

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

FACULTY OF GOVERNANCE AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0622

© 2018 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

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S PROGRAMMES PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, AND THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMMES.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	6
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE COMBINED NVAO-EAPAA FRAMEWORK 2016.....	15
APPENDICES	37
APPENDIX 1: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	39
APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE	41
APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	47
APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	52
APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	55
APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	56

This report was finalized on 06-04-2018



REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S AND MASTER'S PROGRAMMES PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, AND THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

This report takes the joint NVAO-EAPAA Accreditation Framework 2016 as a starting point.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMMES

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

Name of the programme:	Public Administration (Bestuurskunde)
CROHO number:	56627
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Beleid, Bestuur en Organisatie (BBO)/Policy, Governance and Organisation Economie, Bestuur en Management (EBM)/Economics, Governance and Management
Location(s):	The Hague
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	Dutch, English
Expiration of accreditation:	31/12/2018

Master's programme Public Administration

Name of the programme:	Public Administration
CROHO number:	60020
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Economics and Governance International and European Governance Public Management
Location(s):	The Hague
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Expiration of accreditation:	31/12/2018

Master's programme Public Sector Management

Name of the programme:	Public Sector Management (Management van de Publieke Sector)
CROHO number:	60416
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Public Affairs Strategy, Consulting and Change Management
Location(s):	The Hague
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	Dutch
Expiration of accreditation:	31/12/2018



The visit of the assessment panel Public Administration to the Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs of Leiden University took place on 30 November – 1 December 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Leiden University
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 on 16 October 2017. The panel that assessed the bachelor- and master's programme Public Administration and the master's programme Public Sector Management consisted of:

- Prof. dr. T. (Tony) Bovaird, professor emeritus of Public Management and Policy at the University of Birmingham (United Kingdom) [chair];
- Prof. dr. A. (Adrian) Ritz, professor for Public Management at the University of Bern (Switzerland) [vice-chair];
- Prof. E. (Esther) Versluis, professor of European Regulatory Governance at Maastricht University;
- Prof. dr. H.M.C. (Harrie) Eijkelhof, professor emeritus of Physics Education at the University of Utrecht;
- Drs. C. (Cees) Vermeer, town clerk of the city of Breda;
- S. (Sophie) van Wijngaarden, master's student Systems Engineering, Policy Analysis & Management at the Delft University of Technology [student member].

The panel was supported by Peter Hildering MSc and dr. Joke Corporaal of QANU, who acted as secretaries.

Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The assessment of the bachelor- and master's programme Public Administration and the master's programme Public Sector Management is part of a cluster assessment. From October to December 2017, a panel assessed seven bachelor's programmes and seventeen master's programmes in Public Administration at eight universities.

The panel consists of seventeen members:

- Prof. T. (Tony) Bovaird, professor emeritus of Public Management and Policy at the University of Birmingham (United Kingdom) [chair];
- Prof. A. (Adrian) Ritz, professor for Public Management at the University of Bern (Switzerland) [vice-chair];
- Prof. M. (Marleen) Brans, professor at the Public Governance Institute of the KU Leuven (Belgium) [vice-chair];
- Prof. H.M.C. (Harrie) Eijkelhof, professor emeritus of Physics Education at Utrecht University;
- Prof. P.B. Peter Sloep, professor emeritus in Technology-Enhanced Learning, in particular Learning in Social at the Open Universiteit Nederland;
- Prof. T. (Tiina) Randma-Liiv, professor of Public Management and Policy and vice-dean for Research at Tallinn University of Technology (Estonia);

- Prof. L. (Lan) Xue, professor and dean of the School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University (China);
- Prof. E. (Esther) Versluis, professor of European Regulatory Governance at Maastricht University.
- Prof. W. (William) Webster, professor of Public Policy and Management at the Stirling Management School, University of Stirling (UK);
- Prof. J.J.A. (Jacques) Thomassen, emeritus professor of Political Science at the University of Twente;
- Prof J. E. (Jenneke) Bosch-Boesjes, emeritus professor of Development and Differentiation in Academic Education at the University of Groningen;
- Drs. B. (Bertine) Steenbergen, interim director at the Ministry of Security and Justice.
- Prof. J.P. (Jan) Pronk, professor emeritus in Theory and Practice of International Development at the International Institute of Social Studies and former Minister for Development Co-operation and Minister of Environment, Spatial Planning and Housing;
- Drs. C. (Cees) Vermeer, town clerk of the city of Breda;
- Drs. H. (Henk) de Jong, director of Strategy and Policy of the Dutch National Police;
- J.C. (Jasper) Meijering BSc, master's student Engineering and Policy Analysis at Delft University of Technology [student member];
- S. (Sophie) van Wijngaarden BSc, master's student Systems Engineering, Policy Analysis & Management at the Delft University of Technology [student member].

A panel of six to eight members was appointed for each visited, based on the expertise and availability of each panel member, and taking into account possible conflicts of interest.

Peter Hildering MSc of QANU was project coordinator of the cluster assessment Public Administration. He was secretary during the visits to University of Twente, Radboud University, Erasmus University Rotterdam and Leiden University. He also attended the final panel consultations of every visit and read and commented on draft versions of each report in order to monitor the consistency of the assessments and the resulting reports. Mark Delmartino MA, freelance worker of QANU, was secretary of the panel during the visits to Tilburg University, Maastricht University, Utrecht University, and VU University Amsterdam. Dr. Joke Corporaal, freelance worker of QANU, was second secretary during the visits to the Erasmus University Rotterdam and Leiden University.

Joint NVAO-EAPAA assessment

The panel assessment was aimed at (re-)accreditation by both NVAO and EAPAA. In order to increase efficiency and reduce administrative burden, both accreditation processes were combined. NVAO and EAPAA agreed on a joint process and framework on 12 September 2016. This report is based on the joint NVAO-EAPAA framework and is aimed at double accreditation for all programmes involved.

Preparation

Before the assessment panel's site visit to the Leiden University, the project coordinator received the self-evaluation reports that the programmes wrote based on the joint NVAO-EAPAA framework. He sent it to the panel after checking it for completeness of information. Upon reading the self-evaluation reports, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings. The panel also studied a selection of ten theses and the accompanying assessment forms for each programme. This selection was made by the panel's chair, in cooperation with the secretary, from a list of graduates from the past three years. The chair and secretary took care that all tracks and specializations within the programmes were covered, and made sure that the distribution of grades in the theses selection matched the distribution of grades over all theses.

The panel chair, secretary and programme jointly composed a schedule for the site visit. Prior to the site visit, the programme selected representative partners for the various interviews. Interviews were planned with students, teaching staff, management, alumni and professional field, the programme committee and the board of examiners. See appendix 5 for the definitive schedule.

Site visit

The site visit to Leiden University from 30 November to 1 December 2017 followed a visit to the Erasmus University Rotterdam that took place from 27 to 29 November 2017. At the start of the week, the panel held a preparatory meeting during which it was instructed regarding the assessment framework and procedures. After this, the panel discussed its working method and its preliminary findings for the site visit, and reflected on the content and use of the programmes' domain-specific framework of reference (appendix 2).

During the site visit, the panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes, and examined materials provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials is given in appendix 6. The panel provided students and staff with the opportunity to speak informally with the panel outside the set interviews. Two students made use of this opportunity. The panel explored the experiences provided by these students further during the site visit.

The panel used the final part of the visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards the panel chair gave an oral presentation, in which he expressed the panel's preliminary impressions and general observations. The visit was concluded with a development conversation, in which the panel and the programmes discussed various development routes for the programmes. The result of this conversation is summarized in a separate report.

Report

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the assessment panel's findings. Subsequently, she sent it to the assessment panel for feedback. After processing the panel members' feedback, the coordinator sent the draft reports to the university in order to have them checked for factual irregularities. The secretary discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and adapted the reports accordingly before their finalisation.

Decision rules

The panel used the definitions from the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited programme assessments to assess the six standards in the joint NVAO-EAPAA framework. To determine the score for the programmes as a whole, the decision rules of the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited programme assessments were applied to the scores for Standard 1 to 4.

Generic quality

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

Unsatisfactory

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

Satisfactory

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

Good

The programme systematically surpasses the current generic quality standards.

Excellent

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The bachelor's programme Public Administration concentrates on public administration and governance in an ever-changing context. Characteristic of the programme is the multi-level perspective on public administration and the attention to different actors in the process of public policy making. Students choose one of two tracks: Economics, Governance and Management (EBM: Economie, Bestuur en Management) and Policy, Governance and Organisation (BBO: Beleid, Bestuur en Organisatie). The panel concludes that the programme has a clear and distinctive profile. The panel also appreciates the choice between two tracks that is offered to students and thinks that the new location in The Hague, close to national and international public administration institutions, is an asset to the programme.

The panel believes that the clear profile of the programme is not yet reflected in the current mission statement, and encourages the programme to rephrase the overall aim more precisely. The profile and overall aim should also mention the educational philosophy underpinning the programme. The intended learning outcomes of the programme are in line with the level, academic orientation and requirements of the field. The panel is satisfied with the concise way in which they have been formulated.

The panel was impressed with the bachelor's programme and considers it a strong and comprehensive programme that employs a wide variety of teaching methods. The courses match the intended learning outcomes very well and cleverly integrate theory, professional and academic skills. The core components cover the core topics in the field of public administration and public administration research. The programme has adequate links with and makes good use of the environment in The Hague. The panel is pleased to see that the programme offers bachelor's students the possibility to follow a short or longer internship but also concludes that the number of students choosing to do so is relatively low.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the teaching staff in the programme. To ensure the link between research and teaching, all teachers also have research time. Staff members are clearly highly experienced researchers, and the panel values the link between research and teaching. However, the panel was surprised by the low involvement of full professors in the bachelor's programme. It suggests that consideration should be given to ways of increasing their role in the programme, if only through their presence in some high profile activities such as master classes.

The programme has an impressive assessment system in place. The panel is enthusiastic about the changes that the Board of Examiners has made to assessment and quality control. As a result, the programme now has an assessment plan which links assessment to learning objectives, all courses have two assessments, the overall diversity of assessment has increased, the quality of all written exams is monitored before and after exams are held, and finally, the thesis assessment trajectory has improved greatly and is now very good.

The panel concludes that graduates have achieved the intended learning outcomes. Bachelor's theses have a clear structure, and show sufficient attention for theory and methodology. The programme has an adequate system of quality assurance. Course and curriculum evaluations lead to continuous improvements to the programmes at the level of the courses, the connections between courses and the programme as a whole. The programme reviews of 2011 and 2014 have been taken seriously and have led to numerous changes, most clearly the professionalisation of the Board of Examiners and the procedures associated with the theses.

The programme aims for an equal division between men and women at staff and student level. The panel concludes that the number of male and female students is more or less balanced. At staff level, gender balance is less complete. Though currently not very unequal, the panel thinks that this imbalance needs readdressing.



Master's programme Public Administration

The central question in the English-taught *master's programme Public Administration* is how society's most pressing problems can be addressed from the perspective of governance. The programme is based on the assumption that societal changes should be addressed at the intersection of different levels of governance – supranational, national or local – while paying attention to public and private actors. The programme offers three specialisations, each with a different focus: *International and European Governance*, *Public Management* and *Economics and Governance* (launched in September 2016 and jointly offered with the Department of Economics of Leiden Law School). Each track reflects a certain sub-discipline of Public Administration. The programme collaborates closely with other institutes at Leiden University and with professional partners in The Hague. The panel noticed that, compared to other Public Administration master's programmes in the Netherlands, this master's programme emphasises its strong research focus. The panel thinks that the specialisations are well in tune with the labour market and it is enthusiastic about the thematic focus of the three tracks.

The panel believes that the clear profile of the programme is not yet reflected in the current mission statement, and encourages the programme to rephrase the overall aim more precisely. The profile and overall aim should also mention the educational philosophy underpinning the programme. At the moment, the panel felt such a philosophy was still missing. The intended learning outcomes of the programme are in line with the level, academic orientation and requirements of the field. The panel is satisfied with the concise way in which they have been formulated.

The panel was impressed with the curriculum and the quality of teaching. To ensure the link between research and teaching, all teachers also have research time. Staff members are clearly highly experienced researchers, and the panel values the link between research and teaching. The programme uses a good variety of teaching methods, including new digital, interactive and experimental forms of teaching. The panel specifically praised the strong substantive courses that bind the programme together, the critical stance that students are encouraged to take and the strong inclusion of research methods. The master's student representatives seemed to clearly identify themselves with the tracks they followed. The panel concludes that these are solid public administration tracks, with a strong set of courses for each track. The programme is connected to the professional field at different levels of government through guest lecturers, external teachers and staff research. The panel is of the opinion that the capstone projects in the master's programme relate well to professional practice and have been well implemented.

The programme has an impressive assessment system in place. The panel is enthusiastic about the changes that the Board of Examiners has made to assessment and quality control. As a result, the programme now has an assessment plan which links assessment to learning objectives, all courses have two assessments, the overall diversity of assessment has increased, the quality of all written exams is monitored before and after exams are held, and finally, the thesis assessment trajectory has improved greatly and is now very good.

The panel concludes that graduates have achieved the intended learning outcomes. Master's theses have a clear structure, and show that students pay a lot of attention to methodology. The programme has an adequate system of quality assurance. Course and curriculum evaluations lead to continuous improvements to the programmes at the level of the courses, the connections between courses and the programme as a whole. The programme reviews of 2011 and 2014 have been taken seriously and have led to numerous changes, most clearly the professionalisation of the Board of Examiners and the procedures associated with the theses.

The programme aims for an equal division between men and women at staff and student level. The panel concludes that the number of male and female students is more or less balanced. At staff level, gender balance is less complete. Though currently not very unequal, the panel thinks that this imbalance needs readdressing. Regarding internationalisation, the panel considers equal opportunities for students from different backgrounds important. It is content to see that the

programme has taken steps to better include international students and students from different cohorts in the programme and the University.

Master's programme Public Sector Management

The master's programme Public Sector Management (delivered in Dutch) is an evening programme intended for professionals already working in the Dutch public sector. The programme pays attention to processes between and within organisations in the public sector, and to the different perspectives that actors might have. Students learn to know about and understand relevant developments and issues of Dutch public management, as well as the theoretical approaches to tackle them. There are two specialisation tracks: *Public Affairs* and *Strategie, Advisering en Verandermanagement (SAV: Strategy, Consulting and Change Management)*. The panel concludes that the programme has a clear profile with a strong focus on the Dutch public sector. The programme succeeds in making the most of its new location (close to relevant national and international institutions) by offering an executive programme for public sector workers that integrates theory and practice. The panel likes the multi-level and multi-actor approach of both master's specialisations, and agrees with the programme management that the Public Affairs specialisation is a unique specialisation dealing with a relatively new area of public management.

