

**ERASMUS MUNDUS MASTER'S PROGRAM  
IN PUBLIC POLICY**

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL STUDIES

**ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM**

QANU  
Catharijnesingel 56  
PO Box 8035  
3503 RA Utrecht  
The Netherlands

Phone: +31 (0) 30 230 3100  
E-mail: [support@qanu.nl](mailto:support@qanu.nl)  
Internet: [www.qanu.nl](http://www.qanu.nl)

Project number: Q613.EUR

© 2017 QANU

Text and numerical material from this publication may be reproduced in print, by photocopying or by any other means with the permission of QANU if the source is mentioned.



# CONTENTS

<b>REPORT ON THE ERASMUS MUNDUS MASTER'S PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY OF ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM.....</b>	<b>4</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAM .....	4
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION .....	4
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	4
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL.....	5
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT .....	7
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS .....	11
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>27</b>
APPENDIX 1: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	29
APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE .....	29
APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES.....	31
APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM.....	33
APPENDIX 5: PROGRAM OF THE SITE VISIT .....	35
APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL.....	37

This report was finalized on 19 September 2017



# REPORT ON THE ERASMUS MUNDUS MASTER'S PROGRAM IN PUBLIC POLICY OF ERASMUS UNIVERSITY ROTTERDAM

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Limited Program Assessments as a starting point (19 December 2014).

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAM

### Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy

Name of the program:	Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy
CROHO number:	75098
Level of the program:	master's
Orientation of the program:	academic
Number of credits:	120 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Governance and Development; Political Economy and Development
Location(s):	The Hague, the Netherlands & York, United Kingdom (specialization Governance and Development); The Hague, the Netherlands & Barcelona, Spain (specialization Political Economy and Development)
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Joint program:	yes
Partner institutions involved:	University of York, United Kingdom; Institut Barcelona d'Estudis Internacionals, Spain
Type of degree awarded:	Master of Arts
Language of instruction:	English
Expiration of accreditation:	15/07/2018

The visit of the assessment panel Political Science to the International Institute of Social Studies of the Erasmus University Rotterdam took place on 17-18 May 2017.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Erasmus University Rotterdam
Status of the institution:	publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	positive

## COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel Political Science. The panel that assessed the master's program Political Science consisted of:

- Prof. dr. Marijke Breuning, Professor of Political Sciences, Department of Political Science, University of North Texas in Denton, Texas [chair].
- Dr. Renske Doorenspleet, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and International Studies, University of Warwick.



- Dr. Christien Van den Anker, Associate Professor of Politics and International Relations, Faculty of Health & Applied Sciences, University of the West of England in Bristol.
- Prof. dr. Ferdi De Ville, co-director of the Centre for EU Studies, Ghent University.
- Prof. dr. Peter Vermeersch, Professor of Political Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, KU Leuven.
- Prof. dr. Dirk De Bièvre, Professor of International Politics, Department of Political Science, University of Antwerp.
- Felix Wagner, third-year bachelor student Political Science Radboud University Nijmegen [student-member].

The panel was supported by dr. Els Schröder, who acted as secretary. Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.

## WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

### *Preparation*

In preparation for the assessment, the management provided a critical reflection for the master's program. In these critical reflections, the management described the current state of affairs and provided useful information for the assessment of its programs. The secretary checked the report for completeness of information before sending it to the panel members. In consultation with the chair, the secretary selected fifteen master theses, covering the full range of marks given and from all specialisations from the academic years 2013-2015 and 2014-2016. For a list, see Appendix 6. The panel members also received the grades and the assessment forms filled out by the examiners and supervisors. In a preparatory meeting on 21 March 2017, the panel members discussed their findings based on the critical reflection and studied material.

### *Site visit*

A site visit to the International Institute of Social Studies took place at 17-18 May 2017 in the presence of all panel members, assisted by an NVAO-certified secretary. Prior to the site visit, the panel asked the program to select representative interview partners. It met during the site visit with the program management, current students, staff, alumni, members of the examination board and members of the program committee of the program. Skype interviews were conducted to also meet with members of staff and the program management of the two other institutions involved in the Consortium. The panel provided students and lecturers the opportunity to meet informally during a consultation hour outside the set interviews. No requests were received for this option. The panel used the final part of the visit for an internal meeting to discuss its findings. The visit was concluded with an oral presentation of the preliminary impressions and general observations by the chair of the panel. This presentation was open to all. For the program of the site visit, see Appendix 5. The panel also examined relevant study material, assessment forms and additional material during the site visit. An overview of all documents and reviewed by the panel is included in Appendix 6.

### *Report*

Based on the panel's findings, a draft report was prepared by the secretary. All panel members commented upon the draft report and their comments were implemented accordingly. Subsequently, the program checked for factual irregularities. Comments by the program were discussed between secretary and chair and, where necessary, other panel members before finalising the report.

### *Decision rules*

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited program assessments, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of both the standards and the program as a whole.

### **Generic quality**

The quality that can reasonably be expected in an international perspective from a higher education master's program.



**Unsatisfactory**

The program does not meet the current generic quality standards and shows serious shortcomings in several areas.

**Satisfactory**

The program meets the current generic quality standards and shows an acceptable level across its entire spectrum.

**Good**

The program systematically surpasses the current generic quality standard.

**Excellent**

The program systematically well surpasses the current generic quality standard and is regarded as an international example.



## SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

The post-initial, academically oriented Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy (Mundus MAPP) started in 2007 as a Double Degree program funded through the European Erasmus Mundus Program. In 2011, the partner institutions successfully applied for a continuation of the Erasmus Mundus program as a joint degree. The Mundus MAPP program started as a fully joint degree program in September 2012.

The program is offered by a consortium consisting of the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) at the Erasmus University Rotterdam in The Hague (the Netherlands), the Department of Public Policy at the Central European University (CEU) in Budapest (Hungary), the Instituto Barcelona de Estudios Internacionales (IBEI) in Barcelona (Spain) and the University of York (York) in York (United Kingdom). The principal body of the Consortium is the Mundus MAPP Academic Board. Each partner university has equal representation in the Board, which is responsible for, among others, deciding on admissions and examinations, distributing scholarships, hearing complaints and overseeing curriculum development and quality assurance. The curriculum for the joint program has been developed in close cooperation between the staff of all four partner institutions, the students and alumni of the former double degree program.

The program as a whole comprises the full spectrum of Public Policy. The Mundus MAPP program has four different tracks which are situated in the broad field of political science, public policy and public administration. The four mobility tracks or specializations in the joint degree each allow for a different focus while maintaining a uniform core. Students study at two institutions, following one of these mobility tracks. They follow their first year at ISS in The Hague and their second year at York (ISS-York track: Governance and Development) or at IBEI in Barcelona (ISS-IBEI track: Political Economy and Development). Alternatively, they follow their first year at CEU in Budapest and their second year at York (CEU-York track: European Public Policy) or at IBEI in Barcelona (CEU-IBEI track: Global Public Policy).

All four tracks are accredited by the relevant national authorities, respectively in the Netherlands, United Kingdom, Spain and Hungary. Additionally, the CEU tracks are also accredited in the United States of America, as CEU is an American institution. The two tracks accredited by the Dutch authorities are the ISS-IBEI track and the ISS-York track, as only these mobility tracks are awarded a master's degree issued by a Dutch university (jointly with either York or IBEI). Hence, this limited program assessment addresses only these two tracks at three partner institutions (ISS, York, IBEI) of the Consortium. The complex structure of a joint degree program leaves its mark on this assessment, as will become clear from reading the panel's observations regarding the standards of the assessment framework.

The panel considers the Mundus MAPP program unique within the domain of Political Science. The program focuses on international and transnational policy issues, is both multidisciplinary and multiculturally oriented and does not privilege any national context over another. The ISS-IBEI and ISS-York track are both carefully formulated and characterized, reflecting the joint nature of the degree program as well as the diversity and richness of the theoretical knowledge and academic approaches on offer within the three host institutions involved.

Mundus MAPP seeks to equip graduates with the conceptual knowledge and skills that are necessary for understanding and potentially intervening in contemporary policy problems. In addition, the program offers practical training to future academic and policy leaders in the public, private and non-profit sectors. The program translated these aims to different levels of operation. At the transnational level, it focuses on issues such as climate change, international terrorism and financial regulatory failure. At the national and local levels, it delves into the politics and implementation of anticorruption strategies and decentralisation policies. At a more individual level, Mundus MAPP's goal is to advance the graduates' career objectives, whether these involve further academic studies in a doctoral program or a fast-track professional career.



These objectives are operationalized in twenty detailed learning outcomes, which are in line with an academic master's program rooted in political science. They properly reflect the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework and the Dublin descriptors at master's level. The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be ambitious and challenging yet advises to reformulate the learning outcome regarding the conceptual advancement in social science theories. Additionally, the panel recommends including the program's central vision, based on a distinction between problem-solving and problem-situating approaches, in the intended learning outcomes.

The panel verified that the teaching-learning environment within the joint degree program Mundus MAPP is adequately organized to support students in achieving the intended learning outcomes. The program's didactical approach, which strongly leans on the diverse and multicultural intake of students, is intellectually challenging and brings students into contact with diverse teaching methods and international approaches. Students learn from each other's experiences, creating insights in alternative perspectives on Public Policy that could not easily be obtained in separate programs within only one higher education institution. The international classroom is considered by the panel as one of Mundus MAPP's true strengths, central to its didactic concept in combination with the existing culture of academic critical thinking with practice components and its intensive tutoring.

The panel applauds the program for its ability to create a truly joint program with a clear content structure and for its systematic response to student and staff feedback. Both the joint components and track-specific courses are well-designed and communicate an overarching vision built on the interaction between problem-situating and problem-solving approaches to contemporary problems of international policy making. This vision is widely supported by staff members within the participating institutions. Nonetheless, the panel also noted that this shared philosophy still results in some transition problems between Year 1 and Year 2 for students and it therefore strongly suggests the program to address these in the following years. Communication, both in written and oral form, is hereby key. A shared Mundus MAPP thesis manual with clear guidelines and criteria and an updated version of the existing program guide could be, amongst other measures, useful documents to counter these transition problems. In addition, the panel strongly advises the Academic Board to direct its attention to the introduction of a learning trajectory aimed at developing students' adaptability skills. This would guide students more explicitly through the program and connect Year 1 more clearly to Year 2. It would have the additional benefit of defining a shared skill set for all students upon which the second-year supervisors could further build.

