Annex 6: List of abbreviations

ECTS	European Credit according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System
COBRA	The integral quality assurance for education at KU Leuven, ensuring external accountability
NVAO	Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie)
FANC	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control
QA	Quality Assurance
KU Leuven	Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
UCLouvain	Université catholique de Louvain

The panel report has been ordered by NVAO for the accreditation of the Master of Science in Medical Physics of KU Leuven and UCLouvain according to the Framework for the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint programmes.

Colofon

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MEDICAL PHYSICS

KU LEUVEN & UCLouvain (VL131113-26)

Accreditation • Panel report

4 June 2026

Composition: NVAO • Vlaanderen



Nederlands-Vlaamse Accreditatieorganisatie
Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders

Parkstraat 83 • 2514 JG Den Haag
P.O. Box 85498 • 2508 CD The Hague
The Netherlands

T +31 (0)70 312 23 00
E info@nvao.net
www.nvao.net