The panel believes that the clear profile of the programme is not yet reflected in the current mission statement, and encourages the programme to rephrase the overall aim more precisely. The profile and overall aim should also mention the educational philosophy underpinning the programme. The intended learning outcomes of the programme are in line with the level, academic orientation and requirements of the field. The panel is satisfied with the concise way in which they have been formulated.

The panel concludes that the overall structure of the programme is clear and coherent. In the courses, the panel thinks that the MPS programme could offer a wider variety of teaching and learning methods. Most courses are now a combination of lectures and group assignments. The programme management is already in the process of increasing the variety of teaching methods in the courses, for instance by letting students write and present a policy advice, and introducing more digital means of teaching. This is work in progress that the panel applauds.

The panel was concerned about how the intended learning outcomes had been translated into course objectives, and how research methods and skills were embedded in the courses. While both academic and professional skills are taught, the latter is much more prominently visible in the curriculum. Academic skill education is not clearly mapped out to check whether all topics are properly covered. The literature selected for the courses and the realised learning outcomes (Standard 4) convinced the panel that, although not clearly formulated in the course objectives, the courses ultimately reach the required master's level. The panel thinks, however, that the programme could position itself more strongly as an academic master's level programme. It recommends the programme to reformulate its course objectives in a more challenging way, in line with the academic level highlighted in the intended learning outcomes. It also advises the programme to rebalance the focus between academic skills and professional content in favour of academic skills. The panel thinks there is room in terms of workload to expand existing courses in order to increase the level of academic content and challenge. Based on the interviews throughout the site visit, the panel is confident that the programme management is aware of these issues, and will take appropriate action.

The programme is connected to the professional field at different levels of government through guest lecturers, external teachers and staff research. The panel is of the opinion that the capstone projects in the master's programme relate well to professional practice and have been well implemented. The programme also makes good use of employers' feedback.

Though the programme is geared towards practitioners, it also admits motivated students without any work experience. The panel recommends the programme to formulate its admission



requirements more precisely and not to deviate from them on an individual basis, to prevent the suggestion of arbitrariness.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the teaching staff in the programme. To ensure the link between research and teaching, all teachers also have research time. Staff are clearly highly experienced researchers, and the panel values the link between research and teaching. The panel noted that MPS students are very satisfied with their teachers.

The programme has an impressive assessment system in place. The panel is enthusiastic about the changes that the Board of Examiners has made to assessment and quality control. As a result, the programme now has an assessment plan which links assessment to learning objectives, all courses have two assessments, the overall diversity of assessment has increased, the quality of all written exams is monitored before and after exams are held. Finally, the thesis assessment trajectory, which was in need of change in terms of quality assurance, has been improved greatly. The panel recommends the programme to increase the variety of assessment methods, and to pay more attention to the assessment of academic skills.

The panel concludes that graduates have achieved the intended learning outcomes. Master's theses are of satisfactory quality. The programme has an adequate system of quality assurance. Course and curriculum evaluations lead to continuous improvements to the programmes at the level of the courses, the connections between courses and the programme as a whole. The programme reviews of 2011 and 2014 have been taken seriously and have led to numerous changes, most clearly the professionalisation of the Board of Examiners and the procedures associated with the theses.

The programme aims for an equal division between men and women at staff and student level. The panel concludes that the number of male and female students is more or less balanced. At staff level, gender balance is less complete. Though currently not very unequal, the panel thinks that this imbalance needs readdressing. Finally, the panel is content to see that the programme has taken steps to better include students from different cohorts in the programme and in the University.

The panel assesses the standards from the combined NVAO-EAPAA framework 2016 in the following way:

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	good
Standard 3: Assessment	good
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 5: External input	satisfactory
Standard 6: Diversity	satisfactory
General conclusion	satisfactory

Master's programme Public Administration

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	good
Standard 3: Assessment	good
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 5: External input	satisfactory
Standard 6: Diversity	satisfactory
General conclusion	satisfactory

Master's programme Public Sector Management

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	satisfactory
Standard 3: Assessment	satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	satisfactory
Standard 5: External input	satisfactory
Standard 6: Diversity	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: 06-04-2018



Prof. Tony Bovaird



Dr. Joke Corporaal

DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE COMBINED NVAO-EAPAA FRAMEWORK 2016

Organisational embedding

The Public Administration programmes at Leiden University are embedded in the Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs, one of the university's seven faculties. Within the Faculty, research is organised in and staff are appointed to three institutes. The PA programmes are part of the Institute of Public Administration that is situated in The Hague. The three programmes discussed in this report have two Programme Committees, one for the bachelor's and one for both master's programmes. All three programmes share one Examination Board. In addition, each programme has its own Programme Board, consisting of (at least) a Programme Director and a student. With a yearly intake of well above 200 students, the bachelor's programme is the biggest PA programme in the Netherlands.

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes of the programme have been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements. 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 programme. Insofar as is applicable, the intended learning outcomes are in accordance with relevant legislation and regulations. The programme should clearly state its educational philosophy in reaching these outcomes and identify a clear mission.

Findings

Profile and mission

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The bachelor's programme Public Administration (delivered in Dutch) concentrates on public administration and governance in an ever-changing context. Characteristic for the programme is the multi-level perspective on public administration and the attention to different actors in the process of public policy making. Students are encouraged to use insights from the 'traditional' disciplines (political sciences, law, and economics) as well as from other disciplines such as history, administrative ethics and (political) philosophy. The programme discusses, among other things, how the connections between national and international governance have an effect on Dutch politics and policy. The aim of the programme is described as: 'for graduates to have knowledge and understanding of the study and practice of public administration and to acquire the academic and professional skills needed for critical analysis, research and advice.'

Students choose one of two tracks: Economics, Governance and Management (EBM: Economie, Bestuur en Management) and Policy, Governance and Organisation (BBO: Beleid, Bestuur en Organisatie). The first track focuses on economic issues in public administration and the latter provides students with a multidisciplinary perspective on the public sector. The majority of courses (65%) are shared. As of February 2017, students follow courses at the programme's new location at the Wijnhaven in The Hague, close to the heart of Dutch government and administration, and home to many international organisations. The programme has a research focus ('research-led teaching') and teaches students how to integrate different research approaches and designs.

The panel concludes that the bachelor's programme has a clear and distinctive profile. The programme emphasises the ability to use multi- and interdisciplinary approaches and to make judgments, so that students are able to adopt a position in societal debates. The panel also appreciates the choice between two tracks that is offered to students, one with an economic focus and one with a more 'traditional' focus on public administration. The panel thinks that the new



location in The Hague, close to national and international public administration institutions, is an asset to the programme. The student representatives also said that they appreciate that they can literally see around them what they learn. At the same time, the panel thinks that the programme should be aware of students' concerns that both the link with Leiden University and the identity of the Dutch programme are under pressure within The Hague's international context.

The panel concludes that the overall aim the programme has formulated could reflect the programme's unique profile better. Finally, the panel thinks that the mission statement could be clearer on the educational philosophy central to the programme: what is specific to 'research-led teaching'?

Master's programme Public Administration

The central question in the English-taught master's programme Public Administration is how society's most pressing problems can be addressed from the perspective of governance. The programme has a strong academic orientation, and puts emphasis on the development of research skills. According to the self-evaluation report, the programme is based on the assumption that societal changes should be addressed at the intersection of different levels of governance – supranational, national or local – while paying attention to public and private actors. The intended learning outcomes are geared towards the overall aim of the programme, which is described as: 'training managers, leaders and analysts who are able to grapple with the complexities of current public sector challenges from the perspective of a variety of organisations'. The programme offers students the choice between three specialisations, each with a different focus: *International and European Governance*, *Public Management* and *Economics and Governance* (launched in September 2016 and jointly offered with the Department of Economics of Leiden Law School). The programme collaborates closely with other institutes at Leiden University (for instance the Leiden Institute of Advanced Computer Science) and with professional partners in The Hague.

The panel noticed that, compared to other Public Administration master's programmes in the Netherlands, this master's programme emphasises its strong research focus. The reasons the students gave for having chosen this programme were the fact that this programme ranks high in university rankings, the programme's unique location and the specialisations that the programme offers. The panel thinks that these specialisations are well in tune with the labour market and it considers the themes of the three tracks to be appropriate (also see section 2.2). The panel believes that the clear profile of the programme is not yet reflected in the current mission statement, and encourages the programme to rephrase the overall aim more precisely. The profile and overall aim should also mention the educational philosophy underpinning the programme. At the moment, the panel felt such a philosophy was missing.

Master's programme Public Sector Management

The master's programme Public Sector Management (delivered in Dutch) is an evening programme intended for professionals already working in the Dutch public sector. Part of the mission statement reads: 'A graduate of the Master's in Public Sector Management has acquired both general and specialized academic knowledge, understanding and skills in the field of the operation and performance of the public sector in its political, administrative, legal and social context.' The words 'performance' and 'interaction' (between public organisations and stakeholders) are important in the programme description. There is attention to processes between and within organisations in the public sector, and for the different perspectives that actors might have. Students learn to know about and understand relevant developments and issues of Dutch public management, as well as the theoretical approaches to tackle them. There are two specialisations: *Public Affairs* (focusing on the interaction between public organisations and groups trying to influence the policy process) and *Strategie, Advisering en Verandermanagement* (SAV: Strategy, Consulting and Change Management), concentrating on public organisations' efforts to maintain and improve their performance against the background of multilevel governance, increased political pressure and pressure from other stakeholders (citizens, media, pressure groups).

The panel concludes that the programme has a clear profile with a strong focus on the Dutch public sector. The programme succeeds in making the most of its new location (close to relevant national and international institutions) by offering an executive programme for public sector workers that integrates theory and practice. In the view of the panel, this master's programme seeks to encourage students to adopt a critical attitude towards current management doctrines such as 'transformational leadership', public network management, et cetera. The panel values such a critical stance. Students can either specialise in the Dutch sector or opt for a wider and more international track. The panel likes the multi-level and multi-actor approach of both master tracks, and agrees with the programme management that the Public Affairs specialisation is a unique specialisation dealing with a relatively new area of public management.

Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning programmes of all three programmes (see Appendix 1) are grouped along the five categories of the Dublin descriptors, and they are based upon the public administration domain-specific reference framework (PAGO). Consequently, the level, academic orientation and requirements of the field are clearly visible in the wording of the intended learning outcomes. The panel was satisfied with the intended learning outcomes and with the concise way in which they have been phrased. They clearly describe the academic level that is aimed for and they also match the programme's unique profiles and missions.

Considerations

The *bachelor's and master's programme Public Administration* and the *Master of International Public Management and Public Policy* have clearly defined and distinctive profiles. They all take a multi-disciplinary, multi-level approach; they focus on research and analytical skills and look at different organisations and actors, both from an internal and external perspective. The committee thinks that the written aims of the programmes could be rephrased to better match these distinctive features. For all three programmes, the mission statement could also be clearer on the educational principles underpinning the programmes.

The panel thinks the programmes succeed in making the most of their location in The Hague, at the heart of the Dutch public sector. However, as mentioned above, the panel also thinks that the programme management should take students' concerns regarding the new location seriously. The students find it important that the programme maintains its Dutch identity in an international context. They also value the link with other programmes and institutes at Leiden University.

The intended learning outcomes of the programmes are in line with the level, academic orientation and requirements of the field. The panel is satisfied with the concise way in which they have been formulated.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Sector Management: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'satisfactory'.



Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

The curriculum, staff and programme-specific services and facilities enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. 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 programme-specific services and facilities is essential to that end. Curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitute a coherent teaching-learning environment for the students.

Findings

2.1: Core components

The core curriculum provides a thorough teaching of the basic concepts, theories, methods and history (classics) of Public Administration at the level of the programme (bachelor's or master's).

The academic year at Leiden University is divided into two semesters; each semester consists of two blocks. During each block, students follow three courses at a time. All courses account for 5 EC, exceptions being the concluding thesis projects and the minor subject in the bachelor's programme. All courses have a numeric code ranging from 100 to 600 describing the level of challenge. Bachelor courses start at level-100 and master courses at level-500.

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The first two years of the bachelor's programme consist of 24 compulsory courses. In most blocks, students in both tracks follow two courses together and one course with students from their own track only. The first half of year three (30 EC) is reserved for 'optional subjects' (see Standard 2.2). The second half of the concluding year is reserved for four more courses and the bachelor's project (10 EC). Courses cover a wide range of subjects and theories from the field of public administration, governance, policymaking, politics, law, economics and management, as well as research methods (both quantitative and qualitative) and ethics.

Master's programme Public Administration

The master's programme Public Administration has 20 EC of required courses, 20 EC of track-specific courses and one elective course (5 EC in the second block). The programme concludes with a master's thesis (15 EC). The four core courses are two substantive and two research courses: 'Public Institutions', 'Public Policy and Values', 'Research Design' and 'Research Methods'. The four track-specific courses are scheduled in the first and third block and cover subjects and theories that are specific for the three tracks: International and European Governance (IEG), Public Management (PM) and Economics and Governance (E&G).

Master's programme Public Sector Management

The master's programme Public Sector Management consists of five compulsory courses (25 EC), a master's thesis (15 EC) and 20 EC worth of track-related courses. The joint courses provide students with general knowledge of the public sector, public administration research, performance management, organisational change and public values and ethics. Track-specific courses are for instance a course on the policy cycle and the Dutch administrative arena from a multilevel perspective (Public Affairs track) or a course on increasing legal influence of administrative processes and its consequences (SAV-track).

Having studied the curricula and the content of several core courses of the programmes (see Appendix 6), the panel concludes that the core components of the three programmes cover the core topics in the field of public administration theory and research. In the view of the panel, the bachelor's and master's programme Public Administration are both impressive and comprehensive programmes. In the bachelor's programme the panel liked the fact that public administration is combined with a financial management component. In the master's programme, the panel specifically praised the strong substantive courses that bind the programme together, the critical stance that students are encouraged to take and the strong inclusion of research methods.

For the *master's programme Public Sector Management*, the panel had concerns about how the intended learning outcomes had been translated into course objectives, and how research methods and skills were embedded in the courses. In the view of the panel, the course descriptions did not clearly present the courses as being at an academic master's level. Some course descriptions, for instance, state that the courses provide 'an introduction' to a specific subject, where the panel expects master's students to study subjects at an advanced level of knowledge and understanding. It was also not clear to the panel from the course descriptions how master's level research methods and academic skills were embedded in the courses.