The panel ascertained that the teaching-learning environment within the joint degree program Mundus MAPP is adequately organized to support students in achieving the intended learning outcomes. Course work at ISS, York and IBEI are up to standard for master's level and the practical components, in particular the study visit, enhance students' professional skills and networks. A point of some concern is the current organization of the internship. Following IBEI and York's example, the panel recommends appointing an official internship coordinator at ISS. He or she may invest in long-term collaborations with suitable organizations in the Netherlands. The Mundus MAPP program benefits from the expertise of a large team of teaching staff that, in the panel's view, is appropriately qualified to teach at master's level. The panel heartily supports the program's attention for further team-building initiatives in the coming years.

The current system of assessment is reasonable, but not without its vulnerabilities: it is highly dependent upon the quality, integrity, objectivity and time investment of the EQAR and the integrity of the Academic Board members. Notwithstanding these observations, the panel feels assured by the current measures in place to sufficiently guarantee a fair and reliable assessment for students in these challenging surroundings. Yet it also encourages the Mundus MAPP Consortium to direct its attention to the improvements that can be made in the coming years, in particular with respect to the transparency of assessment for students. Meeting all standards of a Dutch limited program assessment at a satisfactory level is no meager feat. The panel wants to underline that even though they recognize that improvements can be made regarding the transparency of assessment, it has ascertained that ISS and the Academic Board adopt a proactive and serious approach regarding this matter.





Based on the written documentation and additional information provided during the site visit, the panel concludes that the Mundus MAPP program has navigated the task to align assessment between four institutions to the best of its abilities. Course work is sufficiently monitored by the legal bodies at the partner institutions of the Consortium. Students are positive regarding feedback procedures. The quality of assessment of course work is adequately assured. Cases of fraud, such as plagiarism and academic dishonesty, are effectively addressed within the partner institutions. Nevertheless, the panel learnt during the site visit that further legal advice is needed to draft a protocol regarding matters of fraud as legal restrictions regarding data sharing makes it hard for the Academic Board to be fully in control, due to the cross-national environment in which the program operates.

The panel concludes that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses studied by the panel reflected interesting arguments and perspectives on topics which are presented against a relevant and sufficiently contextualized theoretical background. Students amply demonstrate that they are able to conduct an independent research project at master's level. The panel recommends rendering the students' reflective abilities more clearly into the theses. The alumni are satisfied with the program as a preparation for their further career. They identified the strong research methods training, the richness of the encountered theoretical perspectives and the interaction within the international classroom as the most useful part of the program for their current employment.

A joint degree program based at four partner institutions is confronted with many additional (legal) challenges that a single degree program does not encounter, for example regarding sharing confidential student information that potentially hinders free communication between Year 1 and Year 2 regarding matters of fraud and/or student progress. Consequently, it needs a proactive attitude to counter problems, the willingness to embrace both improvement and change, and time to concisely follow procedure in a legally satisfying manner. Mundus MAPP has presented itself positively in this respect: the program management is reflective and willing to act upon recommendations for further improvement, it responds well to feedback from its staff, students and third parties, and it is well under way to fully meet all legal requirements demanded by national law in five different legal systems. Change is, however, only functional if adequate time is allowed and allocated to discuss measures for improvement amongst the partner institutions. At the moment, the panel recommends that priority be given to improvement in the transparency of assessment, starting with the introduction of a shared Mundus MAPP thesis manual and criteria, enhancement of the degree of intersubjectivity and further alignment of assessment practices amongst staff members.

The panel assesses the standards from the *Assessment framework for limited program assessments* in the following way:

*Master's program Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy*

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	good
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	satisfactory
Standard 3: Assessment	satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	satisfactory
General conclusion	satisfactory

The chair and the secretary of the panel hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 19 September 2017



Prof. dr. Marijke Breuning



dr. Els Schröder





# DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS

## **Introduction to the Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy**

The Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy (hereafter: Mundus MAPP) started in 2007 as a Double Degree program funded through the European Erasmus Mundus Program. In 2011, the partner institutions successfully applied for a continuation of the Erasmus Mundus program as a joint degree. The Mundus MAPP program started as a fully joint degree program in September 2012.

The program is offered by a consortium consisting of the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) at the Erasmus University Rotterdam in The Hague (the Netherlands), the Department of Public Policy at the Central European University (CEU) in Budapest (Hungary), the Instituto Barcelona de Estudios Internacionales (IBEI) in Barcelona (Spain) and the University of York (York) in York (United Kingdom). The principal body of the Consortium is the Mundus MAPP Academic Board. Each partner university has equal representation in the Board, which is responsible for, among others, deciding on admissions and examinations, distributing scholarships, hearing complaints and overseeing curriculum development and quality assurance. The curriculum for the joint program has been developed in close cooperation between the staff of all four partner institutions, the students and alumni of the former double degree program.

The program as a whole comprises the full spectrum of Public Policy. The Mundus MAPP program has four different tracks which are situated in the broad field of Political Science, Public Policy and Public Administration. The four mobility tracks or specializations in the joint degree each allow for a different focus while maintaining a uniform core. Students study at two institutions, following one of these mobility tracks. They follow their first year at ISS in The Hague and their second year at York (ISS-York track: Governance and Development) or at IBEI in Barcelona (ISS-IBEI track: Political Economy and Development). Alternatively, they follow their first year at CEU in Budapest and their second year at York (CEU-York track: European Public Policy) or at IBEI in Barcelona (CEU-IBEI track: Global Public Policy).

The two tracks starting in CEU can be situated more in the area of Public Administration while the tracks starting in ISS are more in the field of Political Science. The differences between the tracks can be described along two dimensions. Students who start at ISS are exposed to development studies, while those starting at CEU focus on the impact of economic and democratic transition. The second dimension is the distinction between 'problem-situating' and 'problem-solving' analysis in international governance and development. A common characteristic of the MAPP program is that each track aims to confront the students with theories and issues beyond the experience of Western European or North American countries.

All four tracks are accredited by the relevant national authorities, respectively in the Netherlands, United Kingdom, Spain and Hungary. Additionally, the CEU tracks are also accredited in the United States of America, as CEU is an American institution. The two tracks accredited by the Dutch authorities are the ISS-IBEI track and the ISS-York track, as only these mobility tracks are awarded a master's degree issued by a Dutch university (jointly with either York or IBEI). Hence, this limited program assessment addresses only these two tracks at three partner institutions (ISS, York, IBEI) of the Consortium. CEU is not formally part of this limited program assessment, though CEU's representative in the Academic Board is also part of the daily management of the ISS-IBEI and ISS-York tracks and has therefore been interviewed by the panel.



**Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes**

The intended learning outcomes of the program have been concretized with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements.

**Explanation:**

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

**Findings***Mundus MAPP profile*

The Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy (Mundus MAPP) is submitted for accreditation under the cluster Political Science. ISS is closely involved with the network of political scientists in The Netherlands and provided input in the domain-specific framework of reference. This framework is attached in Appendix 2. The panel ascertained that the two tracks under consideration (ISS-IBEI and ISS-York) meet the profile and requirements formulated in the domain-specific framework of reference. It studied the framework, compared the program's approach of the domain and its learning outcomes to the framework and verified its findings with representatives of the program management, students and alumni.

Mundus MAPP has a clearly recognisable and distinct profile, which is considered by the panel as highly relevant for a degree in the field of Political Science in its academic orientation, methodological approach, skill set and professional outlook. It offers a varied and diverse overview of theory and methodological approaches, is highly flexible in catering towards students' interests and does not privilege any national context over another: students are exposed to a variety of European and international academic traditions and policy contexts. The diversity of the international classroom is consistently tapped into to bring in further multidisciplinary and multicultural views, experiences and perspectives. Mundus MAPP distinguishes itself from other public policy programs in its focus on both international and transnational policy issues. Exposure to either development studies or to a careful consideration of the impact of economic and democratic transition processes is another defining characteristic of the program.

*Track-specific approaches*

The four mobility tracks each allow for a different balance between problem-situating and problem-solving approaches. ISS and IBEI focus on problem-situating approaches, while a problem-solving outlook takes centre stage at York and CEU. Hence, all mobility tracks offer a different substantive focus. This focus was also repeatedly attested to in interviews with staff members and students. The problem-situating and problem-solving distinction was named by staff members and students, confirming the centrality of this theme in the program. The panel therefore earmarks this distinction as part of the joint philosophy of the program.

These observations are also translated in the track-specific profiles. The panel learnt from the self-assessment report that the ISS-IBEI track seeks to deepen students' knowledge in problem-situating approaches to public policy. ISS' situational analysis of governance in development, which draws on approaches in policy studies, international relations and international political economy, is complemented with IBEI's situational and extensive case study-oriented approach drawing on the fields of international relations and development economics. The ISS-York track, in turn, trains students in the analysis of policy issues related to governance and development from a transnational, and often more informal institutionalized, base. As such, the ISS' situational analysis of governance in development, which draws on approaches in policy studies, international relations and international political economy, is combined with York's problem-solving analysis of policies in development



drawing on the interdisciplinary linkages between public administration, governance and organizational studies.

#### *Aims and objectives*

The post-initial Mundus MAPP program is aimed at young and mid-career professionals currently working in the government sector, national and international NGOs or donor organizations, and university graduates with a profile in governance and democracy. Mundus MAPP's goal is to advance the graduates' career objectives, whether these involve further academic studies in a doctoral program or a fast-track professional career. Most applicants have a degree in social sciences, yet the entry assessment criteria also allow students with a degree outside of the social sciences to enrol in the program, based on highly relevant work experience, an excellent motivation and strong references.

Mundus MAPP seeks to equip graduates with the conceptual knowledge and skills that are necessary for understanding and potentially intervening in contemporary policy problems. In addition, the program offers practical training to future academic and policy leaders in the public, private and non-profit sectors. The program translated these aims into different levels of operation. At the transnational level, it focuses on global issues such as climate change, international terrorism and financial regulatory failure. At the national and local levels, it delves into the politics and implementation of anticorruption strategies and decentralization policies. At a more individual level, personal growth – both academically and professionally – is part of the program's aims. These objectives are rendered in twenty detailed learning outcomes, as included in Appendix 2.

The panel considers the formulated learning outcomes testament to an ambitious and exciting program of a high academic standard. In particular the aims to provide expert advice to decision makers in national and international fora (B4), the design and participation in the delivery of public policies in various sectors and (multi-) disciplinary institutional settings (B5), the enhancement of leadership skills and cultural sensitivity (C4), the ability to work in multi-disciplinary and multi-cultural teams (C8) and the aim for a continuous and autonomous reflection upon student's individual learning strategies (C10) are seen as example of this ambitious drive. The panel considers the aim to reach conceptual advancement in social science theories of the policy processes (A5) as overstressing the aims of a master's degree and hard to achieve within a two-year master's program. In its view, this learning outcome is more suitable for doctoral studies at PhD level. They advise to rephrase this particular learning outcome, for example by changing 'advancement' to 'application'.

Additionally, the panel recommends including the program's central vision in the intended learning outcomes. Currently, the distinction between problem-situating and problem-solving is not mentioned in the intended learning outcomes while it is widely recognized within the Mundus MAPP program as a defining feature of its approach to the domain public policy. This central philosophy could easily be added to the formulated learning outcome describing the analysis of policy issues and development of holistic perspectives on European and global governance (B1).

#### **Considerations**

The panel considers the Mundus MAPP program unique within the domain of Political Science. The program focuses on international and transnational policy issues, is both multidisciplinary and multiculturally oriented and does not privilege any national context over another. The ISS-IBEI and ISS-York track are both carefully formulated and characterized, reflecting the joint nature of the degree program as well as the diversity and richness of the theoretical knowledge and academic approaches on offer within the three host institutions involved.

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes of Mundus MAPP are in line with an academic master's program rooted in political science. They properly reflect the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework and the Dublin descriptors at master's level. The intended learning outcomes clarify what is expected from the program's graduates in terms of knowledge and



skills, both academically and professionally. The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be ambitious and challenging yet advises to reformulate the learning outcome regarding the conceptual advancement in social science theories. Additionally, the panel recommends including the program's central vision, based on a distinction between problem-solving and problem-situating approaches, in the intended learning outcomes.

### **Conclusion**

The panel assesses Standard 1 as 'good'.

#### **Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment**

The curriculum, staff and program-specific services and facilities enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

#### **Explanation:**

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

### **Findings**

#### *Curriculum*

The curriculum of the joint program has been developed in close cooperation between the four participating institutions. The Mundus MAPP program offers a combination of institution-specific course work (81 EC) and joint components (39 EC). An overview of the curricula of the ISS-IBEI track and ISS-York track is presented in Appendix 4.

Year 1 is similar in structure for the ISS-York and the ISS-IBEI track. All students take the core courses 'Comparative Public Policy' (5 EC) and 'Development Economics and Public Policy' (5 EC) and the track-specific courses 'Thinking about Governance and Institutions' (5 EC), 'Contemporary Capitalism and Governance: Neo-Liberalism and Beyond' (8 EC) and 'Politics of Global Development: Debating Liberal Internationalism' (8 EC). Additionally, they take research methods courses (8 EC), which encompass both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Joint components of the Mundus MAPP program consist of a 'Study Visit' (3 EC) and a 'Thesis Report' (10 EC). Students also have the option to freely pick electives within the Faculty for 8 EC. Students are also encouraged to take up their mandatory internship (3 EC) in Year 1, although they can also do so over the summer, if necessary.

Year 2 is different for both mobility tracks. In York, all Mundus MAPP second-year students follow the core courses 'Public Management and Delivery' (7 EC) and 'Global Governance' (7 EC). Additionally, students take the 'Conflict and Development' track-specific course (10 EC). In Barcelona, all Mundus MAPP second-year students take the core courses 'Public Management' (6 EC) and 'Global Governance' (6 EC). ISS-IBEI students then take two track-specific courses: 'International Relations' (8 EC) and 'Development Economics' (4 EC). Joint components of the Mundus MAPP program followed in both York and Barcelona are the 'Thesis Workshop' (3 EC) and the 'Thesis' (20 EC). All second-year students take electives (10 EC).

The panel studied the curricula for both tracks, both in the self-assessment report as well as in the program guide. It was impressed by the fact that the Consortium had managed to create an innovative and challenging program with a clear focus and underlying idea. Interviews with the teaching staff and the Academic Board confirmed that the joint program is tightly managed and has a clear content structure. Content is well-defined per course and coordination between the tracks and two years is well-attuned. The panel did not encounter any overlap between the various program parts. In addition, second-year students confirmed that they had not encountered any problems regarding overlapping content between the two institutions. The program is also under permanent scrutiny: the Academic Board responds quickly to feedback from both students and staff, as attested



to by both groups during the site visit. The panel applauds the program for its ability to create a truly joint program with a clear content structure and for its systematic response to student and staff feedback. However, the panel strongly recommends re-writing its current course descriptions in the program guide, as it found that many courses were still presented to students with outdated information that sometimes did not do justice to the exciting and innovative courses on offer.

For the panel, the interaction between the 'problem-situating' and 'problem-solving' approaches was also recognizable in the program design. For example, Mundus MAPP students follow a core course on 'Global Governance' at York and IBEI. In Barcelona, this course has a more situational approach, whereas in York the approach is more focused on policy analysis. Staff members at all three institutions were able to clearly differentiate between the two tracks and the strengths of the individual host institutions. The panel learnt from Skype interviews that ISS offers diversity and critical thinking, offering a very balanced and diverse approach to theory rather than only orthodox and mainstream approaches. IBEI similarly adopts an eclectic theoretical approach with a strong focus on interdisciplinary. York adds diversity in its philosophical outlook and a more clearly defined state authority perspective, encouraging students to actively learn how to navigate ambiguity. Thematically, the ISS-IBEI track focuses more on political economy and development, whereas the ISS-York track focuses on governance and development.

After studying some ISS, IBEI and York courses in further detail, the panel ascertained that the academic standard of the Mundus MAPP program is high. The first-year ISS courses are well-laid out and of good academic quality. The core courses function as building blocks and levellers, and also bring the diverse student population up to speed. They make use of appropriate, sound and up to date literature. In the panel's view, some ISS courses were of an academic level that far surpasses the level required for an academic master's program, particularly the track-specific course 'Contemporary Capitalism and Governance: Neo-Liberalism and Beyond' and the research methods courses. In discussion with the panel, Mundus MAPP students criticized the general core course 'Comparative Public Policy' in Year 1. Although student evaluations indicated that this criticism is not new, it was also clear to the panel that the problem was being addressed. A redesign of the course content was already taking shape at the time of the site visit, taking student feedback into consideration. Proposed changes were shared and discussed with students, the course convenor and the Academic Board. Students indicated to feel highly energized and invigorated by their ISS courses; they did not consider the high level as an obstacle, but rather as a challenge to perform well.

The panel considers the offered second-year courses at IBEI and York of good academic standard at master's level. It appreciated in particular the IBEI track-specific 'Development Economics' course as an exciting course for Mundus MAPP students, which addresses the program's methodological approach and also connects the academic outlook of the program to the work field in an exemplary way. The panel also noted that IBEI and York require students to navigate the learning process in an autonomous way so as to demonstrate and develop an independent knowledge-acquiring attitude within their course work.

Although the panel is satisfied with the level of the IBEI and York courses, some transition problems were mentioned during the site visit. Students indicated to feel slightly disappointed by the IBEI and York courses in Year 2, after the highly demanding ISS course work. The panel is pleased with the ambitious attitude and work drive of the Mundus MAPP students, but also noticed that not all students currently seem to realize the extent of the core challenge underlying their transition from Year 1 to Year 2: the need to embrace a completely different attitude in the way in which they approach their studies. In the panel's view, clear communication about the core strength and challenge underlying the program and information about the different approaches in teaching styles and approaches to the subject matter between the various institutions (closely supervised seminars at ISS, a more seminal approach at IBEI and a highly autonomous attitude demanded at York) may already help to prepare students for their second year.

In addition, the panel strongly advises the Academic Board to direct its attention to a clear learning trajectory regarding the adaptability of their students. Whereas the curriculum shows a clear cumulative structure, the various universities have a different approach. Consequently, students need to adapt to an entirely new university culture and they indicated to the panel to consider the change to Year 2 as an interruption in their learning process. More explicit focus on the learning



trajectory behind this change could help students to recognize a clearer cumulative structure within the program. It would define a shared skill set for all students upon which the second-year supervisors could build. This may also accommodate some concerns regarding the transition process between Year 1 and Year 2. Methodological training would make a good potential starting point, as some second-year students and alumni indicated to have felt methodologically challenged by the change of their main supervisor between Year 1 and Year 2. The program could, for example, consider introducing defined moments in Year 1 at which the students can practice their skills, before transitioning to their second-year institution based on the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle.

These panel remarks regarding student's methodological training also build on their observations regarding the thesis process. Students are assigned two supervisors, one from each of the two host universities of their chosen track. Students work in Year 1 on their 'Thesis Report' of 6,000 words (10 EC). Both supervisors are involved, with students' first-year supervisor taking the active lead. The thesis report functions as an advanced thesis proposal which already covers considerable ground for the thesis itself and which forms an independent research component within the program. It is independently assessed by the students' two supervisors. At the start of Year 2, students follow a 'Thesis Workshop' (3 EC). In this workshop, students receive developmental feedback on their planned thesis by their peers. Their thesis supervisor, workshop convenor and peers orally provide feedback. The thesis workshop is marked on a pass/resubmit basis only and hence functions as a go/no go moment in practice. The 'Thesis' of 20,000 words (20 EC) is independently assessed by both the students' first-year and second-year supervisors.