The panel explored the topic of the level and challenge of the courses in interviews and by studying the contents of several courses and course evaluations and the level of the realised learning outcomes of the programme's graduates. As explained by the programme management, a substantial group of students has a professional background, and initially has difficulties adapting to the master's level of the programme. Therefore, a course generally starts at a basic, introductory level and builds up towards master's level. The literature selected for the courses and the realised learning outcomes (Standard 4) convinced the panel that, although not clearly formulated in the course objectives, the courses ultimately reach the required master's level. It however thinks that the programme could position itself more strongly as an academic master's level programme. While both academic and professional skills are taught, the latter is much more prominently visible in the curriculum. The courses in the academic and professional skills learning pathway (see Standard 2.6) are designed alongside the professional skills, rather than academic skills. Academic skill education is not clearly mapped out to check whether all topics are properly covered.

The panel recommends the programme to reformulate its course objectives in a more challenging way, in line with the academic level it aims for in the intended learning outcomes. It also advises the programme to rebalance the focus between academic skills and professional content in favour of academic skills. This might for instance be achieved by structuring a separate academic skills learning pathway in the curriculum. The panel thinks there is room in terms of workload to expand existing courses in order to increase the level of academic content and challenge. Also, the programme could consider steering the expectations of students entering the programme to better prepare them for an academic master's level curriculum (see 2.8). Based on the interviews throughout the site visit, the panel is confident that the programme management is aware of these issues, and will take appropriate action.

2.2 Other components and specialisations

The programme clearly defines its objectives for additional work and the rationale for the objectives, and explains how the curriculum is designed to achieve these objectives. The statement of objectives includes any programme specialisation or concentration and the main categories of students to be served (e.g. full-time, part-time).

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

Students in the bachelor's programme can specialise in a certain area of the field of public administration by choosing an economic or public sector track. Further specialisation can be reached in the 'vrije keuzeruimte' ('optional subjects') at the beginning of the third year. As mentioned above, these 'optional subjects' (30 EC in total) are offered in the first half of the third year. They can be filled with elective courses, a minor subject, an internship (15 or 30 EC if it includes a research component) or a study period abroad in the Erasmus Exchange programme. In addition there are Honours programmes, such as the Honours programme 'Tackling Global Challenges'. Students are selected for these programmes on the basis of their study results.

The panel concludes that, through the room for specialisation in the programme, students can define their own study path following personal interests and talents. It is enthusiastic about the two tracks in the bachelor's programme, and also about the high number of elective courses in the first half of the final year. In the view of the panel, these specialisation components have clearly defined goals and objectives. The panel was surprised to hear that students do not often choose to study abroad



(approximately 16 students per year), even though the programme management actively encourages this. It proposes checking whether this suggests the need for improvements in the information provided regarding the exchange programme. Finally, the panel noted that students strongly identify themselves with the track that they follow. The panel sees this as proof that the tracks add to the profile of this bachelor's programme.

Master's programme Public Administration

There are three tracks in the master's programme: *International and European Governance*, *Public Management* and *Economics and Governance*. Students choose one of these tracks at the start of the programme, and follow four track courses (20 EC). Each track reflects a certain sub-discipline of the broad and multidisciplinary field of Public Administration.

- *International and European Governance* deals with regulatory governance, EU, international decision-making and international relations.
- *Public Management* focuses on theories of (public) management, leadership and organisations.
- *Economics and Governance* (launched in 2016/2017, jointly offered with the Department of Economics of Leiden Law School) builds on applied economic theory concerning market regulation, social policy and labour economics and comparative political economy.

Like the bachelor's students, the master's student representatives seemed to clearly identify themselves with the tracks they followed. The panel concludes that these are solid public administration tracks, with a strong set of courses for each track. Outside the tracks there is limited room for specialisation; the master's programme contains one elective course in the second block. The panel does not consider this problematic, as the tracks already provide ample opportunity to specialise in a preferred sub-discipline.

Master's programme Public Sector Management

The master's programme Public Sector Management has 20 EC worth of track-related courses. The four specialisation courses are either followed within the *Public Affairs* or *Strategy, Consulting and Change Management* track. The panel arrived at the conclusion that the programme offers sufficient room for students to specialise in one of two tracks. The panel was impressed by the Public Affairs track in particular, and considered it to be unique in the Netherlands. It therefore understood the suggestion by the programme management that this track might be turned into an executive programme.

For the thesis project in both master's programmes, students enrol in a capstone project that closely relates to staff research. The panel notes that a downside of thesis capstone groups could be that students cannot fully pursue their own thesis topics. It recommends ensuring that students who prefer to choose their own topic are facilitated to do so.

2.3 Multi-disciplinarity

The courses taken to fulfil the core curriculum components provide research methods, concepts and theories from the disciplines of economics, law, political science, sociology, public finances, informatisation, and public management as well as the relationship between these fields.

The panel studied the content of a number of core courses of the three programmes (see Appendix 6) and discussed the issue of multidisciplinary in several of its interviews. In the *bachelor's programme*, multidisciplinary is reached by offering courses that approach the public sector from other academic disciplines (for instance political science, law, economics, sociology and history) as well as research techniques from these fields. The *master's programme Public Administration* also reflects the multidisciplinary nature of the field of public administration. As described above (section 2.2) each specialisation is weighted toward a certain sub-discipline. Finally, most of the courses in the *MPS programme* deal with specific legal, political, administrative and socio-cultural contexts of public organisations. In doing so, they touch upon disciplines such as law, political science, sociology, economics, business administration and organisation studies. In the concluding thesis projects of all three programmes, multiple disciplines are again integrated to answer a research question. The panel

concludes that all three programmes make good use of research methods, concepts and theories from disciplines that are highly relevant to the field of public administration and study the relationship between these disciplines.

2.4 Length

The programmed curriculum length is in line with the objectives of the programme and in accordance with the accreditation category that is applied for.

The bachelor's programme (180 EC) and both master's programmes (60 EC) meet the length criteria for academic bachelor's and master's programmes in the Netherlands.

2.5 Relationship to practice and internships

The programme provides adequate training of practical skills in correspondence with the mission and the programme objectives. Therefore it has adequate links to the public administration profession.

As well as being research-led, the programmes pride themselves on being practice-driven. Being situated in the heart of The Hague, all programmes have close ties with the city and its public institutions: the ministries, municipality, et cetera. This makes it relatively easy for the programmes to bring in expertise from outside and to send students into the public sector (for instance, on course assignments or extracurricular excursions).

Bachelor's students can opt for a 15 EC or 30 EC internship in the third year of their programme, and experience what it is like to work and (in case of the 30 EC option) carry out research in the professional field of public administration. As stated above, an increasing number of students choose to do so: from approximately 25 students in 2014/2015 (approximately 1 out of 10 students) to approximately 45 students in 2016/2017 (approximately 1 out of 6). The panel is pleased to see that the programme offers bachelor's students the possibility to follow a short or longer internship. However, it also points out that, given the size of the programme (the yearly average intake over the last three years was well above 250) and compared to the figures from other Dutch public administration programmes, the number of students choosing to do an internship is relatively low.

The two master's programmes do not contain an internship, but do facilitate and offer supervision for an extracurricular internship of 15 EC, providing it matches the goals of the programme and has an academic character. Sometimes a short internship is part of the master's thesis project. An estimated 25% of students uses one of these options. From talking to the students, the panel concludes that, precisely because of the research-focus of the programmes, students value the opportunity to carry out an internship. Some students from the MPS programme felt that the programme could more actively promote and improve practical support for finding an (extracurricular) internship. They were unaware of the fact that the master's programme Public Administration has an online internship databank. The panel concludes that communication about a possible (extracurricular) internship could be clearer.

The self-evaluation reports explain that the relationship with practice in all three programmes has recently been intensified in a number of ways. All programmes frequently invite public sector professionals as guest lecturers. In addition, the programmes have started a pilot project with extracurricular 'current affairs lectures' where professionals talk about a recent practical issue. Furthermore, the programmes have expanded their alumni programme so that alumni can help bridge the gap between the programme and the professional field. Furthermore, a mentorship programme (bachelor's programme) and a career development officer (appointed in 2015 for all programmes) are intended to help students make well-informed choices for their third year (bachelor's programme) and beyond. The number of 'labour market preparation activities' has increased a lot over the past two years. Programme management now also works more closely together with the study association B.I.L., which organises excursions and other career preparation activities. Finally, all programmes pay attention to professional skills that are deemed necessary for



professional practice, such as good communication skills and awareness of ethical aspects of scientific research (most prominently the master's programmes).

The panel concludes that the programmes have adequate links with and make good use of the The Hague environment. They are connected to the professional field at different levels of government through guest lecturers, external teachers and staff research (though most clearly in the master's programmes). The panel is of the opinion that the capstone projects in the master's programme relate well to professional practice and have been well implemented. The panel also notes that the MPS programme, as well as being geared toward young and mid-career professionals, makes good use of employers' feedback. In the view of the panel, all programmes prepare students in a convincing manner for either a master's programme or a career in public administration.

2.6 Structure and didactics of the programme

The programme is coherent in its contents. The didactic concepts are in line with the aims and objectives of the programme. The teaching methods correspond to the didactic philosophy of the programme. The programme is 'doable' in the formal time foreseen for the programme in the respective years.

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The self-evaluation report describes how the bachelor's programme builds on four principles: (1) integrating knowledge and insights, (2) increasing independence in learning, (3) building up knowledge and (4) learning through variation in assessment. The programme specifies how each of the basic principles is implemented in the programme. For instance, the mentorship programme aids the second principle 'increasing independence in learning', and so do the seminars, in which the focus shifts from knowledge transfer (year 1) to practising academic and professional skills (year 2) and taking ownership of the students' own learning experience (year 3). The panel concludes that although the description of the four principles is logical, the programme could more clearly state its didactic concepts. The self-evaluation report lacks a description of the teaching philosophy. Research-led teaching is brought up in the mission statement of the programme but not mentioned again as one of the underpinning educational philosophies, nor is the link between courses and the research expertise of the staff.

From studying the curriculum as a whole and some core courses in more detail (see Appendix 6), the panel concludes that the programme uses an impressive variety of teaching methods (closely linked to assessment, see Standard 3). In addition to attending lectures and seminars students debate, conduct interviews, go on excursions, produce experience reports and policy evaluation plans, write Wikipedia pages, and create video blogs. Nevertheless, students commented that, in the first two years of the programme, the level of challenge could have been higher - they were often asked just to apply and reproduce theory. However, in the view of the panel, the courses match the intended learning outcomes very well and cleverly integrate theory, professional and academic skills. The fact that each course has a numeric code/level description also helps to ensure a good match between the course objectives and the overall goals of the programme. The programme is structured in a logical manner that trains students to work increasingly independently, thus preparing them well for a master's programme. The students the panel talked to were satisfied with their teachers and felt that they went beyond offering 180 EC, for instance by organising extracurricular guest lecturers and Honours programmes.

Students and graduates could not identify any stumbling blocks that would make it impossible to finish the programme in the given time. The programme has, however, experienced a decrease in overall success rates. After a successful first year (84% of students obtain the required 45 EC for a positive study advice), the success rates drop. The number of students finishing the programme within three years has gone down from 38% in the group starting in 2012-2013 to 28% in the 2013-2014 cohort. Now, approximately 75% of students finish the programme within four years. The programme provides two reasons for the recent fall in success rates: the introduction of stricter entry requirements for the bachelor's thesis project in 2014/2015 (130 EC and all research courses of the

first and second year must be completed) and the introduction of at least two assessments per course, which (for every assessment component counting for more than 30%) both need to be a pass mark. The programme also explains that measures have been taken to improve study success, such as a restructuring of the methods courses and closely monitoring study progress through the mentorship programme. The panel is satisfied with the measures taken, and agrees with programme management that setting stricter entry requirements for the bachelor's thesis and having two assessments per course are in itself good measures for further improving the quality of the programme.

Master's programme Public Administration

The master's programme is based on the following three didactic principles: (1) coherence between courses, (2) incremental learning process and (3) diversity of teaching and assessment methods. During each academic year, all core courses are offered twice. This is because students can enter the programme in September and February, depending on when they have obtained their bachelor's degree. The three sets of specialisation courses are only offered once to both cohorts jointly. Each specialisation track has its own coordinator. Coordinators regularly meet in so-called 'blokoverleggen' (track meetings). If something changes in a course, the coordinators try to make sure this does not create a problem for other courses. In addition all PA professors meet at the Annual Education Day to discuss changes to the programme and their implications. The overall structure of the programme has been in place since 2012.

As previously mentioned (2.1), the panel believes that the master's programme is an impressive and comprehensive programme with strong substantive courses that bind the programme together (see Appendix 6 for an overview of courses that the panel looked at in more detail). The panel also praised the strong inclusion of research methods in the courses. The programme is structured along three learning trajectories: core substantive courses, research courses and specialisation courses. These trajectories come together in the master's thesis project. Student evaluations show that students experience the various specialisations as coherent (though at the time of the site visit no data were yet available for the new specialisation Economics and Governance). The panel concludes that the programme uses a good variety of teaching methods, including new digital, interactive and experimental forms of teaching. However, the panel also thought that the logic for choosing a particular teaching method could be made more explicit, as could the overall educational philosophy of the programme.

The success rates of the programme are showing an upward trend. Of the cohort that started in 2014/2015, 35% of students finished the programme within one year. Two years prior, this was approximately 22%. The time-to-degree is also improving. For the 2013-2014 cohort the average study length was 2.0 years (74% of these students had obtained their degree after two years), for the 2015-2016 cohort this is 1.6 years (at the time of the site visit the success rate after two years was not yet known). Though improving, the panel notes that compared to other Dutch master's programmes in Public Administration, public administration master's students at Leiden take the longest to graduate. One way in which the programme wants to further improve the success rates is by organising thesis work in compulsory capstone projects. The programme expects that this will help streamline the individual supervision process for students and supervisors. The panel thinks that the capstone projects are a good initiative to improve the pass rates. In addition, it notes that there also seems to be a culture within the programme in which completion of the programme in one year is not necessarily the norm. It suggests that programme management could try to find ways to change this culture.

Master of Public Sector Management

This master's programme has two learning pathways: one related to knowledge and understanding and one to the development of academic and professional skills (academic writing, conducting research, analytical skills, reflective skills). Both comprise of a set of courses (core courses and track specific courses) that come together in the master's thesis project. Just as in the 'regular' master's



programme Public Administration, students can enter the programme twice a year. As a result, all core courses are offered two times each year. Courses are scheduled in the evenings.

From studying a number of core courses (Appendix 6) and from talking to the students, the panel concludes that the overall structure of the programme is clear and coherent. In the courses, the panel thinks that the MPS programme could offer a wider variety of teaching and learning methods, such as the new digital, interactive and experimental forms of teaching which feature in the master's course PA. Most courses are now a combination of lectures and group assignments.

As discussed during the site visit, the programme management is aware of this problem, and has already taken steps to increase the variety of teaching methods in the courses, for instance by letting students write and present a policy advice note, and introducing more digital means of teaching. This is work in progress that the panel applauds.

Finally, the panel discussed the workload of the programme in more detail during the site visit. The panel was surprised to discover that the MPS programme is a one-year full-time programme that is followed by a substantial number of students who combine the programme with a daytime job. In addition, they work on assignments. Throughout the interviews the panel asked how the workload of the programme is distributed. Students have three two-hour lectures a week, which leads to six contact hours. The rest of the study hours are allocated to working on assignments. Although most students experience a very high workload, this seems mostly related to the fact that students study in addition to their job and not to the workload of the programme itself. As mentioned above (Standard 2.1) the panel recommended making some courses more challenging, and suggested revising these courses by increasing the level of academic challenge and the workload so that the number of EC gives a more realistic estimate of the number of study hours.

Of the students who started in September 2015, 29% had obtained their degree after one year. The average pass rate after two years was 56% for the cohorts starting in 2012, 2013 and 2014, and the overall pass rate was 72%. In other words, a quarter of students who start the programme do not graduate. The programme management attributes the low study success to the fact that a high number of students combine the programme with a daytime job. As discussed during the site visit, the panel believes that it is important for the programme to formulate measures to improve the pass rates. The panel agrees with the MPS teachers that one of these measures should be a better structuring of the thesis trajectory and supervision process, in which students are assigned a supervisor at an early stage and have regular meetings with him/her.

2.7 Admission of students

Admission goals, admission policy and admission standards, including academic prerequisites, are in line with the mission and programme objectives. They are clearly and publicly stated, specifying any differences for categories of students.

The *bachelor's programme* admits students with a completed pre-university education (vwo) degree or a completed first year of higher professional education (hbo). To give students a clear picture of the programme, there are open days, experience days and a full day in which prospective students follow courses and receive information from students. After enrolment they fill in a 'matching' questionnaire. Should students doubt their study choice after that, then there is one last meeting in June (a 'Last Minute meeting') after which they can decide if the programme is right for them. The yearly intake is well above 200 students. In 2015/2016 228 students enrolled, in the previous two years intake numbers were above 260.

The *master's programme Public Administration* automatically admits students with an academic bachelor's degree in Public Administration. Students from abroad with a similar degree must submit a letter of motivation and have an IELTS test score of 7.0 (or TOEFL 100). All other students with a bachelor's degree in a related social science discipline or a completed public administration degree at a university of applied sciences (HBO) must first complete a pre-master's programme. In

2015/2016 111 students enrolled. This was an increase compared to the previous two years (69 and 104 students respectively). The proportion of international students is around 20% (2015-2016).

The admission requirements of the *master's programme Public Sector Management* state that the programme automatically admits students with a bachelor's degree in Public Administration or Political Science who are able to show that they are sufficiently motivated in a motivation letter. The panel was surprised to learn that not all student representatives that they spoke with had had to write such a motivation letter, possibly because this is a recent requirement. The admission procedure also states that the Board of Admissions may decide that applicants who do not meet the entry requirements can be admitted on the basis of academic capacity, previous education, professional experience and completed courses automatically or after a bridging programme (premaster). This premaster must be finished within one semester and without any retakes. In 2015/2016 68 students enrolled in the programme. This was a decrease from the previous year (82 students), probably due to stricter entry requirements. The programme has now taken measures to attract more students.

The panel concludes that the admission procedures for all three programmes are clearly defined. They match the learning objectives and missions of the programmes. The panel recommends the MPS programme to formulate its admission requirements more precisely and not to deviate from them on an individual basis, to prevent the suggestion of arbitrariness.

2.8 Intake

The structure, contents and the didactics of the programme are in line with the qualifications of the students that enter into the programme.

As described above, the *bachelor's programme* organises several matching activities in order to prepare high school students for the programme. After entering the programme, new students are then assigned a mentor who will keep a close track of study progress, and who will help the students make well-informed choices for their second and third year. The four didactic principles take account of the learning process that students go through, from building up knowledge and developing skills that are necessary to independently work on their bachelor's thesis. Students work on three courses at a time. In the view of the panel this helps them organise their work and manage their time effectively.

Students that enter one of the two master's programmes have already completed an academic bachelor's or similar degree, either in the Netherlands or abroad. Some of them will have finished one of the two premaster's programmes. From talking to the students, the panel concludes that the premaster does not completely solve the gap for students with a HBO-background, but that differences can quickly be resolved in the first months of the programme, mainly by students working hard and asking many questions. The panel also learned that for foreign students who are not yet accustomed to the Dutch study culture, the transition to the programme can be a big challenge. This apparently is especially the case for Asian students, who are less used to debating in class and can find it hard to join in. The panel was concerned that it might also be harder for foreign students to find an internship at, for instance, a Dutch Ministry, since it is of the opinion that there should be equal opportunities for all students (also see Standard 6). So the panel is pleased that the programme is offering an online databank with internships.

As described, the MPS programme is geared towards practitioners, but also admits motivated students without any work experience. From talking to the students, the panel concludes that students are enthusiastic about the student mix. They felt that they could learn from one another. Some students did think that students without a job had an advantage when carrying out assignments. Being able to do assignments in different organisations would give them a richer learning experience. The panel was more critical about mixing students with different backgrounds, as different groups of students may have different expectations of the programme. It shared this concern with the programme management. The programme management explained that the



professionals like debating, but that it can be hard to ensure that theories and concepts are integrated in these discussions, so that the debate is conducted according to a more scientific approach. From looking at the thesis trajectories and talking to graduates, programme management also believed, however, that they had achieved a lot. The panel appreciates the changes which have been made in the MPS programme, but also agrees that there is more progress to be made - not only by complying with the stricter admissions procedure, but possibly also by organising matching activities that give prospective students a clearer idea of the programme, revising courses, and deliberately mixing the two groups of students in working groups.

Finally, the panel asked how the general structure of the master's programmes, with two intake moments per year, influences the students' learning experience. Students who have entered the programme half a year earlier share their track specific courses with new students. The teachers were of the opinion that having both groups of students together works better than expected, because the students learned from each other. Some students said that it was relatively easy to see who the new students were, as new students tended to ask fewer questions in class. However, they also thought that new students soon caught up. Some students were more critical. They believed that in the current structure, coherence of the programme is sometimes compromised as certain 'introductory' courses (for instance the course 'Gedrag en interactie in publieke organisaties' in the SVA-track of the MPS programme) are offered in the last block for the second intake of students. The panel recommends investigating if students would recommend offering more courses twice to avoid this problem, and, if practically feasible, to accommodate these wishes.

The panel concludes that in general the structure, contents and didactics of the programmes match the students' qualifications. In the view of the panel, the introduction and matching activities in the bachelor's programme are appropriate ways of making sure that students know what is expected of them when they enter the programmes. The panel thinks that the master's programmes could also offer such matching activities, especially in the MPS programme where success rates are low.

2.9 Faculty qualifications

A substantial percentage of the professional faculty nucleus actively involved in the programme holds an earned doctorate or other equivalent terminal academic degree in their field. Any faculty lacking the terminal degree must have a record or sufficient professional or academic experience directly relevant to their assigned responsibilities. The field of expertise and experience of the faculty reflects the needed expertise to deliver the programme as intended. All faculty with teaching assignments have at least proven basic educational skills. The educational skills are adapted to the didactics of the programme and its components. Where practitioners teach courses, there is satisfactory evidence of the quality of their academic qualifications, professional experience and teaching ability.

The majority of course coordinators (in the master's programmes *all* coordinators) have a doctorate degree and are assistant, associate or full professors. Course coordinators are specialists in their field. All teachers delivering the courses have a University Teaching Qualification (BKO) or are in the process of acquiring such a qualification. Teachers must obtain their BKO qualification within two years after being appointed at Leiden University. To ensure the link between research and teaching, all teachers also have research time. The programmes have an elaborate system of calculating and managing the teaching load. For example, staff may not supervise more than 10 master theses per year. The student-staff ratio in the bachelor's programme is 1:31, that in the master's programme MPS is 1:17.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the teaching staff in all three programmes. Staff are clearly highly experienced researchers, and the panel values the link between research and teaching. The panel was surprised by the low involvement of full professors in the bachelor's programme, and learned that it has been a deliberate choice to let them focus on administrative tasks and supervising master's theses. The panel considers the low involvement of full professors in the programme disappointing. In the opinion of the panel consideration should be given to ways of increasing their

role in the programme, if only through their presence in some high profile activities such as master classes.

From talking to the students, the panel concludes that they are generally very satisfied with their teachers. They see them as very experienced in doing research and as having a good network, and thought that this gives them a good view of what students can do after studying. Students did comment that teaching skills between teachers vary, and that they often needed to adjust to new tutors. Students in the MPS programme were the most enthusiastic about their teachers. They thought staff were open and responsive, gave good feedback, and appreciated the informal contacts they were able to have with their lecturers.

Considerations

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The panel was impressed with the teaching-learning environment of the bachelor's programme Public Administration. It considered the programme to be coherently structured and comprehensive. Courses cover a wide range of subjects and theories from the field of public administration, governance, policymaking, politics, law, economics and management, as well as research methods and ethics. The panel appreciated that students can choose between two tracks and it also was enthusiastic about the high number of elective courses. The panel was pleased to see that the programme offers bachelor's students the possibility to follow a short or longer internship, though the number of students using this opportunity is relatively low.

The panel concluded that the programme uses an impressive variety of teaching methods that are closely linked to assessment. The teaching methods in the courses match the intended learning outcomes very well and cleverly integrate knowledge, theory, professional and academic skills. The fact that each course has a numeric code/level description also helps to ensure a good match between the course objectives and the overall goals of the programme. The programme is structured in a logical manner that trains students to work increasingly independent, thus preparing them well for a master's programme.

The panel was satisfied with the quality of the teaching staff in the programme and valued the link between research and teaching. However, the fact that few full professors are involved in the programme surprised the panel and it thinks that consideration should be given to ways of increasing their role, if only through their presence in some high profile activities such as master classes.

Master's programme Public Administration

The master's programme has a strong set of substantive courses that bind the programme together. The panel was positive about the explicit attention to reflective skills and the strong inclusion of research methods. The panel concluded that the three specialisation tracks in the master's programme are solid public administration tracks, with a strong set of courses for each track. Each specialisation track has its own coordinator. Coordinators regularly meet to ensure coherence of the overall programme.

The panel praises the rich variety of teaching methods, including new digital, interactive and experimental forms of teaching. In some cases the logic for choosing a particular teaching method could be made more explicit, as could the overall educational philosophy of the programme.

Though improving, the panel noted that compared to other Dutch master's programmes in Public Administration, public administration master's students at Leiden take the longest to graduate. The panel believes that introducing capstone projects is a good initiative to improve the pass rates. In the view of the panel the teachers delivering the programme are highly experienced researchers.



Master's programme Public Sector Management

The master's programme Public Sector Management weaves joint courses, track-related courses and the master's thesis into a logical and coherent structure. The joint courses provide students with general knowledge and track-specific courses deal with one of the two specialisations. The panel was enthusiastic about the Public Affairs track and considered it to be unique in the Netherlands.

The panel had concerns about how the intended learning outcomes had been translated into the course objectives, as well as the way in which master's level research methods and skills had been integrated in the curriculum. The panel felt that the course objectives did not clearly describe the master's level of the courses. As the programme's intended learning outcomes are adequate (Standard 1) and are shown to be achieved by the graduates (Standard 4), and the literature for the courses is appropriate, the panel concludes that the programme is ultimately successful in reaching a master's level. It however recommends the programme to reformulate its course objectives in a more challenging way, in line with the academic level it aims for in the intended learning outcomes. It also advises a rebalancing of the focus between academic skills and professional content in favour of academic skills. This could for instance be achieved by structuring a separate academic skills learning pathway in the curriculum.

The panel thinks there is room in terms of workload to expand existing courses in order to increase the level of academic content and challenge. Also, the programme could consider steering the expectations of students entering the programme to better prepare them for an academic master's level curriculum. In this process, programme management should also consider if courses are offered in the right place in the curriculum for both the September and February group. Based on the interviews throughout the site visit, the panel is confident that the programme management is aware of most of these issues, and will take appropriate action. The panel is satisfied with the quality of teaching in the programme, and appreciates that students in the MPS programme are very enthusiastic about their teachers.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'good'.

Master's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'good'.

Master's programme Public Sector Management: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 3: Assessment

The programme has an adequate assessment system in place. The tests and assessments are valid, reliable and transparent to the students. The programme's examining board safeguards the quality of the interim and final tests administered.

Findings

To assess the quality, validity and transparency of assessment within the three programmes, the panel looked at the assessment policies of the programmes, the assessment of the theses and the functioning of the Examination Board responsible for all three programmes.

Assessment policy

Each of the three programme's assessment policies is formalised in the Course and Examination Regulations (in Dutch: OER), the Board of Examiners' Rules and Regulations and the Assessment Plan. The Assessment Plan links the intended learning outcomes of the courses to course assessment and to the overall goals of the programmes. The general policy towards assessment and testing is that each degree programme should have a diversity of assessment methods, not only spread over the courses, but also within courses. Assessment methods are steered by the course objectives. For example, knowledge is often assessed through written exams, applying knowledge through papers and professional skills in case work and interactive seminars. All compulsory courses in the curricula have at least two assessments. Often used assessment methods across the programmes are written exams, essays, research papers, peer review, weekly assignments, and presentations. At the

beginning of every year, the methods of assessment for every course are communicated to the students in an electronic study guide (e-Prospectus).

The panel has studied the assessment plans and concludes that these are very helpful tools to ensure that assessment methods are diverse and that assessment ties in well with both the course objectives and the overall goals of the programmes. The panel did note that, though the number of assessments has increased in the MPS programme, this programme seems to have significantly less variation in assessment than the master's programme Public Administration. MPS students mainly write many short papers individually (for instance a reflection paper, a policy brief, a small-scale empirical research paper) and assignments are not very strongly geared towards assessing academic skills. From paying more attention to academic skills in the courses, as the panel strongly suggests (see 2.1 and 2.6), academic skills should also receive more attention in assessment. The panel recommends increasing the diversity of assessment in this programme, for instance by assessing students on presentations, as this was one aspect that graduates had missed in the programme.

Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners is responsible for all Public Administration programmes at Leiden University. It consists of five members: two members from the Institute of Public Administration, one member from the Institute for Security and Global Affairs, one member from the Law Faculty and one external member from the Department of Political Science. An official secretary supports the Board of Examiners. The Board meets every month; the external member attends one meeting per year. The self-evaluation report describes how the Board of Examiners has a key role in safeguarding the quality, transparency and integrity of the examination process. Following the recommendations of the Midterm Review Committee (2014), the Board has developed a strategic plan with six core tasks: (1) safeguarding the quality of tests and exams, (2) providing guidelines and instructions for setting assessments (including thesis assessment) and grading, (3) appointing examiners, (4) preventing fraud and plagiarism, (5) documenting exams and students' work, and (6) communicating the assessment criteria to students and staff.

From talking to the Board of Examiners, the panel concludes that within a short period of time the Board has greatly improved the assessment process. The Board said that it was now able to show the added value of the new approach and get more positive response to what it is doing. Colleagues recognise how new procedures decrease rather than increase the workload. When asked by the panel, the Board said it felt sufficiently supported by the Faculty administration - it very much appreciates its secretary, provided by the Faculty. However, the amount of time reserved for Board of Examiners' related activities remains on the low side.

The panel was very impressed with the changes that the Board of Examiners has made: introducing two assessments per course, increasing the overall diversity of assessment, monitoring the quality of all written exams before and after they are held, and introducing what the panel thinks is an excellent thesis assessment protocol (see below). In the view of the panel, the Board of Examiners has strict rules that are clearly set out. According to these rules, new and junior teachers without a teaching qualification may not set exams independently and all examiners receive a short memo reminding them of their responsibilities.

Thesis assessment

The assessment procedure for the bachelor's and master's theses has been revised after the Midterm review (see 5.1) to enhance transparency and uniformity of grading. An important instrument in this process is a standardised form for thesis assessment (the programmes call it a grade form) which has been in use since 2016 and contains the various criteria on which thesis assessment should be based, including research question, research design, theory, analysis, students' independence and writing style/quality of argumentation. The form also contains a blank page for 'grade justification' where supervisors have to explain the thought process underpinning the evaluation. Supervisors are based at the Institute of Public Administration or (for the bachelor's thesis) at the Economics department of Leiden Law School.



After students have submitted the final draft of their thesis, the first supervisor checks the thesis for plagiarism, and then sends it on to the second supervisor. Because there is limited time between the first opportunity and the retake, the bachelor's thesis is sent to both supervisors at the same time by a bachelor's project coordinator. If necessary, bachelor's students are allowed to adopt both supervisors' comments into the thesis for the retake. The master's thesis is only sent to the second supervisor if the primary supervisor grades it at least as 6.0 (on a ten point scale). A third reader is involved if one of the supervisors grades the thesis as insufficient or if first and second supervisors' grades differ more than one point. First and second supervisor both fill in assessment forms independently and have to give written feedback. Master's students defend their thesis and receive their grade afterwards.

From talking to the Board of Examiners and the teachers, the panel understood that thesis quality control goes further than having new assessment forms. The teachers said they recognise having new forms is not necessarily sufficient. Together with the Board of Examiners they have started organising annual peer review sessions, 'norming sessions', where eight to ten thesis supervisors meet to discuss a random sample of theses. In the first year they only looked at master's theses, but they now also include bachelor's theses. The norming sessions are not just held to see if theses are graded correctly, but also to discuss if assessment forms are used in a consistent way. The panel praises these 'thesis carousels'. At the time of the site visit, the thesis carousel process had not yet been introduced into the MPS programme. The panel strongly encourages this programme to also organise some structured way of checking the quality of thesis assessment.

The panel is very impressed with the process of thesis quality assurance and considers this good practice. The independence of both supervisors is safeguarded by asking them to fill in forms independently. The panel notes that recording substantial written feedback not only gives insight in how the final grade was established, but also makes it possible to see if any patterns arise that hint at particular strengths and weaknesses of the programmes. The panel noted that currently, students do not get to see the feedback form but only receive oral feedback, and points out that students could also benefit from receiving a copy of the assessment forms.

The panel is pleased with the current approach to assessment, and thinks it is a major improvement over the old situation. In the sample of bachelor's and master's theses that the panel studied, the old feedback forms made it hard to see how the final grade had been arrived at (see section 4). And from talking to students and graduates and looking at student evaluations, the panel learned that, particularly in the master's programme Crisis and Security Management (until recently offered by the Institute of Public Administration, and described in a separate report) and the MPS programme, some students have previously perceived a serious lack of transparency in the grading process of the theses and felt that the level of feedback depended a lot on the supervisor with whom they were matched. The panel is pleased to hear that the process has been so successfully altered to address these issues.

Considerations

The programmes have an impressive assessment system in place. The panel is enthusiastic about the changes that the Board of Examiners has made to assessment in the programmes and quality control. As a result, the programmes now have an assessment plan which links assessment to learning objectives, all courses have two assessments, the overall diversity of assessment has increased, the quality of all written exams is monitored before and after exams are held, and finally, the thesis assessment trajectory has improved greatly and is now very good. So is the quality assurance of testing. The panel recommends the MPS programme to increase the variety of assessment methods, to introduce a thesis carousel process for quality assurance, and, in line with the recommendations in Standard 2, to pay more attention to the assessment of academic skills.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'good'.

Master's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'good'.

Master's programme Public Sector Management: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved. The level achieved is demonstrated by interim and final tests, final projects and the performance of graduates in actual practice or in post-graduate programmes.

Findings

The panel studied a sample of theses for each programme, and interviewed several alumni in order to assess whether the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

From studying the theses, the panel concludes that the quality of both bachelor's theses and master's theses is adequate. In some of the theses, the strong conceptual framework that had been used and the thorough empirical data collection particularly impressed the panel. The panel establishes that students have achieved the intended learning outcomes.

On the basis of the sample that they read, the panel concludes that the bachelor's theses had a clear structure, and show sufficient attention to theory and methodology (operationalisation of the research question), thereby indicating that all elements of a thesis are addressed in the methodological training. The sample of master's theses showed that students are encouraged to conform to a model of thesis writing in which they set out the dependent and independent variables, concepts, project description and indicators in a methodology chapter. In the view of the panel, this is generally good practice, though it might not fit all topics equally well. The panel noted that a downside of this approach is, that it leads to rather a lot of repetition in each thesis, as these elements are set out at the beginning, the middle and the end. In general, the panel accepted the grading of the theses in the sample they read, though in some case the panel would have graded the thesis slightly higher (8.5 instead of 8) or lower (5.5 instead of 6) than the supervisors, which the panel considers to be an acceptable level of divergence.

According to the data provided, graduates from the *bachelor's programme* mostly choose to stay at Leiden University (54% of students in 2015). Most of them continue their studies in the master's programme Public Administration (41% of graduates in 2015). The most popular master's programmes after that are Crisis and Security Management, and Public Sector Management (MPS). Graduates generally perform well in these programmes, which can be seen as proof that they have achieved the intended learning outcomes.

Graduates from the two master's programmes usually find a job within two years. After the master's programme Public Administration 74% of graduates manage to find a position within six months and 89% within a year. 73% of MPS graduates find a job within three months, and 90% within a year (practitioners who followed the programme alongside a job are not included in these numbers). The results show that graduates generally have no difficulties in finding a job, though for a minority it might take up to two years to find a position. Most graduates from the master's programme *Public Administration* work for a private company (29%) or the government (27%). A substantial number (18%) also find their first job at a research institute, which the panel sees as proof of the research focus of this programme. The numbers for the MPS graduates are that 35% work for the government and 33% for a municipality, followed by the private sector (21%) and other sectors: education (12%), police and defence (11%), consultancy (11%), et cetera.

The alumni to whom the panel talked felt that their programmes had a unique approach to policy by teaching students not only to look from the inside out and understanding the organisational view, but also from the outside in and to connect with other organisations in other places in the world.



Because of this approach they had a broader view of how organisations work in a political context. They also felt well prepared to plan their work efficiently. The panel concludes that the programmes are successful in adequately preparing students for a master's programme and for the professional field. This is seen as proof that the intended learning outcomes have indeed been achieved.

Considerations

The panel concludes that students of all three programmes have achieved the intended learning outcomes. Bachelor's theses have a clear structure, and show sufficient attention for theory and methodology. Master's theses testify that students pay a lot of attention to methodology. The panel sees this as good practice, but also points out that a mechanical use of a thesis model might lead to too much repetition. Both master's programmes have creditable employability figures. Approximately 75% of students find a job within half a year after graduation, and close to 90% within a year. Most of them find a job in the public sector.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Sector Management: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 5: External input

The content of a curriculum and the means of communication and teaching change over time. Flexibility, and the ability to innovate on the basis of adequate information on governance and teaching skills are important features of any educational programme, in order to meet the need of the students and the teaching staff. The programme provides evidence of an adequate process of curriculum development in which all relevant stakeholders are involved.

Findings

5.1 Curriculum development

The programme innovates itself, and uses measures of quality in this process, such as summaries of course evaluations, exit interviews, graduate surveys and related information.

All three programmes have embedded curriculum development in a yearly quality cycle. Important moments in this cycle are November, when the three Programme Directors write an annual report based on the programmes' statistics (intake, student satisfaction, study success, et cetera), and February, when the preparations for the next academic year start. The annual reports are discussed with the Programme Committees (one for the bachelor's programme and one for both master's programmes), the Institute Board and Faculty Board.

All programmes are regularly evaluated at three levels: micro-level (course evaluations), meso-level (connections between courses) and macro-level (curriculum as a whole). Students evaluate all individual courses and their reviews go to the two Programme Committees. In addition to course evaluations, the bachelor's programme organises end-of-year programme evaluations for students to reflect on the curriculum. The master's programmes do this twice a year. Finally, all three programmes encourage students to take part in the National Student Survey (Nationale Studenten Enquête, NSE).

During the site visit, the panel spoke to both Programme Committees. Each committee consists of three students and three staff members. The Programme Committees have an advisory role for the Course and Examinations Regulations and the annual reports, and they organise individual course evaluations. The bachelor's Programme Committee said they were satisfied with the response rate to course evaluations: almost all students fill them in. The bachelor's student members discuss issues that arise in the Programme Committee on WhatsApp and report the responses back to the rest of the Committee. The master's Programme Committee said that the evaluation forms are a great help to get a good overview of possible problems in the curriculum. For more specific matters, they talk

to students individually. This Programme Committee allocates courses to individual members of the Programme Committee who then take action if a course receives a very low score in student evaluations. The Committee explained that teachers sometimes also directly approached them for feedback. Both Programme Committees report their findings to the three Programme Directors who discuss the results with the course coordinators. The self-evaluations also report that it remains a challenge to inform students about changes that are the result of course evaluations. The panel suggests incorporating students' feedback in the course manuals.

The panel concludes that the two Programme Committees are functioning well as part of the quality control chain. Student members are elected and are properly involved in the committees. The panel was impressed to learn that the student association B.I.L. also independently assesses courses and publishes the results with responses from the course coordinators.

Recent changes to the programmes are, as outlined above, a restructuring of the thesis trajectory (including thesis assessment), changes to assessment in general (introducing assessment plans, two assessments per course, increasing the variety of assessment, and so forth). Other changes in the bachelor's programme are an increase of the number of contact hours to at least 12, the introduction of an Honours track in 2013/2014, an expansion of the first year mentorship programme to the second year and an improvement of the information provision to prospective students. Recent changes to the master's programmes, other than assessment, are a reformulation of the intended learning outcomes to better match the Dublin descriptors and domain-specific requirements and a redesign of the course structure and teaching methods in line with the revised learning outcomes. As mentioned above, the panel was impressed with the intended learning outcomes, the coherence of the curriculum structure, the teaching methods and with assessment in general. It concludes that the programmes take curriculum development seriously and constantly improve the curricula where necessary.

The Institute of Public Administration has an Advisory Council ('Raad van Advies'), which offers advice on educational matters. The self-evaluation reports state that the involvement of the Council in curriculum review could be more pronounced. In addition, the master's reports explain that they also receive external input from the professional field 'through expert meetings and researcher-practice interactions'. Finally, the master's programmes clarify that they want to start organising periodic meetings with alumni (the MPS programme has already started doing so), guest lecturers and other external stakeholders to further strengthen their input for the development of the curriculum. The panel applauds these initiatives, and believes that external stakeholders can provide valuable insights into curriculum development. The panel believes that the current contribution of the professional field to the master's programmes is already very good.

5.2 External reviews

The programme provides evidence that the recommendations received during previous reviews (by NVAO, EAPAA or any other (inter)national review body) have led to changes in the content or the organisation of the programme.

In the past six years the programmes have been reviewed twice. Comments from the degree assessment by NVAO-EAPAA have been adopted (2011), as well as those from the six-yearly Midterm Review (2014). The panel praises the programmes' initiative of undertaking a midterm review. The changes that were made are outlined above (5.1). These all followed from the Midterm Review. The Midterm Review committee also recommended developing a clear vision on education and teaching. As described in sections 1 and 2.6, though the programmes are clearly and coherently structured and contain multiple learning paths, this panel is again of the opinion that the programmes could describe their underlying didactic philosophy in a clearer way.

Considerations

All three programmes have an adequate system of quality assurance in place. Course and curriculum evaluations lead to continuous improvements to the programmes at the level of the courses, the



connections between courses and the programme as a whole. The programme reviews of 2011 and 2014 have been taken seriously and have led to numerous changes, most clearly the professionalisation of the Board of Examiners and the procedures associated with the theses. The panel is enthusiastic about the plans to include the Advisory Board, professional field and alumni in curriculum and programme evaluation and believes that these external stakeholders can provide useful insights into strengths and weaknesses of the programmes.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 5 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 5 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Sector Management: the panel assesses Standard 5 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 6: Diversity

Diversity among staff and students is one of the aims of the programme.

Findings

The panel has looked at the diversity of staff and students in terms of gender and nationality/ethnic background. According to the self-evaluation report, Leiden University sees diversity among staff and students and the inclusion of underrepresented groups 'as a cornerstone for study success and an inspiring learning environment'.