The two thesis supervisors communicate regularly, both in Year 1 and Year 2, and are joint examiners of the thesis report and thesis. In this way, they guarantee the joint nature of the program's final work. Second-year supervisors are allocated and introduced in the Spring of Year 1. The panel discussed at length the interaction between supervisors with both students and the ISS convenor. Alumni reported some methodological disagreements with their second-year supervisor. The panel ascertained that the students in question received adequate support to finish their theses in time and feels that the program handled these incidents adequately. Nevertheless, these instances highlighted one of the program's challenges: within the larger host institutions, upholding the separate identity of the Mundus MAPP program is more of a challenge, emphasizing the need for continuous alignment between (new) staff members teaching within the program.

#### *Practical components and professional orientation*

To be eligible for EU funding, a Mundus master's program must include practical components. Hence, an 'Internship' (3 EC) and 'Study Visit' (3 EC) are part of the Mundus MAPP. Students were very enthusiastic about the study visit, which they follow jointly with the CEU first-year students. The study visit is highly self-organized. Students settle on a city and identify interesting organizations and relevant institutions, resulting in an intensive visiting schedule. In 3 days, they visit on average 6-8 institutions, discussing a wide range of policy-related topics. Students prepare for these visits by formulating questions and topics of discussion, which inform their final policy brief or essay based on the study visit. They are also asked to formulate recommendations for the visited institutions. The panel considered the study visit a very useful and highly informative feature of the joint program; it brings students into contact with many relevant organizations and institutions and offers students an occasion to practice their analytical and communication skills in a professional setting, clearly preparing them well for their professional life.

The minimum requirement for an internship is that it lasts a minimum of four weeks and results in a meaningful contribution to the organization's work. Many students opt to fulfil their internship requirements over the summer, making use of their (pre-)existing professional networks within the EU. Some students follow research internships. The panel ascertained that these research internships do not function as fall-back options. Research internships are bound to strict guidelines: they are strictly vetted, are advertised to all students, need to fit the Public Policy profile and contain a clear practical component, which is clearly presented in the internship reports.

Students shared with the panel that they find it difficult to find a suitable work placement, due to the limited scope and time allocation. ISS tries to support students by circulating a list with potential placements and by stimulating students to start looking for a place as early as possible. Students indicated that more help is available for finding suitable work placements at York and IBEI, but that





Mundus MAPP students are not allowed to use these channels; the internship is the firm responsibility of the first-year institution. Following IBEI and York's example, the panel would like to recommend appointing an official internship coordinator at ISS. He or she may invest in long-term collaborations with suitable organizations in the Netherlands.

#### *The international and interactive classroom*

The program can boast a truly 'international classroom', with students from Asia, Africa and South America joining European and Northern American students in large numbers. The panel learnt from the self-assessment report and in interviews during the site visit, that the international classroom in many ways also informs the teaching-learning environment: the program embraces the diversity of its classrooms, making its students' wide-ranging experiences part of its instruction and discussions in class. In their meeting with the panel, the students confirmed these characteristics. They were positive about the ways in which the diversity and maturity of students is used in class and how this diversity is tapped to bring in additional views and experiences to the mainly Western-oriented literature. The panel views this interactive, international classroom as a testimony of the program's firm and embedded commitment to social change. Students learn from each other's experiences, creating insights and alternative perspectives on Public Policy that could not easily be obtained elsewhere. The international classroom is considered by the panel as one of Mundus MAPP's true strengths, central to its didactic concept in combination with the existing culture of academic critical thinking with practice components and its intensive tutoring.

Many courses in the two-year program design are also open to non-Mundus MAPP students. This student diversity offers challenges to both teaching staff and Mundus MAPP students. Teaching staff at ISS, York and IBEI confirmed that Mundus MAPP students are generally more assertive and inquisitive in class. Often Mundus MAPP students critically challenge their teachers in class, creating a healthy academic and intellectually charged study climate. This engagement level of Mundus MAPP students is highly appreciated by the teaching staff. Second-year students and alumni of the program, however, indicated a downside: they emphasized that they often felt a difference in engagement of their (non-Mundus MAPP) fellow students, in particular in their second year at IBEI and York and even more so in courses that were strongly discussion-based.

#### *Staff*

The Mundus MAPP program benefits from the expertise of a large team of teaching staff, which are appropriately qualified to teach at master's level; by and large, staff members have been trained within their national contexts to teach at university degree level. The panel studied the list of teaching staff currently involved in the program and confirms to know many of them to be first-rate researchers and leading specialists in their discipline. All staff members (at ISS, York and IBEI) with a major role in the program have a PhD qualification. Most staff members are in senior positions within their respective departments and are therefore experienced researchers and lecturers.

At ISS, many teachers involved in the Mundus MAPP program have been teaching in the program for years: they have the appropriate teaching qualifications and English-language proficiency and are well-aware of the separate identity of the program. Student evaluations praise their commitment and their willingness to always go the extra mile for creating an interactive and intellectually challenging environment. In Year 2, teaching staff involved in the Mundus MAPP program is less recognizable as a team: many students follow electives with teachers that are less used to teaching Mundus MAPP students. This is partly unavoidable, as Mundus MAPP students mostly follow courses at IBEI and York within the regular master's courses. Second-year students and alumni pointed out that all their Barcelona and York teachers were qualified and approachable. Nevertheless, they felt that not all staff members were fully aware of the special identity of the Mundus MAPP program, as they often joined students in different master's programs.

The ISS course convenor, who plays a central role in tutoring and advising the Mundus MAPP students in the ISS-York and ISS-IBEI tracks, recognized this student feedback. Strengthening the teaching staff's commitment to the program and team-building with institutional backing is considered vital. The Academic Board currently seeks to address this issue, by gathering a committed pool of teaching staff at both York and IBEI that annually come back to teaching classes in the Mundus MAPP program. Although the panel acknowledges the challenges involved, it suggests considering adopting a staff exchange program. New and reverting staff members to the Mundus MAPP program could be invited



to sit in in Mundus MAPP classes at the other hosts, in particular at the first-year partners ISS and CEU. This could serve as a team-building exercise as well as a yearly opportunity to align teaching practices between the institutions: it may build bridges and could inform a more cumulative trajectory, as part of the preparation of students for their transition from Year 1 to Year 2.

Finally, the panel wants to point out the central role that the Year 1 ISS course convener currently holds in the ISS-IBEI and ISS-York tracks of the program: staff and students positively commented upon his boundless enthusiasm and energy. The panel was impressed with the demonstrated commitment and universal acclaim, but also wants to point out that such a setup may hamper diversity and, especially, could make the program vulnerable. It therefore recommends aiming for further task division amongst Mundus MAPP staff members.

### **Considerations**

The panel ascertained that the teaching-learning environment within the joint degree program Mundus MAPP is adequately organized to support students in achieving the intended learning outcomes. The Mundus MAPP program benefits from the expertise of a large team of teaching staff that is appropriately qualified to teach at master's level. The panel heartily supports the program's attention for further team-building initiatives in the coming years.

The program's didactical approach, which strongly leans on the diverse and multicultural intake of students, is intellectually challenging and brings students into contact with diverse teaching methods and international approaches. Students learn from each other's experiences, creating insights and alternative perspectives on Public Policy that could not easily be obtained elsewhere. The international classroom is considered by the panel as one of Mundus MAPP's true strengths, central to its didactic concept in combination with the existing culture of academic critical thinking with practice components and its intensive tutoring.

The panel applauds the program for its ability to create a truly joint program with a clear content structure and for its systematic response to student and staff feedback. Both the joint components and track-specific courses communicate an overarching vision built on the interaction between problem-situating and problem-solving approaches to contemporary problems of international policy making. This vision is widely shared by staff members within the participating institutions. Nonetheless, the panel also noted that there are still some transition problems between Year 1 and Year 2 for students and it therefore strongly suggests the program to address these in the following years. Communication, both in written and oral form, is hereby key. In addition, the panel strongly advises the Academic Board to direct its attention to the introduction of a learning trajectory aimed at developing students adaptability skills. This would guide students more explicitly through the program and connect Year 1 more clearly to Year 2. It would have the additional benefit of defining a shared skill set for all students upon which the second-year supervisors could further build.

Course work at ISS, York and IBEI are of adequate standard for a degree at master's level and the practical components, in particular the study visit, enhance students' professional skills and networks. A point of some concern is the current organization of the internship. Following IBEI and York's example, the panel recommends appointing an official internship coordinator at ISS. He or she may invest in long-term collaborations with suitable organizations in the Netherlands.

### **Conclusion**

The panel assesses Standard 2 as 'satisfactory'.

#### **Standard 3: Assessment**

The program has an adequate assessment system in place.

#### **Explanation:**

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



## **Findings**

Mundus MAPP has a complex system to assure an adequate system of testing and assessment at all four host institutions. Partly, these are informed by local and national guidelines and regulations. Information regarding this system of assessment is shared with students through the program guide, which next to the self-assessment report was studied in detail by the panel. Additionally, the panel read the latest report regarding quality assurance within the joint program by the independent External Quality Assurance Reviewer (EQAR) who assists the Academic Board and overviews the joint components and the standard of the award.

### *Assessment modes and system of testing*

The program guide provides information on the system of testing and assessment modes per course. Students are assessed individually through a variety of written assignments (essays, papers and policy briefs) and examinations throughout their coursework at ISS, York and IBEI. Additionally, their oral skills are regularly tested in class. Cumulatively, more and more importance is placed on students' argumentation and analysis in individual essays. Some courses demand some modest group work, but group work never forms a major element in students' individual assessments. This balance between individual and group work was also confirmed by students. In Year 2, the 'Thesis Workshop' is marked at both IBEI and York on a pass/resubmit basis only, as delivery and acceptance of feedback is part of the learning objectives and therefore hard to quantify. The panel is satisfied with the variety in assessment modes.

According to the self-assessment report, assessment methods are selected in accordance with the learning objectives for every course. The panel noted that learning objectives and assessment modes per course were not always described in the program guide. Students, however, indicated to be aware of both learning objectives and assessment modes; at the beginning of each new course, staff always duly communicated both. The panel learnt that each host institution ensures the validity and reliability of marks for core, track-specific and elective courses through a system of second grading. This practice currently assures that alignment takes place and that course objectives are met. A matrix has been created linking the program's intended learning outcomes to courses. The panel recommends to translate the existing program matrix into test matrices (linking the intended learning outcomes per course to assessment types and moments) and to consistently render the intended learning outcomes per course in the program guide for further transparency. These measures would also provide further insight in the ways in which learning outcomes are assured within the system of testing. The panel recognizes the fact that the program is working towards further transparency and encourages it to continue on this path.

### *Quality assurance of course work*

The evaluation of course work takes place under the quality assurance regime in each of the host institutions. Both first- and second-year students confirmed to regularly evaluate both courses and tests with the relevant bodies in all three host institutions. Also, students indicated that they receive adequate feedback regarding their performance, which further enables their learning process. In particular York was named as a positive example, for its structured system of evaluation – both orally and written. They also confirmed that feedback is adequately followed up by the Academic Board. The panel is satisfied with the way in which the different institutions guarantee the evaluation of both courses and assessment within the Mundus MAPP program and advises the Consortium partners to learn from each other's best practice regarding assessment, for example through a staff exchange program, as suggest above under Standard 2, or through other suitable initiatives.

Dedicated examiners at all three locations guarantee an adequate system of testing for course work, based on the rules and regulations of the local institutions. Students confirmed to be in the know about of the various bodies involved in the quality assurance of assessment within each institution; examination regulations and information about procedures, grading scales and reassessment opportunities are provided for each host institution upon arrival and are also listed in the program guide. In the panel's view, information regarding the system of testing suffices.



During the site visit, the panel spoke with representatives of the ISS Board of Examiners, of the Mundus MAPP program and with the Mundus Mapp EQAR. These representatives confirmed that the various institutions acted both reactively and proactively against fraud, legally appoint examiners per course and monitor the assessment in course work. Outliers are researched and courses are duly evaluated and acted upon, if deemed necessary. The ISS Board of Examiners pointed out that fraud in general needs attention: under Dutch law, confidential material cannot be shared amongst the four Consortium members. Legal advice is thus needed to draft a protocol regarding matters of fraud for the various Boards of Examiners and the way in which it is handled within the Consortium. The panel feels satisfied that the various local Boards fulfill their tasks and that they jointly safeguard a reliable and valid assessment system.

#### *Quality assurance of joint components*

The Academic Board is responsible for the quality assurance of the joint program components: the 'Study Visit' (3 EC), 'Internship' (3 EC), 'Thesis Report' (10 EC), 'Thesis Workshop' (3 EC) and 'Thesis' (20 EC). As the Academic Board is also the *de facto* program management of the joint degree, the independence of the quality control system did cause some concern with the panel. Hence, the panel spoke at length in various interviews about this matter with representatives of the Academic Board, ISS Board of Examiners, ISS course convener, ISS faculty management and with the EQAR.

All ISS representatives agreed with the panel that it would be highly desirable to create a fully independent Joint Board of Examiners to ensure the quality assurance of the joint components within the Mundus MAPP. The creation of such a body is, however, complicated due to the many legal implications in five countries (the Netherlands, Spain, United Kingdom, Hungary and the United States). As a result, delays and obstacles on the path to a Joint Board of Examiners are inevitable. To comply with Dutch rules and regulations, a working solution has been found to ensure an independent viewpoint to enhance the independence, the reliability and validity of these joint components in the meantime.

For example, all student work is run through plagiarism software to detect fraud. Cases that stand out negatively are investigated by the Board. This has not yet resulted in problematic fraud cases, but if encountered, these would be discussed and handled after consultation with the existing Boards of Examiners at the host institutions. A system of second grading, jointly shared between the two institutions of the ISS-IBEI and ISS-York track, enhances the reliability and validity of the assessment of joint components. Academic Board members are often themselves involved in thesis supervision. To avoid clashing responsibilities and to enhance the integrity and independence of the Academic Board, the Board members agreed to withdraw from the discussion when personally involved. This practice has been formally recorded in the Boards' minutes and was confirmed orally by Board members.

The panel studied a report produced by the EQAR and ascertained that the Academic Board acted upon his feedback by studying the Academic Board's minutes and by discussing the issue at length with representatives of the Academic Board and the ISS faculty management. They met the EQAR and verified that he was aware of the importance of his task. As an external assessor in the British university system, he has the required qualifications to act as an EQAR. The EQAR also studies the joint components' performance data and investigates outliers. The program's intended learning outcomes are aligned with the results in the thesis report and thesis in order to assure that students meet the intended learning outcomes. Calculations of the final grades are verified by him. In this way, the EQAR provides the required independent checks and balances needed to ensure the academic standard of the award and the quality, validity and reliability of the quality assurance of these joint components. The panel fully acknowledges the value of the EQAR's appointment. Considering his extensive tasks and the central importance of the EQAR for assuring an independent view of the programme's assessment, the panel would recommend appointing more than one person in this important role. In this way, the programme's existing quality assurance design could inform the creation of a fully independent body that may preferably evolve into a Joint Board of Examiners.

The panel also took a detailed look into the thesis process, including the supervision procedures and quality assurance of assessment. Both the thesis reports and theses are examined by two assessors. A summary, written feedback in a comments box and a final grade are provided. Problem specification, argument and structure, analysis, research design and methods, presentation and referencing and an overall assessment are scored as fail, satisfactory/pass, average, good, very good or excellent. Students must defend their theses before graduating; the second supervisor follows this defence either in person or by Skype. For this oral defence, the grade is either pass or fail. Every assessor independently evaluates the thesis. They consult with each other to arrive at the final grade. The first supervisor (who supervises the work on the thesis report) is the second examiner for the finished thesis. In case they cannot come to an agreement on the grade, a third examiner from the Consortium is called in. Appeals are handled by the Academic Board in close collaboration with the EQAR. The panel finds the assessment procedures to be in order.

The panel noted that the quality of the written feedback in the comments boxes on the assessment forms differed in length and also in quality. The panel agreed in individual cases with the points of critique raised in the comment boxes, but was surprised that these points of critique apparently did not translate into lower marks. The panel encourages the program to work towards greater uniformity in the provision of feedback and the use of the assessment forms. It seems that the practice of offering constructive written feedback is best mastered in York. When readdressing the marking criteria, the panel advises the program to make use of this strength within one of the Consortium partners' practice. To support both teaching staff and students, the panel suggests agreeing upon a shared Mundus MAPP thesis manual with clear guidelines and criteria. Such a common document could serve to create alignment in expectations and requirements between supervisors, would further strengthen the 'joint' notion of the program and may also manage student expectations. In such a thesis manual, the panel would also like to see the structural relation between the thesis report, thesis workshop and thesis explicitly defined, underlining and explaining the cumulative element in student's methodological and academic training.

To assess the quality of assessment of the theses and thesis reports for standard 4, the panel needed to familiarize itself with the wide variety of grading scales used within the Mundus MAPP. All four Consortium partners know their own grading scales within different grading systems. These institutional grades are then translated into Mundus MAPP grades, which do not compare to any familiar international grading system. This was considered confusing by the panel, especially as all institutions also seemed to work with different marking criteria and different assessment forms. Alongside the creation of a joint thesis manual, the thesis assessment forms could be redrafted in order to communicate the marking criteria in a clearer manner. In the panel's view, these marking criteria would ideally be translated into rubrics that, in turn, can be matched to the various grading scales used within Mundus MAPP. Additionally, the panel recommends to make explicit which grading system (ISS/IBEI/York/Mundus MAPP) has been used by the assessor on the thesis forms to enhance further transparency.

Annually, the EQAR checks the assessment of stratified samples of the study visit reports, the internship reports, the thesis reports and the final theses. This system is considered an adequate measure by the panel to check on outliers and to keep an eye on the degree's over all level. As such, these checks also function as a mechanism to ensure alignment between marking practices and to guarantee an independent review of the assessment of these joint components. However, this system of checks and balances is currently highly dependent on one person and should, ideally, be shared. Hence, the panel advises to enhance intersubjectivity between members of teaching staff or to search for other suitable measures to share the responsibility for assuring the quality of assessment throughout the program between the various institutions.

### **Considerations**

Based on the written documentation and additional information provided during the site visit, the panel concludes that the Mundus MAPP program has navigated the task to align assessment between four institutions to the best of its abilities. Course work is sufficiently monitored by the legal bodies



at the partner institutions of the Consortium. Students are positive regarding feedback procedures. The quality of assessment of course work is adequately assured. Fraud is effectively addressed within the partner institutions. Nevertheless, the panel learnt that further legal advice is needed to draft a protocol regarding matters of fraud as legal restrictions due to cross-national differences regarding data sharing make it hard for the Academic Board to be fully in control.

The current system of assessment is dependent upon the quality, integrity, objectivity and time investment of the EQAR and the integrity of the Academic Board members. Marking criteria for the oral parts of the joint components are not listed in the program guide or thesis assessment forms and are therefore not fully transparent to either students or the panel. In the view of the panel, the Mundus MAPP program management would be wise to address this issue in the very near future. The panel suggests that the program first focuses on enhancing the transparency of assessment.

Notwithstanding these observations, the panel feels assured by the current measures in place to sufficiently guarantee a fair and reliable assessment for students in these challenging surroundings. The Academic Board members are aware of the potential for conflicts in interest and have taken adequate steps to avoid these. An independent view point is secured through the appointment of the EQAR, with a three-year non-renewable mandate to avoid too close a connection between the EQAR and the program. Also, the proactive attitude and the awareness for the need for further action convinced the panel that the program is taking full responsibility. The panel agrees with the ISS management that the appointment of a Joint Board of Examiners, or a similar independent body, would be the most conducive way to ensure the quality, validity, reliability and transparency of assessment of the joint components. Hence, the panel considers the creation of a Joint Board of Examiners a potential next step in the full maturation of quality assurance of joint components within the Mundus MAPP program yet also encourages the program to explore with all partner institutions other working options under cross-national law.

The panel verified that the need to take this next step is fully recognized by the ISS management and representatives of the Academic Board. This process is, however, time-consuming and challenging. It needs to be adequately researched and importantly, checked against national rules and regulations under Dutch, English, Hungarian, Spanish and American law. Acknowledging the challenging nature of the creation of a system of assessment within a joint degree, the panel is satisfied with the current level obtained by the creation of a set of interlocking quality assurance mechanisms. The panel concluded that through these mechanisms the Mundus MAPP program created a situation in which the quality, validity and reliability of the assessment of both track-specific course work and the joint components are sufficiently assured. Yet it also encourages the Mundus MAPP Consortium to direct its attention to further improvements in the coming years.