From 2012 onwards, more male than female students have enrolled in the *bachelor's programme Public Administration* and the *master's programme Public Sector Management*. The balance is roughly 60% male and 40% female. The *master's programme Public Administration* shows more equal numbers; here the division is roughly fifty-fifty. At the level of Faculty teachers (assistant professors or higher), the percentage of female and male staff is 23%-77% in the bachelor's programme, and approximately 30%-70% in both master's programmes. The panel concludes that, especially in the bachelor's programme, gender diversity at staff level is not complete and needs readdressing.

The *bachelor's programme Public Administration* and the *master's programme Public Sector Management* are Dutch taught programmes. Hence, the number of international students is small. The bachelor's students did note that the programme focuses on Dutch policies and that most students are white. They felt that, to increase diversity, the programme could pay more attention to social problems of minority groups. In the *master's programme Public Administration*, approximately 35% of staff and 20% of students come from abroad, mostly from other European countries. In the view of the panel, this is in line with the international character and the intended learning outcomes of this programme. In the self-evaluation report, the programme explains that it is a challenge to make international students feel part of the Leiden community. They see three reasons for this: the language barrier, the fact that students are in the Netherlands for a period of one year only and the fact that the programme starts twice a year so that social groups have already formed when new students enter the programme (of course, this also applies to Dutch students who enter with the second intake). One of the programmes' strategies to increase the feeling of a community among staff and students is to encourage staff to take part in two courses of the BKO-programme (the University's Teaching Qualification programme) on 'Intercultural communication' and 'Teaching in the International Classroom', and to host special social events for new students. The programme is also considering a 'buddy system' between students of the February and September cohorts. The panel believes that all students should feel properly included. For this reason, it is positive about the programme's strategies and plans to make international students feel more part of the programme.

Considerations

All three programmes aim for an equal division between men and women at staff and student level. The panel concludes that the number of male and female students is more or less balanced. At staff level, gender balance is less complete and the panel thinks that this imbalance needs further attention. Regarding internationalisation, the panel considers equal opportunities for students from

different backgrounds important. It is content to see that the master's programme *Public Administration* has taken steps to better include international students and students from different cohorts in the programme and in the University.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 6 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Administration: the panel assesses Standard 6 as 'satisfactory'.

Master's programme Public Sector Management: the panel assesses Standard 6 as 'satisfactory'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

For the bachelor's and master's programme Public Administration, the panel assesses Standard 1, 4, 5 and 6 as 'satisfactory' and Standard 2 and 3 as 'good'. For the master's programme Public Sector Management, the panel assesses all six standards as 'satisfactory'.

According to the decision rules of NVAO's Framework for limited programme assessments applied to Standard 1 to 4, the panel assesses:

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme Public Administration* as 'satisfactory'.

The panel assesses the *master's programme Public Administration* as 'satisfactory'.

The panel assesses the *master's programme Public Sector Management* as 'satisfactory'.

APPENDICES

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

Prof. dr. T. (Tony) Bovaird (chair) is emeritus professor of the University of Birmingham (United Kingdom). He has previously worked at Aston Business School and Bristol Business School. From 2012 he has held a visiting chair in Meiji University (Japan) and has been visiting professor at various universities and business schools in the UK and abroad, such as the University of Bern, University of Barcelona, the University of Minho (Portugal) and the University of Brasila. His research covers strategic management of public services, performance measurement in public agencies, evaluation of public management and governance reforms, and user and community co-production of public services. He has carried out research and has been involved in projects for, amongst others, the European Commission, several UK government departments and the Welsh Government. He is on the Governing Council of Local Areas Research and Intelligence Association (LARIA) and has been a member of the Strategy Board of the UK Research Councils' Local Government Initiative (LARCI) and the Local Government Reference Panel of the National Audit Office. He has given keynote speeches for several (inter)national annual conferences. Professor Bovaird is a member of the Editorial Board of the *International Public Management Journal* and co-author of *Public Management and Governance*. Professor Bovaird is a member of the Scientific Advisory Board of the German Institute for Public Administration Research and a non-executive director of Governance International.

Prof. dr. H.M.C. (Harrie) Eijkelhof studied experimental physics at Leiden University. He taught physics, agricultural science and general science at secondary schools in Amsterdam, Senanga (Zambia) and Leiden and has been in charge of six national curriculum projects in physics and science education. At the international level he participated in science education projects in Portugal (Ciencia Viva), Israel, Tanzania and Ghana, and in the projects Science Across the World and PRIMAS. At Utrecht University he has been head of the Science and Mathematics Teacher Training Department, in charge of bachelor's and master's programmes in Physics and Astronomy and vice-dean bachelor education of the Faculty of Science. Between 1997 and 2011 he was professor of Physics Education and after his retirement between 2011 and 2014 director of the Freudenthal Institute for Science and Mathematics Education. Currently he is involved in various curriculum, professional development and quality assurance programmes. His research publications focus a.o. on concepts of ionizing radiation, curriculum development and PISA results.

Prof. dr. Adrian Ritz (vice-chair) is professor for Public Management at the interdisciplinary centre for public management at the University of Bern in Switzerland where he teaches at the Faculty of Social Sciences and at the Faculty of Law. He is the delegate of the University Board of Directors for further education and the president of the university commission for further education. Furthermore, Ritz is the managing director of the Executive Master of Public Administration (MPA) and the Certificate of Advanced Studies in Public Management and Policy (CeMap) at the University of Bern. Adrian Ritz worked as research scholar at the University of Georgia, School of Public and International Affairs, Department of Public Administration and Policy, in Athens GA USA, and at Indiana University, School for Public and Environmental Affairs, in Bloomington IN USA. He is a member of the Accreditation Committee of the European Association for Public Administration Accreditation (EAPAA). Currently, Ritz serves as President of the Scientific Commission for Public, Non-profit, and Health Management (WK ÖBWL) of the German Academic Association for Business Research (VHB). Ritz is editorial board member of the *International Review of Administrative Sciences* (IRAS) and his research has been published in all major Public Administration journals. His activities in consulting and applied research for public institutions take place at all federal levels of Switzerland.

Drs. Cees Vermeer studied Law and Public Administration at Leiden University and has a special interest in connecting tasks, people and results and combining system reality with life reality; all to the benefit of the development of organisations. He is and has been active in several different organisations in the public domain: he has worked as corporate director of the city of Leiden (2007-2010), director of The Netherlands Court of Audit (2000-2006); has been a member of the managing



board of Rijkswaterstaat (part of the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, 1995-2000); and has been director of personnel management at the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport (1993-1995). Since 2015 he works as the town clerk for the city of Breda, and previously fulfilled this role at the city of Zaanstad (2010-2015).

Prof. dr. Esther Versluis is professor of European Regulatory Governance at Maastricht University. She obtained her PhD in 2003 from Utrecht University and was awarded the Van Poelje prize for best PhD dissertation in the field of public administration for her dissertation on 'Enforcement Matters. Enforcement and Compliance of European Directives in Four Member States'. Since 2001 she is involved with education at Maastricht University, first as lecturer, as assistant professor and since 2015 as professor. She was member and chair of the Faculty Council and chair of the Graduate Program Committee Arts & Culture. Until 2014 she was director of Studies master's programme European Public Affairs and is currently director of Studies of the bachelor's programme European Studies. In 2015 she was awarded the Best PhD supervisor of the year-award by the Netherlands Institute of Government. Professor Versluis' research concentrates on problems and complexities related to European regulatory governance. She is an active member of the Netherlands Institute of Government (NIG), the European Consortium for Political Research (ECPR), the European Union Studies Association (EUSA) and the University Association for Contemporary European Studies (UACES).

Sophie van Wijngaarden is master's student of the programme SEPAM (MSc Systems Engineering, Policy Analysis and Management) at the Delft University of Technology. She obtained her BSc Technische Bestuurskunde also at the Delft University of Technology. Her research focuses on transport and logistics. From 2015 to 2017 she was an active member and treasurer for the Study association S.V.T.B. Curius, and vice-president of the 1-2-STARTUP Weekend Committee 2016 for the organization YES!Delft Students in Delft.

APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

Domain-specific requirements Public Administration, Public Governance, and Governance and Organization (PAGO) Programmes, 2010

Introduction

The study of public administration has developed and expanded into a broad interdisciplinary body of knowledge, which tackles a variety of themes and practices on public administration, governance and organization (PAGO). The academic community in the Netherlands acknowledges that throughout the years this field has widened and now includes not only public administration but also governance and organization. This entails a diversity of approaches on the one hand, but on the other, the conviction that these approaches are connected and interrelated and worthwhile to keep together. Programmes may share basic components, but also may differ to express their specialisation in this broadened field. This parallels developments in the profession. Alumni are increasingly challenged in a wide variety of fields that put varying demands regarding professional knowledge, skills and attitudes. In this frame of reference we will address this field as the PAGO-field: including public administration, public governance, and governance and organization.

In this domain-specific frame of reference we start with a brief summary regarding the development of the PAGO-field and argue that the broadening of the field is due to various exogenous and endogenous changes. Accordingly we will outline the programme principles of PAGO-studies as well as related learning outcomes.

Developments

The societal impact of processes like globalization, individualization and ICT has altered the nature of public problems. Issues like risk and security, environment and ecology, economics and welfare, and nationality and culture are high on the societal and political agenda. The impact of such problems has consequences for the abilities of (national) governments. It challenges them to reach beyond traditional approaches. This has led to manifold changes in political and administrative landscapes. New expectations and demands are expressed towards politics and administration, including moral standards. New criteria for performance have emerged that aim at 'value for money', new businesslike concepts of management, and reformed public service delivery. There have been new interpretations of democracy and accountability, and of relations between state, civil society and the market.

Government and public administration not only changed its own practices, it also changed its relationship with society. Public administration thus moved towards governance, i.e. dealing with public problems through dispersed networks of organizations and actors, including social institutions, non-governmental organizations (NGO's), and private companies. Government and public policy are still relevant, but new outlooks and mechanisms are designed and used to make things work.

These developments have also changed the field of study of PA. Scholars started to use new concepts to understand developments, broadening categories such as 'government-governance', and crossing boundaries between the public and private world. These concepts include focused attention to issues like interdependence, ambiguity, networks, contextuality, governance, and the role of institutions, trust and integrity. These developments invited researchers to cross disciplinary borders and take aboard theories, concepts, methods and ideas, from organization studies (structure, culture, management, strategy, networks, et cetera) as well as other bodies of knowledge (new fields within economics, political science and sociology, communication theory, ethics and philosophy, geography, international relations and law, et cetera).

Another issue that needs to be highlighted is that the study of Public Administration in the Netherlands includes several fields that elsewhere are situated in political science. The PAGO-studies not only focus on classical PA issues, but also on public organization and management issues, as well as on subfields like 'public policy', 'policy making', 'public governance', 'public culture and ethics'.



Scholars of these issues are part of the broad 'PA' community, in research as well as in educational programmes.

Resulting Fields of Study

This PAGO-community consists of three fields of study. The first embodies the classical features of the discipline, concentrating on politics, administration and the public sector. Public administration often started within the context of (departments of) politics and/or law, with an emphasis on the study of government and bureaucracy as well as public policy-making and implementation.

The second emerged through the fact that public interests and public problems are increasingly tackled by a multitude of public and private actors. It broadened the scope of study to include nongovernmental actors, as part of the often complex public-private, multi-actor networks that deal with collective and public interests.

The third field focuses on questions of governance and organization that surpass the traditional public-private boundaries. It includes the study of private actors in social contexts. This orientation links the worlds of business administration and public administration and pays attention to what we know about management, strategy and behaviour in corporations. This approach can be labelled as 'governance and organization'.

PAGO today is a broad multi- and interdisciplinary field of science. The classical core disciplines of political science, law, sociology and economics are important, and there is an increasing involvement of disciplines that focus on organization, culture, and communication. Also, challenging new interchanges with bodies of knowledge in (for example) social and organizational psychology, planning studies and geography, philosophy and ethics and history have demonstrated added value.

The PAGO-community acknowledges that there are different views regarding object and focus of the field of study. For instance: is PAGO about knowledge by description, explanation and prediction, or is evaluation and improvement the prime goal? Or, how do we relate to and communicate with practitioners in public (and private) administration, governance and organization? Rather than excluding certain views, the PAGO-community welcomes a variety in approaches, ideas and outlook. This variety is also visible in the PAGO-programmes.

Defining programme principles

PAGO-programmes are academic programmes aiming at the development of academic knowledge, skills and attitude in students that are relevant for understanding public administration, governance and organization. They pay particular attention to social and political contexts and developments, relevant (interdisciplinary) bodies of knowledge, aim at developing research capacities, and contribute to working professionally in public and private domains. In this frame of reference we have listed elements that are to be seen as building blocks for academic programmes. As far as knowledge is concerned, contemporary programmes encompass various disciplinary views supporting the PAGO-domain, and various sorts of domain-specific knowledge. As far as skills are concerned, they encompass skills for applying and reflecting on scientific methods and approaches, integrating knowledge and skills for working in public domains/organizations. As far as attitude is concerned, it encompasses critical stances and moral stature. Each of these subfields is briefly elaborated in order to circumscribe specific learning outcomes at Bachelor and Master levels (see next paragraph).

Knowledge

Knowledge of society and changing contexts

Activities in public domains influence, are influenced by, and interact with social systems and developments. On the one hand, they constrain public sectors, as they reproduce values, traditions and culture(s). On the other hand, they call for public action; (new) facts, events and problems, fuelled by new technologies, pose new challenges. PAGO-programmes enhance understandings of

social structures and behaviours, societal trends and changes. This calls for an awareness of political, sociological, cultural, historical, philosophical, ethical, economic and judicial contexts.

Knowledge of political and administrative systems

The organization, processes and activities in public domains are shaped by and within political systems. PAGO-programmes should devote attention to the institutions, structure, organization and activities of such political systems, at different levels (local, regional, national, transnational). PAGO-programmes encompass political and social theories, including those regarding legitimacy and the democratic design and functioning of organizations in public domains. They also pay attention to the application of these theories in everyday practice.

Knowledge of (public) policy, decision making and implementation

Governance for societal problems includes many insights derived from various bodies of knowledge, ranging from high-level decision-making to everyday service delivery. PAGO-programmes address both classic and contemporary theories, methods and techniques of policy-making, management, decision-making, and their implementation in everyday practice.

Knowledge of organizations and organizing principles

Public domains entail a variety of organizations, some organized as classical government bodies, some as between the public and private sectors, while others have been influenced by and/or have taken on the characteristics of private organizations. There is a growing awareness that policies and service delivery must be organized and require well-trained and motivated professionals. This leads to a more explicit emphasis on organizational studies. PAGO programmes entail knowledge of organizational concepts/perspectives on organizing, domains of managerial activities, insights in organizational change and management tools.