## **Conclusion**

The panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

### **Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes**

The program demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

#### **Explanation:**

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

## **Findings**

The panel studied a representative sample of fifteen master's theses and fifteen thesis reports from the 2013-2015 and 2014-2016 cohorts. The thesis report is an advanced thesis proposal and already covers considerable ground for the thesis: a problem specification (research question), theoretical framework and initial literature review. The research design and selection of methods are taken up



in the thesis itself. The panel felt that it would on average have marked slightly lower and wonders whether the complex grade translation system resulted in a form of grade inflation. Nevertheless, the panel confirms that all studied material is of sufficient academic quality, and that the average level of achievement is satisfactory for a degree at master's level. It therefore does not consider its observation regarding differences in grading as problematic.

The panel found that the theses it reviewed contained interesting arguments and perspectives on topics which are presented against a relevant and sufficiently contextualized theoretical background. As critical reflection upon one's own work and chosen methods are part of the intended learning outcomes, the panel would have expected to see these qualities to shine through more dominantly within the written theses than currently is the case. Additionally, the panel noted that some students did not effectively reflect on the limitations of their chosen research method. It would have expected to consistently encounter a critical section reflecting on research methods, as it concluded that these abilities are clearly incorporated within the research methods courses as taught in Year 1 and are part of the intended learning outcomes. Such a reflection on methodology would further enhance the academic quality of the theses and thesis reports. As such, it is also closely related to the panel's recommendation to build a more clearly defined cumulative learning trajectory regarding research methods, as discussed above under standard 2. Notwithstanding these observations, the panel concluded that the intended learning outcomes have been achieved by students.

From the interview with alumni, the panel concludes that they look back on the program with appreciation and satisfaction. They all felt that the Mundus MAPP program offered new and exciting professional opportunities and that they truly had enhanced their employability within the field. Many of the program's graduates embarked upon a research career upon finishing the program or found employment within a relevant organization. Graduates told the panel that the variety, richness and diversity of the curriculum attracted them to the program, just as the multidisciplinary, multicultural and truly international outlook. They identified the strong research methods training, the richness of the encountered theoretical perspectives and the interaction within the international classroom as the most useful part of the program for their current employment. The panel considers these outcomes to be favorable for the program and concludes that the graduates are sufficiently prepared for their future career and suitable for an academically oriented post-initial joint degree program.

### **Considerations**

Based on the sample of theses and the information from alumni, the panel concludes that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses show that students are able to conduct an independent research project at master's level. The studied theses reflected interesting arguments and perspectives and topics which are presented within a relevant and sufficiently contextualized theoretical background. The panel recommends rendering the students' reflective abilities more clearly into the theses. The alumni are satisfied with the program as a preparation for their further career. They identified the strong research methods training, the richness of the encountered theoretical perspectives and the interaction within the international classroom as the most useful part of the program for their current employment.

### **Conclusion**

The panel assesses Standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

## **GENERAL CONCLUSION**

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes of Mundus MAPP are in line with an academic master's program rooted in political science. They properly reflect the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework and the Dublin descriptors at master's level. The teaching-learning environment is of satisfactory level. The curriculum enables students to meet the intended learning outcomes. Staff is of good academic quality. Feedback is sufficiently taken seriously by the Academic Board and course work is of the required level.



The current system of assessment is reasonable, but not without its vulnerabilities: it is highly dependent upon the quality, integrity, objectivity and time investment of the EQAR and the integrity of the Academic Board members. Notwithstanding these observations, the panel feels assured by the current measures in place to sufficiently guarantee a fair and reliable assessment for students in these challenging surroundings. Yet it also encourages the Mundus MAPP Consortium to direct its attention to the improvements that can be made in the coming years, in particular with respect to the transparency of assessment for students. Meeting all standards of a Dutch limited program assessment at a satisfactory level is no meager feat. The panel wants to underline that even though they recognize that improvements can be made regarding the transparency of assessment, it has ascertained that ISS and the Academic Board adopt a proactive and serious approach regarding this matter.

Although the panel struggled with the transparency of the used grading scales and systems, the panel concluded that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses show that students are able to conduct an independent research project at master's level. The panel found that the theses it reviewed contained interesting arguments and perspectives on topics which are presented against a relevant and sufficiently contextualized theoretical background. The alumni are satisfied with the program as a preparation for their further career.

A joint degree program based at four partner institutions is confronted with many additional (legal) challenges that a single degree program does not encounter, for example regarding sharing confidential student information that potentially hinders free communication between Year 1 and Year 2 regarding matters of fraud and/or student progress. Consequently, it needs a proactive attitude to counter problems, the willingness to embrace improvement and change, and time to concisely follow procedure in a legally satisfactory manner. Mundus MAPP has presented itself positively in this respect: the program management is reflective and willing to act upon recommendations for further improvement, it responds well to feedback of its staff, students and third parties, and it is well under way to fully meet all legal requirements demanded by national law in five different legal systems.

The panel assessed standard 1 as 'good', standard 2, 3 and 4 as 'satisfactory'. In accordance with the decision rules of the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited program assessments, the panel assessed the program over all standards as 'satisfactory'.

### **Conclusion**

The panel assesses the *Erasmus Mundus Master's Program in Public Policy* as 'satisfactory'.

## **MEASURES FOR IMPROVEMENT**

Despite all challenges facing an international joint degree program, Mundus MAPP has established itself as a truly joint program with a clear structure and an explicit focus on international and intercultural learning. The panel established that Mundus MAPP benefits from a proactive and hands on management that is willing to address problems and to enhance the quality of the program in all ways. Despite this positive attitude, it is important to understand that change is only functional if adequate time is allowed and allocated to discuss measures for improvement amongst the partner institutions. The panel recommends that priority be given to improvement in the transparency of assessment, starting with the introduction of a shared Mundus MAPP thesis manual and criteria, enhancement of the degree of intersubjectivity and further alignment of assessment practices amongst staff members.

In the following, the panel would like to offer some measures that may be considered helpful in this respect, although many alternative initiatives and ideas could naturally be developed or explored by the program management. In addition to an enhanced practice of alignment and intersubjectivity





amongst staff members, the panel considers the creation of a Joint Board of Examiners (or a similar independent body) a desirable next step in the full maturation of the Mundus MAPP program. Notwithstanding this observation, the panel advises to explore with adequate legal support the various options to enhance the quality assurance of assessment in the coming year. The panel wants to point out that cases of fraud, such as plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty, need additional attention due to the cross-national legal background in which the program operates, just as the quality assurance of oral components in the program.

In addition, the panel strongly recommends redrafting the program guide and producing a joint thesis manual to increase transparency for students regarding the intended learning outcomes per course, content per course, learning trajectories throughout the program, assessment methods and forms, and marking criteria. Preferably, these marking criteria would be translated into rubrics which can be matched to the various grading systems used within the Mundus MAPP and which could serve to redesign the current thesis (report) assessment forms. Feedback practices, regarding assessment of the thesis in particular, may also benefit from initiatives to align the various practices at the host institutions. In the panel's view, the program could also benefit from communicating its central vision regarding problem-solving and problem-situating approaches more explicitly in these updated (and new) student handbooks and in the intended learning outcomes of the program. It may help in addressing transition problems between Year 1 and Year 2, and this will strengthen the Mundus MAPP profile even further.

Some further measures for improvement could be suggested. Following IBEI and York's example, the panel would like to recommend appointing an official internship coordinator at ISS. He or she may invest in long-term collaborations with suitable organizations in the Netherlands. The panel further suggests adopting a staff exchange program. New and returning staff members to the Mundus MAPP program could be invited to sit in in Mundus MAPP classes at the other institutions, in particular at the first-year institutions ISS and CEU. This could serve as a team-building exercise as well as a yearly opportunity to align teaching and assessment practices between the institutions. The panel also advises to reformulate the learning outcome regarding the conceptual advancement in social science theories.

Finally, the panel wants to point out the central role that the Year 1 ISS course convener currently holds in the ISS-IBEI and ISS-York tracks of the program: staff and students positively commented upon his boundless enthusiasm and energy. The panel was impressed with the demonstrated commitment and universal acclaim, but also wants to point out that such a setup may hamper diversity and, especially, could make the program vulnerable. It therefore recommends aiming for further task division amongst Mundus MAPP staff members.





## APPENDICES





## APPENDIX 1: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

**Dr. C. (Christien) van den Anker** is Associate Professor of Politics and International Relations at the Faculty of Health & Applied Sciences at the University of the West of England in Bristol (UK) since 2006. Between 2001-20016, she worked as a Lecturer in Global Ethics and as Deputy Director at the Centre for Global Ethics at the University of Birmingham, UK. Christien is an internationally established specialist in human rights and contemporary slavery. In her work, she refocused the narrow human trafficking debate to encompass all forms of slavery, clarified the migration-slavery nexus, and pioneered partnerships working for research-based advocacy.

**Prof. dr. M. (Marijke) Breuning [chair]** is Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas, USA. She specializes in foreign policy decision making, with a specific interest in development cooperation and small states, as well as the politics of international children's rights (and especially intercountry adoption), women/gender and politics, and the sociology of the profession. Marijke has published numerous refereed journal articles and book chapters, as well as three books. She has served as an editor of the *American Political Science Review* (2012-2016), and previously served as a member of the inaugural editorial team of *Foreign Policy Analysis*, a journal of the *International Studies Association*, an editor of the *Journal of Political Science Education*, and book review editor of *International Politics*. She serves – or has served – on several editorial boards and in various leadership positions in the International Studies Association and American Political Science Association.

**Prof. dr. D. (Dirk) De Bièvre** is Associate Professor of International Politics and International Political Economy at the University of Antwerp, Belgium. He studied in Leuven (Belgium), Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium), Konstanz (Germany), and Firenze (Italy), where he obtained his PhD at the European University Institute (EUI) in 2002. He specializes in European trade policy, the World Trade Organisation, and interest group mobilisation. Before joining the Antwerp Faculty in 2006, Dirk was a post-doctoral researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods in Bonn (Germany), and an EU and Volkswagen Foundation research fellow at the Mannheim Centre for European Social Research (MZES). He has taught at the universities of Brussels, Mannheim, Dresden, Leuven, and was a visiting fellow at the Department of Government of the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) during the academic year 2014-15.

**Prof. dr. F. (Ferdinand) De Ville** is Associate Professor at the Centre for EU Studies at Ghent University, Belgium. He received a master degree (2007) and a PhD (2011) in Political Science at Ghent University. In his dissertation he analysed the relationship between the international trade regime and European social, environmental and consumer protection. Ferdi has also done policy advisory research on European trade policy for the Flemish government.

**Dr. R. (Renske) Doorenspleet** is Associate Professor at the University of Warwick, UK. She is a graduate of the University of Leiden; after a postdoctoral fellowship at Harvard University (USA) in 2002/2003, she started a research project on democracy in divided countries, funded by NWO. She has taught courses on comparative politics, democratisation and development, statistics and research methods. During the academic year 2011-2012, she got an academic fellowship and grant of the Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning, in order to innovate teaching in politics, combining film and theatre projects with academic research and teaching around the theme of democracy. During 2012-2014, Renske was the political science coordinator of Warwick's interdisciplinary Q-step Centre, and developed new politics degrees offering quantitative social science training. Her research focuses on democratic transitions and consolidation in comparative perspective. Her articles have been published in academic journals such as *World Politics*, *Democratization*, *Acta Politica*, *the International Political Science Review*, *Ethnopolitics*, *Government and Opposition* and *the European Journal of Political Research*. She is also the author of *Democratic Transitions* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005), co-editor of *One-Party Dominance in African*



*Democracies* (Lynne Rienner, 2013) and of *Political Parties, Party Systems and Democracy in Africa* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). At the moment, she is working on a new book, which will explore the value of democracy in comparative perspective (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

**Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Vermeersch** is Professor of Politics at the KU Leuven, Belgium. He is currently director of the LINES Institute (Leuven International and European Studies) and affiliated as senior researcher with the Centre for Research on Peace and Development – both at KU Leuven. In 2007 and 2008, he was a visiting scholar at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University. Peter is a graduate of the University of Leuven, but he also studied, lived and conducted research in Central Europe and the Balkans. His research focuses on minorities and migration, democratisation, reconciliation and nationalism. His articles have appeared in academic journals such as *The European Journal of Sociology*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, *The Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, and *East European Politics and Societies*. Peter is also the author and editor of several academic books. In addition, he is an associate editor of *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Ethnicity and Nationalism* and a board member of PEN Flanders, and he serves on the editorial board of *Karakter*, a Dutch-language journal that publishes essays about all aspects of science. In 2011 and 2012 Peter Vermeersch was part of the organizing team of the G1000, a largescale deliberative citizens' initiative held in Belgium.

**F. (Felix) Wagner** is a bachelor student of Political Science at the Radboud University Nijmegen since 2012. Felix recently completed a semester at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow, Russia. Between 2014-2016, he was a member of the Program Committee of Political Science. Is a freelance journalist, writing for the Nijmegen Student Journal *Vox*.

## APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

### 1. Inleiding referentiekader

Het domeinspecifiek referentiekader Politicologie is opgesteld op 22-01-2016 ten behoeve van de beoordeling van de bachelor- en masteropleidingen aan de universiteiten in Nederland die binnen het cluster Politicologie 2015 vallen (Vrije Universiteit, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Radboud Universiteit, Leiden Universiteit). In het referentiekader worden de minimumeisen geformuleerd waar een wetenschappelijke opleiding in een (deel)gebied van de politicologie aan moet voldoen. Met behulp van dit referentiekader kunnen de opleidingen politicologie de gemaakte keuzes nader beargumenteren en aantonen dat aan de criteria uit het accreditatiekader van de NVAO wordt voldaan.

### 2. Domeinspecifiek referentiekader opleiding Politicologie

De opleiding Politicologie bereidt voor op de zelfstandige beoefening van de Politicologie en op de beroepsmatige toepassing van de in de opleiding verworven wetenschappelijke kennis en vaardigheden. De politicoloog is gespecialiseerd in het herkennen en analyseren van conflicten tussen en collectieve besluitvormingsprocessen door groepen en organisaties, van de materiële en immateriële belangen, instituties en machtsprocessen die deze conflicten en besluitvorming beïnvloeden, en van de resulterende maatschappelijke effecten. De politicoloog is dankzij zijn/haar specialisme in staat om (de oorzaken en effecten van) hedendaagse maatschappelijke ontwikkelingen te analyseren, zoals globalisering & regionalisering, technologische ontwikkelingen zoals de ICT revolutie, de kennismaatschappij, en de rol van diversiteit.

In lijn met de afspraken die op Europees niveau voor Politicologie zijn gemaakt (European Conference of National Political Science Associations, 1 september 2003) en aansluitend bij hoe wereldwijd het vakgebied wordt omschreven, worden de volgende onderdelen van de Politicologie als wezenlijk voor een goede beroepsbeoefening gezien en zouden minimaal deel van de studie moeten uitmaken: Politieke Theorie/Geschiedenis van politieke ideeën/Politieke Filosofie; Methoden van onderzoek (kwalitatief en kwantitatief); het politieke systeem van het eigen land en van de Europese Unie; Vergelijkende Politicologie; en Internationale Betrekkingen. Deze Europese afspraken betreffen de bacheloropleiding. Verder verschilt per instelling de mate van aandacht voor de volgende onderdelen: Bestuurswetenschap en Beleidsanalyse, Conflictstudies, Politieke Besluitvorming, Politieke Economie, Politiek Gedrag, Politieke Geschiedenis, Politieke Sociologie, en Politieke Psychologie. Masteropleidingen bieden veelal niet het volledige spectrum van de politicologie, maar brengen hun eigen accent(en) aan.

De bacheloropleiding bereidt voor op de beoefening van een breed scala aan beroepen in de beleidsmatige sfeer alsmede op een vervolgstudie die meer autonomie vraagt; de master Politicologie verscherpt en verdiept de politicologische kennis en (onderzoeks)vaardigheden en bereidt voor op de zelfstandige uitoefening van beroepen op academisch niveau. De opleidingen hebben niet tot doel één specifiek beroepsprofiel naast dat van de wetenschappelijke onderzoeker te ontwikkelen. De huidige eisen vanuit de kennismaatschappij vergen juist een breed beroepsprofiel dat voldoende mogelijkheden biedt om mobiel en flexibel te kunnen werken zowel in publieke, non-profit en hybride organisaties, als in de particuliere sector. De huidige eisen aan een verantwoordelijke wetenschapsopleiding die voorbereidt op het werken in de kennismaatschappij houden echter ook in dat de opleiding Politicologie studenten opleidt die open staan voor en inzicht hebben in kennis uit andere disciplines en die in staat zijn politicologische kennis op een inzichtelijke manier aan niet-politicologisch geschoolden over te brengen, de hoeveelheid aan informatie doelgericht en effectief te bundelen, verworven kennis toe te passen in situatie van (collectieve) besluitvorming, actief en kritisch aan publieke discussies over politicologische vraagstellingen deel te nemen, alsmede zelfstandig de steeds veranderende stand van kennis bij te houden. Op basis van bovenstaande omschrijving en de 'Dublin-descriptoren' kunnen de volgende verschillen worden onderscheiden in competenties tussen een afgestudeerde bachelor politicologie en een afgestudeerde master politicologie:



Dublin Descriptoren	Bachelor	Master
Kennis en inzicht (DD1)	voldoende kennis over recente ontwikkelingen in het vakgebied om een wetenschappelijk onderbouwd oordeel te vormen	in staat zijn om kennis te integreren en met complexe materie om te gaan
		Inzicht in de specifieke positie van Politicologie te midden van andere wetenschappen
Toepassen kennis en inzicht (DD2)	vaardigheid om disciplinaire kennis te verwerken; toepassing van kennis op verschijnselen die tijdens de bachelorstudie onder de aandacht zijn gebracht	vaardigheid om kennis uit voor de politicologie relevante disciplines te verwerken en toe te passen op de analyse van politicologische problemen; toepassing van kennis ook op verschijnselen die tijdens de studie niet expliciet onder de aandacht zijn gebracht
	in staat zijn om vanuit politicologische inzichten maatschappelijke problemen te onderkennen en te analyseren	in staat zijn om vanuit politicologische inzichten complexe maatschappelijke problemen te onderkennen en te analyseren en oplossingen op hun waarde te schatten
	competenties voor het opstellen en verdiepen van argumentaties in het algemeen en voor het oplossen van problemen op het vakgebied	in staat zijn om een originele bijdrage ter oplossing van maatschappelijke problemen te leveren
Oordeelsvorming (DD3)	Het op waarde kunnen schatten van opzet en uitkomsten van empirisch wetenschappelijk onderzoek	Het op waarde kunnen schatten van opzet en uitkomsten van empirisch wetenschappelijk onderzoek, inclusief de methodologische en methodisch-technische aspecten daarvan
	voldoende kennis van normatieve theorieën om de waardegeladenheid van zowel wetenschappelijke theorieën als van beleidsvoornemens te onderkennen	diepgaande kennis van normatieve theorieën om een beargumenteerde positie in te nemen in debatten inzake de waardegeladenheid van zowel wetenschappelijke theorieën als van beleidsvoornemens
Communicatie (DD4)	in staat zijn om informatie, ideeën en oplossingen over te dragen	in staat zijn om wetenschappelijke kennis, inclusief de opzet van het onderzoek alsmede de motieven en overwegingen die hieraan ten grondslag liggen, duidelijk en ondubbelzinnig over te brengen. Deelname aan wetenschappelijke en publieke debat
Leervaardigheden (DD5)	kennis hebben van de volledige empirische cyclus van onderzoek door deelname onder begeleiding aan alle fasen van wetenschappelijk onderzoek	zelfstandig kunnen formuleren en uitvoeren van wetenschappelijk onderzoek en het verslagleggen daarover



## APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

### *Joint Master's Program in Public Policy*

#### **A. Knowledge and understanding**

1. Systematic understanding of current theories, paradigms, concepts and principles of policy studies;
2. Systematic understanding of public policy formation at all levels of government, the functioning of supranational institutions and intergovernmental coordination mechanisms;
3. Systematic understanding of national, transnational and international policy processes and principles in the European context and globally;
4. Systematic understanding of the existing political, economic, legal, geopolitical, and social implications of the formulation of public policies;
5. Conceptual advancement in social science theories of the policy process, international relations and international development and the increasing dynamics between these fields of study, often in a research context;
6. Close familiarity with European and other international governance models and regimes.