Knowledge of governance and networks

The powers and authorities to intervene have become less governmental and more distributed. Due to organizational fragmentation, the rise of network relations, and the spread of (normative) governance models – e.g., 'joined up government', 'public-private partnerships', and 'corporate social responsibility' (CSR) – multiple parties have become active in dealing with public problems and representing public interests. PAGO-programmes pay attention to new relations and new governance regimes, having both theoretical and empirical consequences.

Skills

Research skills

The role of knowledge in (public) policies and organizations is crucial for its effectiveness, especially for understanding the complexity of contexts, structures, outcomes and behaviours. PAGO-programmes include methods of quantitative and qualitative social-scientific research to analyse and also emphasise a clear understanding of contextual aspects.

Integrative skills

Public domains can be analysed from different angles; theories are grounded in various disciplines. The quality of research and capacities of civil servants and other functionaries in public domains depend on integrative skills, i.e. abilities to combine, integrate and apply different bodies of knowledge. PAGO-programmes devote attention to and provide opportunities to practice integrative skills.

Cooperation and communication skills

The functioning of the public domain largely depends on the skills of actors to exchange ideas, to negotiate when necessary, and to cooperate in constructive ways. Civil servants and other functionaries use a repertoire of skills and attitudes to communicate ideas to audiences of experts as well as laymen. Cooperation is at the heart of PAGO and includes a sense of responsibility and leadership. PAGO-programmes devote attention to and provide opportunities to practice cooperative and communicative skills.



Attitude

Critical stances

PAGO programmes are academic programmes that not only facilitate cognitive learning and skill development, they also develop critical powers. Students are taught how to critically analyze arguments used by others, how to relate 'fashionable' statements, e.g. by politicians, to more traditional as well as to scientific insights, and how to reflect upon political and normative implications of policy choices and organizational design. PAGO-programmes devote attention to the development of a constructive, critical attitude.

Moral stature and professionalism

The eloquence and credibility of PAGO has two features. First is its ability to approach societal problems in effective ways, but second is the degree to which government and governance principles serves as a moral compass. PAGO-programmes train students in this respect for occupying positions in governance regimes (public and private), they also train students in developing appropriate or 'professional' conduct. This is a matter of guarding values, such as accountability and integrity, and of practicing values, such as entrepreneurship and innovation.

Academic learning outcomes for PAGO studies

The broad fields identified and circumscribed in the above are to be seen as programme criteria and, thus, as the building blocks of a programme. Each programme will emphasize a specific selection of these building blocks to impose specific learning outcomes on students. In the table below we list such learning outcomes. This is a generic list, both applicable for bachelor and master's programmes.

The difference between both studies is in the degree of complexity; in the level of analysis; and in the independence of the student. Here we follow the distinctions made in the so-called Dublin descriptors. In this system a distinction is made between first cycle learning for bachelors and second cycle learning for masters. First cycle learning involves an introduction to the field of study. It aims at the acquisition and understanding of knowledge, ideas, methods and theories, elementary research activities, and basic skills regarding communication and learning competences. At second cycle learning we find a deeper understanding of knowledge; problem solving skills are developed for new and unexpected environments and broader contexts. Here students can apply knowledge in various environments. At the master level we also expect a well-developed level of autonomy regarding the direction and choices in a study.

In generic bachelor PAGO-programmes most of the learning outcomes will apply that are listed below. Master's programmes, however, usually have a much stronger thematic focus and may especially focus on a particular set of these learning outcomes that are best suited for that specialisation, but not covering all the learning outcomes listed below. We propose that the learning outcomes for the bachelor level, apply for the master level in the sense that students demonstrate that they are capable of:

- dealing with increased situational, theoretical and methodological complexity;
- demonstrating increased levels of autonomy and self-management;
- applying ideas, methods, theories in research and problem solving;
- mastering the complexity that is inherent to the field of specialisation.

In the table below we have organized the learning outcomes according to the Dublin descriptors. We present the main components of the Dublin descriptors in italics, and accordingly the proposed learning outcomes.

Knowledge and understanding

1 (Bachelor) [Is] supported by advanced text books [with] some aspects informed by knowledge at the forefront of their field of study

2 (Master) provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing or applying ideas often in a research context

- (Basic) knowledge of (changing) societal contexts
- (Basic) knowledge and understanding of the distinctive nature of organization, policy making, management, service delivery and governance in PAGO domains
- (Basic) awareness of political traditions and politics
- (Basic) knowledge and understanding of the discipline, PAGO-paradigms, intellectual tradition, theories and approaches
- (Basic) knowledge and understanding of multi-actor and multi-level concepts
- A general (basic) understanding regarding the dynamics and processes of actors in public domains, how these processes influence society and vice versa

Applying knowledge and understanding

1 (Bachelor) [through] devising and sustaining arguments

2 (Master) [through] problem solving abilities [applied] in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts

- (Basic) capacity to work at different levels of abstraction
- (Basic) skills in problem definition and problem solving in the PAGO domain
- (Basic) ability to distinguish normative preferences and empirical evidence
- (Basic) skills in combining, integrating and applying knowledge
- (Basic) insight into the scientific practice
- (Basic) capacity to select a suitable theoretical framework for a given empirical problem
- (Basic) skills in combining normative and empirical aspects
- (Basic) capacity to build arguments and reflect upon the arguments of others
- (Basic) awareness of relevant social, ethical, academic and practical issues

Making judgments

1 (Bachelor) [involves] gathering and interpreting relevant data

2 (Master) [demonstrates] the ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity, and formulate judgements with incomplete data

- (Basic) ability to formulate research questions on problems in the PAGO-domain
- (Basic) knowledge regarding research on social-scientific positions and thinking
- (Basic) training in and application of quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods social science research
- (Basic) abilities to collect data and to derive judgments thereof

Communication

1 (Bachelor) [of] information, ideas, problems and solutions

2 (Master) [of] their conclusions and the underpinning knowledge and rationale (restricted scope) to specialist and non specialist audiences (monologue)

- (Basic) capacity to use argumentative skills effectively
- (Basic) capacity to function in multi- and interdisciplinary teams in several roles
- (Basic) capacity to function effectively in governance, organization, management, policy and advocacy settings
- (Basic) capacity to use communicative skills effectively in oral and written presentation



Learning skills

1 (Bachelor) have developed those skills needed to study further with a high level of autonomy

2 (Master) study in a manner that may be largely self-directed or autonomous

- Learning attitude
- (Basic) capacity to reflect upon one's own conceptual and professional capacities and conduct

APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

Afgestudeerden van de opleiding hebben de onderstaande eindkwalificaties bereikt, gerangschikt volgens de Dublin-descriptoren:

Kennis en inzicht

1 Basiskennis en -inzicht aangaande het functioneren van het openbaar bestuur en zijn omgeving, op zowel nationaal als internationaal niveau, waarbij er aandacht besteed wordt aan de rol van zowel publieke, semipublieke als private actoren.

2 Basiskennis en -inzicht aangaande methoden, technieken en grondslagen van sociaal-wetenschappelijk onderzoek.

3 Kennis en -inzicht op hoofdlijnen aangaande aanverwante academische disciplines waarvan inzichten noodzakelijk zijn voor het begrijpen van het functioneren van het openbaar bestuur.

BBO

4 BBO Basiskennis en -inzicht aangaande het functioneren van het openbaar bestuur en zijn omgeving in al zijn facetten.

5 BBO Kennis en inzicht op hoofdlijnen aangaande aanverwante academische disciplines waarvan inzichten noodzakelijk zijn voor een integratieve analyse van het functioneren van het openbaar bestuur in al zijn facetten.

EBM

4 EBM Basiskennis en -inzicht aangaande:

de concepten van micro- en macro-economie vraagstukken op het terrein van sociaal-economisch beleid financiering en financieel management van de collectieve sector de economische analyse van Europese integratie

5 EBM Kennis en -inzicht op hoofdlijnen aangaande de integratieve analyse van economisch-bestuurlijke vraagstukken vanuit de Bestuurskunde en Economie

Toepassen kennis en inzicht

1 Op kritische en onafhankelijke wijze het functioneren van het openbaar bestuur te problematiseren, met als startpunt concrete maatschappelijke vraagstukken uit de politieke en/of bestuurlijke praktijk op verschillende bestuursniveaus.

2 Literatuur te verzamelen, organiseren en selecteren over deze vraagstukken waarbij de inzichten uit de kern en –hulpwetenschappen leidend zijn bij het onderscheiden van hoofd- en bijzaken en het formuleren van een onderzoeksvraag.

3 Data van beperkte complexiteit te verzamelen en analyseren met gebruikmaking van onderzoeksmethoden van kwalitatieve (documentanalyse, inhoudsanalyse, semigestructureerde interviews) en/of kwantitatieve (beschrijvende statistiek, regressieanalyse) aard.

4 De resultaten van empirisch onderzoek te vertalen naar concrete oplossingen voor de bestuurlijke praktijk.

Oordeelsvorming

1 Onderzoeksresultaten van beperkte complexiteit kritisch en onafhankelijk te interpreteren.

2 Deze beargumenteerd te synthetiseren en te integreren tot heldere conclusies, zowel inhoudelijk als vanuit methodologisch perspectief, met als uiteindelijk doel het beantwoorden van de gestelde onderzoeksvraag.

3 Daarbij te reflecteren vanuit alternatieve en/of concurrerende theoretische en/of methodologische invalshoeken.

Bij deze reflectie ook normatieve en ethische overwegingen te betrekken.



Communicatie

- 1 Schriftelijk verslag te leggen van onderzoeksresultaten en dit verslag te vereenvoudigen tot een stuk dat toegankelijk is voor een breder professioneel publiek dan wel een publiek van geïnteresseerde leken.
- 2 Onderzoeksresultaten audiovisueel te presenteren aan een breder professioneel publiek.
- 3 Effectief samen te werken.

Leervaardigheden

- 1 Te werken onder tijdsdruk en daarbij het time-on-task principe in de planning te gebruiken.
- 2 Een master- of andere vervolgopleiding te beginnen.
- 3 Zelfstandig verder te leren, zowel qua inhoudelijke richting als qua planning en benodigde leervaardigheden.

Master's programme Public Administration

Graduates of the programme have attained the following learning outcomes, listed according to the Dublin descriptors:

Knowledge and understanding

- 1 Knowledge and understanding of the broad intellectual tradition of public administration and of important concepts and theories in related disciplines (political science, economics, organisational studies, law, sociology, psychology) as relevant to understanding various governance aspects.
- 2 Advanced knowledge and understanding of the distinctive nature of governance in the public sector, including the functioning of organizations, policy-making, management, and/or public service delivery, in a multi-actor and multi-level context.
- 3 Advanced knowledge and understanding of normative issues related to public governance and of the ethics of government.
- 4 Advanced knowledge and understanding of normative issues related to public governance and of the ethics of government.

Track specific qualifications International and European Governance (IEG)

- 5 IEG Advanced understanding of the complex nature of contemporary public governance arising from the interactions between actors at different levels or sectors of governance: supranational, international, national, and local actors and institutions.
- 6 IEG Advanced understanding of decision making in multi-level governance systems and its effects on the national and local levels of government.
- 7 IEG Advanced knowledge of theoretical approaches analysing the tensions between domestic policies and global trends and regulatory regimes.
- 8 IEG Deep awareness of the constraints and opportunities for domestic policy making arising through globalisation and the intervention of external actors and trans-border policies.

Track specific qualifications Public Management : linking politics and policy (PM)

- 5 PM Advanced knowledge and understanding of the key concepts and theories of public management and of state-of-the-art academic research with regard to core themes, such as management and public service performance, network management, public leadership, and human resource management.
- 6 PM Advanced knowledge and understanding of the key trends in the management of public organizations.
- 7 PM Advanced understanding of the opportunities and constraints for managerial decision-making in public organizations arising from the institutional context in which the organization is embedded.

Track specific qualifications Economics and Governance (EG)

- 5 EG Advanced knowledge and understanding of the principles of welfare-economics in order to analyse policy problems, and develop suitable government responses.
- 6 EG Advanced knowledge and understanding of the variety of policy and regulatory instruments for addressing policy problems, with their assumptions and trade-offs.

7 EG Advanced knowledge and understanding of the challenges for the current welfare state, particularly in the areas such as pension systems, labour policy, social welfare and income distribution.

8 EG Advanced knowledge and understanding of the relationship between the state and market from different intellectual perspectives.

Applying knowledge and understanding:

1 Identify and apply effectively a relevant theoretical framework to analyse real life problems and cases in a conceptually rigorous manner.

2 Define and analyze problems in the three expertise areas, both normatively and empirically, and suggest feasible solutions for decision-making.

3 Discuss the main challenges and opportunities that actors, organisations and/or institutions are currently confronted with, and assess their impact for choices in the respective expertise areas.

4 Select an appropriate research design and method(s) to address a specific research question; collect and analyse qualitative and/or quantitative data relevant to answering the research question.

Judgement

1 Critically evaluate empirical research in the area of expertise, from a methodological and theoretical viewpoint.

2 Reach conclusions and/or solutions to problems based on data and on sound and balanced argumentation, considering the specific context of the practice/case at hand, and evaluate argumentations of others.

3 Reflect on relevant normative and ethical issues, particularly on the issue of multiple goals (legitimacy, effectiveness, etc) and on the principles of democratic government, good government, and reliable government.

4 Critically evaluate the effect of institutional context and complexity on decision-making as related to the three expertise areas.

Communication

1 Present results of a research project at the level expected from academic work in the discipline of public administration.

2 Present arguments and analyses in a format appropriate for a broader professional audience and as input to expert groups.

3 Provide strategic advice to decision-makers.

4 Build, present and defend well-grounded arguments in oral communication.

5 Engage in national debates about the issues related to the three expertise areas.

6 Function effectively in a team, potentially in a multi-disciplinary and multi-cultural setting.

Learning Skills

1 Ability to effectively identify and synthesize existing primary and secondary literature in order to address a question or problem at hand.

2 A mindset to seek evidence and draw from international and other relevant experiences for an informed judgment.

3 Ability to stay informed about current developments in the area of expertise, including the use of relevant social and other 'new' digital media, when applicable.

4 Awareness of the challenges of functioning in a multi-national environment and in a leadership position.

Master's programme Public Sector Management

Afgestudeerden van de opleiding hebben de onderstaande eindkwalificaties bereikt, gerangschikt volgens de Dublin-descriptoren:

Kennis en inzicht

De afgestudeerde van de Masteropleiding Management van de Publieke Sector (MPS) beschikt over:



- 1 Een grondig begrip van de belangrijkste concepten, theorieën en benaderingen op het gebied van het management van de publieke sector.
- 2 Theoretisch verdiepte kennis van en inzicht in de dynamiek van bestuurlijke processen in de publieke sector gebaseerd op een multilevel governance opvatting van openbaar bestuur in comparatief perspectief (historisch; beleidsmatig; internationaal), en gevoed door de professionele praktijkervaring van de afgestudeerde.
- 3 Gedegen kennis van en inzicht in sociaal-wetenschappelijke methodologie en haar uitgangspunten om zelfstandig analyses uit te voeren en maatwerkoplossingen te zoeken voor vraagstukken en problemen uit de praktijk van het management van de publieke sector.
- 4 Grondige kennis van en inzicht in normatieve en bestuursethische aspecten die in een rol spelen in deze vraagstukken en problemen, c.q. de te formuleren maatwerk-oplossingen.

Toepassen kennis en inzicht

De afgestudeerde van de Masteropleiding MPS is in staat:

- 1 Vanuit wetenschappelijk en vanuit toepassingsgericht, professioneel perspectief een kritische analyse te maken van vraagstukken rond het management van de publieke sector. Deze vraagstukken kunnen zowel binnen organisaties liggen als in het verkeer tussen organisaties en hun omgeving en zich op verschillende beleidsterreinen afspelen.
- 2 Gebruik te maken van kennis en inzichten uit gerelateerde disciplines zoals openbare financiën, economie, organisatiepsychologie en/of -sociologie, staats- en bestuursrecht, politicologie, communicatiewetenschap, geschiedenis, nodig om vraagstukken te analyseren en effectief te adresseren.
- 3 Relevante wetenschappelijke literatuur en verdere informatie te verzamelen, organiseren en selecteren met behulp van moderne digitale technieken, en kritisch te verwerken.
- 4 Een onderzoeksopzet te ontwerpen en geschikte instrumenten te kiezen of te ontwikkelen (zoals protocollen en vragenlijsten) gericht op het verzamelen van relevante kwalitatieve en/of kwantitatieve data, en dit onderzoek uit te voeren afgestemd op de normatieve en ethische aspecten die spelen in de context waarin het onderzoek plaatsvindt.

Oordeelsvorming

De afgestudeerde van de Masteropleiding MPS is in staat:

- 1 Resultaten van onderzoek te evalueren en te interpreteren op een kritische en onafhankelijke manier, waarbij van bestuurskundige theorieën alsmede van relevante inzichten uit de sociale- en organisatiepsychologie, de organisatiesociologie, economie, politicologie, rechten en geschiedenis gebruik gemaakt wordt.
- 2 Conclusies, aanbevelingen en/of oplossingen te formuleren aan de hand van een afgewogen en evenwichtige oordeelsvorming, waarbij ook rekening gehouden wordt met de context van de onderzochte casuïstiek en met de argumenten en oordelen van derden.
- 3 Op relevante normatieve en ethische kwesties te reflecteren, met name democratische waarden, 'good governance' en een betrouwbare en integere overheid.

Communicatie

De afgestudeerde van de Masteropleiding MPS beschikt over:

- 1 Verslag te leggen van onderzoek, resultaten, argumentatie en conclusies, en verdere af- en overwegingen in een rapportage die voldoet aan (bestuurs)wetenschappelijke eisen.
- 2 Het onderzoek, c.q. de onderzoeksresultaten en conclusies, zowel alleen op hoofdlijnen als ook tot in detail, audiovisueel te presenteren aan een publiek van wetenschappelijke peers, aan een breder professioneel publiek en aan een publiek van geïnteresseerde leken, en een constructieve discussie te entameren en te leiden.
- 3 Effectief te communiceren en samen te werken met wetenschappelijke en met professionele collega's, ook in interdisciplinaire en multiculturele settings, en met gebruikmaking van 'sociale' en andere 'nieuwe' digitale media.

Leervaardigheden

De afgestudeerde van de Masteropleiding MPS beschikt over:

- 1 Primaire en secundaire wetenschappelijke en vakliteratuur systematisch en efficiënt te bestuderen en verwerken.
- 2 Te werken onder tijdsdruk en daarbij een time-on-task benadering in de planning te gebruiken.
- 3 Een PhD- of andere vervolgopleiding te beginnen.
- 4 Zelfstandig activiteiten te ontplooiën die noodzakelijk zijn om opgebouwde professionaliteit in stand te houden en verder uit te breiden.

APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

<i>Specialisation</i> Beleid, Bestuur en Organisatie	<i>Specialisation</i> Economie, Bestuur en Management
Jaar 1 (from September 2017 onwards)	
Blok 1	Blok 1
Openbaar bestuur en bestuurswetenschappen (Seminar sessions = WG)	Openbaar bestuur en bestuurswetenschappen (WG)
Inleiding sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek (WG)	Inleiding sociaalwetenschappelijk onderzoek (WG)
Geschiedenis van het openbaar bestuur (WG)	Micro-Economie (WG)
Blok 2	Blok 2
Organisatietheorie (WG)	Organisatietheorie (WG)
Beleid 1: beleids- en besluitvorming (WG)	Beleid 1: beleids- en besluitvorming (WG)
Economie in hoofdlijnen (WG)	Macro-Economie
Blok 3	Blok 3
Statistiek (WG)	Statistiek (WG)
Sociologie (WG)	Beleidseconomie (WG)
Publiek management (WG)	Publiek management (WG)
Blok 4	Blok 4
Politologie (WG)	Politologie (WG)
Recht (WG)	Recht (WG)
Beleid, bestuur en organisatie I: kwantitatief leeronderzoek binnenlands bestuur (WG)	Economie, bestuur en management I: integratief project markt en overheid (WG)
Jaar 2 (from September 2017 onwards)	
Blok 1	Blok 1
Philosophy of Science and Foundations of Public Administration (WG)	Philosophy of Science and Foundations of Public Administration (WG)
Management and Performance (WG)	Management and Performance (WG)
Public Sector Economics	Public Sector Economics
Blok 2	Blok 2
Kwantitatieve methoden (WG)	Kwantitatieve methoden (WG)
EU Politics and Policy (WG)	EU Politics and Policy (WG)
International Administration (WG)	Bedrijfseconomie* (WG)
Blok 3	Blok 3
Introduction to Public Affairs (WG)	Sociaal-economisch beleid: theorie en Instituties (WG)
Kwalitatieve methoden (WG)	Kwalitatieve methoden (WG)
Financieel management in de publieke sector	Financieel management in de publieke sector
Blok 4	Blok 4
Politieke filosofie en openbaar bestuur (WG)	Sociaal-economisch beleid: empirische analyse (WG)
Beleid 2: implementatie (WG)	Beleid 2: implementatie (WG)
Beleid, bestuur en organisatie II: kwalitatief leeronderzoek internationaal bestuur (WG)	Economie, bestuur en management II: integratief project bedrijfsmatig werken in de publieke sector (WG)
Jaar 3 (from September 2018 onwards)	
Blok 1-2	Blok 1-2
Vrije keuzeruimte	Vrije keuzeruimte
Blok 3	Blok 3
Multilevel Governance: civil service reform	Europese economische integratie
Beleid III: Beleidsevaluatie (WG)	Beleid III: Beleidsevaluatie (WG)
Bachelor project/thesis (WG) (also in block 1-2)	Bachelor project/thesis (WG) (also in block 1-2)
Blok 4	Blok 4
Bestuursethiek	Bestuursethiek
Staats- en bestuursrecht	Economische theorie van politiek (WG)
Bachelor project/thesis (WG) (also in block 1-2)	Bachelor project/thesis (WG) (also in block 1-2)

The first half of the third year consists of optional subjects (vrije keuzeruimte) (30 EC) in which students can follow electives (e.g. International Relations and Organisations; Professional Skills for Public Impact), do a minor or an internship, or study abroad. In the second half of year three, students follow more advanced courses. In addition, the third year finishes with students writing their bachelor's thesis. The most talented students can participate in Honours programmes, in which members of the Institute are themselves also involved: for instance, in the Honours programme

'Tackling Global Challenges'. Honours programmes are spread out over three years with 30 EC. We also offer courses for exchange and minor students (Dutch/English).

Master's programme Public Administration

Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4		
Public Institutions	Research Design	Research methods	Thesis		
Track course 1	Public Policy and values	Track course 4	Thesis		
Track course 2	Elective	Track course 5	Thesis		
<i>February intake</i>		Block 3	Block 4	Block 1	Block 2
		Public Institutions	Research Design	Research methods	Thesis
		Track course 4	Public Policy and values	Track course 1	Thesis
		Track course 5	Elective	Track course 2	Thesis

International and European Governance (IEG)

Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4		
Public Institutions	Research Design	Research Methods	Thesis		
Architectures of International and European Governance	Public Policy and Values	Management in International Administrations	Thesis		
Global Challenges and Public Policies	Elective	Decision-Making in Multi-Level Governance Systems	Thesis		
<i>February intake</i>		Block 3	Block 4	Block 1	Block 2
		Public Institutions	Research Design	Research Methods	Thesis
		Management in International Administrations	Public Policy and Values	Architectures of International and European Governance	Thesis
		Decision-Making in Multi-Level Governance Systems	Elective	Global Challenges and Public Policies	Thesis

Public Management (PM)

Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4		
Public Institutions	Research Design	Research Methods	Thesis		
Networking for Performance	Public Policy and values	Change Management and Leadership	Thesis		
Co-Production and Citizen Engagement	Elective	HRM in the Public Sector	Thesis		
<i>February intake</i>		Block 3	Block 4	Block 1	Block 2
		Public Institutions	Research Design	Research Methods	Thesis
		Change Management and Leadership	Public Policy and Values	Networking for Performance (Thesis
		HRM in the Public Sector	Elective	Co-Production and Citizen Engagement	Thesis

Economics & Governance (E&G)

Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4		
Public Institutions	Research Design	Research Methods: Applied Empirical Economics	Thesis		
Regulation & Governance	Public Policy and values	Markets and Competition Policy	Thesis		
Welfare State Economics	Elective	Political Economy in International Perspective	Thesis		
<i>February intake</i>		Block 3	Block 4	Block 1	Block 2
		Public Institutions	Research Design	Research Methods: Applied Empirical Economics	Thesis
		Markets and Competition Policy	Public Policy and Values	Regulation & Governance	Thesis
		Political Economy in International Perspective	Elective	Welfare State Economics	Thesis



Master's programme *Public Sector Management*

Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4		
Inleiding MPS	Bestuurskundig Onderzoek	Publieke Waarden en Ethiek	Thesis		
Human Resource Management	Prestatiemanagement	Juridisering van Bestuursprocessen	Thesis		
Strategisch Management	Organisatieverandering	De Overheid als Arbeidsorganisatie	Thesis		
Gedrag en Interactie in Publieke Organisaties		Politiek-Ambtelijke Verhoudingen	Vergelijkend Publiek Management		
De ontwikkeling van Public Affairs		Klassiekers in de Praktijk van Public Affairs			
De Beleidscyclus en de Bestuurlijke Arena		Medialogica en de Publieke Arena			
<i>February intake</i>		Block 3	Block 4	Block 1	Block 2
		Inleiding MPS	Bestuurskundig Onderzoek	Publieke Waarden en Ethiek	Thesis
		Juridisering van Bestuursprocessen	Prestatiemanagement	Human Resource Management	Thesis
		De Overheid als Arbeidsorganisatie	Organisatieverandering	Strategisch Management	Thesis
		Politiek-Ambtelijke Verhoudingen		Gedrag en Interactie in Publieke Organisaties	
		Klassiekers in de Praktijk van Public Affairs		De ontwikkeling van Public Affairs	
		Medialogica en de Publieke Arena		De Beleidscyclus en de Bestuurlijke Arena	

APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

B Public Administration (BSK)

M Public Administration (PA)

M Management Publieke Sector (MPS)

M Crisis and Security Management (CSM)

Thursday 30 November 2017

08.30 – 08.45	Arrival
08.45 – 10.15	Panel consultation
10.15 – 11.15	Programme management
11.15 – 11.30	Break
11.30 – 12.00	Education Committee bachelor
12.00 – 12.45	Lunch
12.45 – 13.15	Students BSK
13.15 – 13.45	Teachers BSK
13.45 – 14.15	Internal consultation
14.15 – 14.45	Students PA incl. alumnus BSK
14.45 – 15.15	Teachers PA
15.15 – 15.45	Alumni and employers PA
15.45 – 17.00	Internal consultation
17.00 – 17.30	Students MPS incl. alumnus BSK
17.30 – 18.00	Teachers MPS
18.00 – 18.30	Alumni and employers MPS
18.30 – 19.00	Internal consultation

Friday 1 December 2017

08.30 – 09.00	Open consultation hour
09.00 – 09.15	Transfer to university
09.15 – 09.45	Education Committee master
09.45 – 10.15	Students CSM incl. alumnus BSK
10.15 – 10.45	Teachers CSM
10.45 – 11.00	Break
11.00 – 11.30	Alumni and employers CSM
11.45 – 12.15	Board of Examiners
12.15 – 13.30	Internal consultation (incl. lunch)
13.30 – 14.30	Concluding conversation programme management
14.30 – 16.30	Internal assessment panel
16.30 – 16.45	Oral presentation
16.45 – 17.00	Break
17.00 – 18.00	Development conversation



APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the bachelor's programme Public Administration, 13 theses of the master's programme Public Administration and 10 theses of the master's programme International Public Management and Public Policy. The associated student numbers are available through QANU upon request.

During the site visit, the panel studied, among other things, the following documents:

- Annual report Board of Examiners
- Minutes meetings Board of Examiners
- Assessment protocol
- Annual report Programme Committee
- Minutes meetings Programme Committee
- Educational philosophy Leiden University
- Narrative BBO EBM
- Narrative MPA
- Narrative MPS
- FGGA Education Guide
- Protocol Studying with Disabilities
- Policy Diversity, Equal Opportunities and Inclusion 2017-2020
- Outline Action Plan Diversity, Equal Opportunities and Inclusion 2017-2020
- FGGA Action Plan Diversity and Inclusion 2017-18
- Action Plan Institutional Audit
- Report ULeiden Institutional Audit
- Report Mid-Term Review ULeiden Institutional Audit
- BSc Programme evaluations
- BSc Independent student evaluation of the programme bachelor PA
- MPS Programme evaluations
- MPS Independent student evaluation of the programme master MPS
- PA Programme evaluations
- Independent student assessment of the programme master PA
- NSE 2017 FGGA opleidingen kleurverloop
- University Educational Vision Outlines 2013
- Research – Programme