#### **B. Application of knowledge and understanding; problem solving abilities**

1. Critically analyse policy issues and develop holistic perspectives on European governance and global governance;
2. Evaluate public policies and policy instruments with quantitative and qualitative methods;
3. Independently formulate relevant research topics, develop preliminary hypotheses and ideas, conduct data collection and analysis, design investigation procedures and prepare scientifically sound and effective reports on research outcomes;
4. Provide expert advice to decision makers in national and international fora, relying on a solid understanding of institutional contexts;
5. Design and participate in the delivery of public policies in various sectors and (multi-disciplinary) institutional settings.

#### **C. Integration of knowledge, handling complexity; making judgements; Learning skills and communication**

1. Interact with expertise in various fields of the social sciences related to public policy and governance;
2. Provide critical analysis of policy studies and related literature;
3. Improve competence in using statistical data, quantitative methods, and qualitative methods and formulate judgments with incomplete data;
4. Enhance their leadership skills and greater cultural sensitivity necessary as public policy becomes transnationalised and public actors interact through new modes of multi-level and networked governance;
5. Better appreciate the need for public integrity and ethical conduct in public service; deepened understanding of diverse forms of accountability and transparency; representation and public participation in local, national, international and transnational policy making.
6. To undertake further studies in a manner that is largely self-directed and autonomous, using library, electronic and on-line information resources with confidence;
7. Make written and oral presentations, not only on information, ideas, problems and solutions, but also their conclusions and the underpinning knowledge and rationale to specialist and non-specialist audiences;
8. Work in multidisciplinary, multicultural teams;
9. Speak, read and write English at professional and academic level;
10. Continuously and autonomously improve professional skills through planning, time management, critical reflection and self-evaluation, and adoption of individual learning strategies.





## APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

*Master's program Joint Master Program in Public Policy*

### **Track ISS-York: Governance and Development**

#### **Year 1 at ISS**

	ECTS
<b>Core Courses</b>	<b>18</b>
Comparative Public Policy (ISS 4182)	5
Development Economics and Public Policy (ISS 4181)	5
Research Methods (various courses)	8
<b>Track Specific Courses</b>	<b>21</b>
Thinking about Governance and Institutions (ISS 4180)	5
Contemporary Capitalism and Governance: neo-liberalism and beyond (ISS 4212)	8
Politics of Global Development: Debating liberal internationalism (ISS 4307)	8
<b>Elective Courses (various courses)</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Study Visit (ISS 4280)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Thesis Report (ISS 4380)</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Total year 1</b>	<b>60</b>

#### **Year 2 at York**

	ECTS
<b>Core Courses</b>	<b>14</b>
Public Management and Delivery	7
Global Governance	7
<b>Track Specific Courses</b>	<b>10</b>
Conflict and Development	10
<b>Elective Courses</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Internship</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Thesis Workshop</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Thesis</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Total year 2</b>	<b>60</b>

N.B. Internships normally take place in the first academic year.



### **Track ISS-IBEI: Political Economy and Development**

#### **Year 1 at ISS**

	ECTS
<b>Core Courses</b>	<b>18</b>
Comparative Public Policy (ISS 4182)	5
Development Economics and Public Policy (ISS 4181)	5
Research Methods (various courses)	8
<b>Track Specific Courses</b>	<b>21</b>
Thinking about Governance and Institutions (ISS 4180)	5
Contemporary Capitalism and Governance: neo-liberalism and beyond (ISS 4212)	8
Politics of Global Development: Debating liberal internationalism (ISS 4307)	8
<b>Elective Courses (various courses)</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Study Visit (ISS 4280)</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Thesis Report (ISS 4380)</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Total year 1</b>	<b>60</b>

#### **Year 2 at IBEI**

	ECTS
<b>Core Courses</b>	<b>12</b>
Public Management	6
Global Governance	6
<b>Track Specific Courses</b>	<b>12</b>
International Relations	8
Development Economics	4
<b>Elective Courses</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Internship</b>	<b>3</b>
Thesis Workshop	3
<b>Thesis</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Total year 2</b>	<b>60</b>

N.B. Internships normally take place in the first academic year.

## APPENDIX 5: PROGRAM OF THE SITE VISIT

Day 1: Wednesday 17 May			
09.00	09.15	Arrival panel at ISS	
09.15	09.25	Welcome	
09.25	10.45	Preparatory meeting and review of available information	Board Room 1.26
10.45	11.00	Coffee break	
11.00	12.15	Preparatory meeting and review of available information	Board Room
12.15	13.00	Lunch break	
13.00	13.30	Interview with management (ISS) <i>Inge Hutter, Rector of the ISS</i> <i>Freek Schiphorst, Deputy Rector of Educational Affairs</i>	Board Room
13.30	13.45	Short Break	
13.45	14.15	Interview Coordination of the program (Consortium + ISS) regarding quality assurance at the various institutions <i>Karim Knio, convenor of the program</i> <i>Agnes Batory, coordinator of the program at CEU, convenor CEU</i> <i>Wieke Blaauw, admin coordinator</i> <b>Skype: Agnes Batory</b>	Dining Room 1.31
14.15	14.30	Short break	
14.30	15.15	Interview Board of Examiners ISS, External Quality Assurance reviewer, Academic Registrar <i>Peter van Bergeijk, BoE member</i> <i>Jeffrey Henderson, EQAR</i> <i>Nynke Jo Smit, Academic Registrar – ex officio member BoE</i>	Board Room
15.15	16.15	Interview with students – first and second year students  First year: <i>Jon Walton (USA), ISS- IBEI+ student rep</i> <i>Ana Trujillo (Colombia), ISS-IBEI</i> <i>Lydia Gronemeier (Germany), ISS-IBEI</i> <i>Poorvi Bhargava (India), ISS-YORK</i>  Second year: <i>Sarah Wullbrecht (USA) IBEI</i> <i>Diego Arrea (Costa Rica) York</i>	Board Room
16.15	16.30	Panel discussion	
16.30	16.45	Coffee break	
16.45	17.30	Interview Academic Board (ISS, IBEI & York) regarding the academic program at the various institutions <i>Karim Knio, convenor at ISS</i> <i>Pablo Pareja Alcaraz, convenor at IBEI</i> <i>Eva Heims, convenor at York</i> <b>Skype: Pablo Pareja, Eva Heims</b>	Dining Room
17.30	17.45	Short break	
17.45	18.15	Interview alumni 1. <i>Tomas Chang Pico (Venezuela), ISS-IBEI 2013-2015, works now at HIVOS</i> 2. <i>Nicolas Martinez (Colombia), ISS- York 2014-2016, looking for jobs now</i>	Dining Room



		3. <i>Zuzana Novakova (Slovakia) ISS-IBEI 2010-2012 (Double Degree student), now PhD student at ISS. Previous job at EPC in Brussels.</i> <b>Skype: Zuzana Novakova</b>	
--	--	--	--

<b>Day 2: Thursday 18 May</b>			
09.00	09.15	Arrival panel at ISS	
09.15	09.30	Setting up Skype connection/conference call	
		Interview Teaching Staff (ISS, IBEI & York) <i>Sarah Hardus, ISS</i> <i>Wil Hout, ISS</i> <i>Rosalba Icaza Garza, ISS</i> <i>Lorenzo Pellegrini, ISS</i> <i>Andrea Bianculli, IBEI</i> <i>Nicole Lindstrom, York</i>	Dining Room
09.30	10.45	<b>Skype: Andrea Bianculli, Nicole Lindstrom</b>	
10.45	11.30	Interview Karim Knio, ISS convenor for Mundus MAPP	Board Room
11.30	12.30	Panel discussion + preparatory meeting for final interview	Board Room
12.30	13.30	Lunch break	
		Final management interview <i>Inge Hutter, Rector ISS</i> <i>Freek Schiphorst, Deputy Rector ISS</i> <i>Karim Knio, Mundus MAPP</i>	Board Room
13.30	14.15		
14.15	16.30	Formulating preliminary findings	Board Room
16.30	16.45	Presentation preliminary findings	Dining Room

## APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied the theses of the students with the following student numbers:

SB2100	SB2064	420584
SB2081	SB2128	420590
SB2080	SB2085	420578
SB2101	420952	420941
SB2079	420963	420588

N.B. The Consortium embraced a new way of listing student numbers for cohort 2014-2015.

During the site visit, the panel studied, among other things, the following documents (partly as hard copies, partly via the institution's electronic learning environment):

- Course materials, sample exams and answer models of the following courses:
  - Comparative Public Policy (Year 1, ISS)
  - Research Methods (Year 1, ISS)
  - Public Management and Delivery (Year 2, York)
  - Public Management (Year 2, IBEI)
- Minutes and annual reports Academic Board 2014-2015 and 2015-2016
- Report by the External Quality Assurance Reviewer (including Term of Reference and recommendations)
- Thesis guide IBEI
- Thesis manual York
- Mundus MAPP Program guide 2016-2018, including thesis and internship regulations
- Interim program assessment report
- Staff list with a major role in the program (including teaching qualification)
- List of graduates 2013-2015 and 2014-2016
- Educational statistics (including student numbers, success rates, staff-to-student ratio and contact hours)
- Information on the award criteria
- Information on the Mundus MAPP applications evaluation criteria
- Example diploma supplement
- Partnership agreement between all four Consortium partners: ISS, CEU, IBEI and York
- Accreditation reports for IBEI and York
- NVAO report Toets Nieuwe Opleiding 2012

