

**MASTER'S PROGRAMME**

**CRISIS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT**

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](mailto:support@qanu.nl)  
Internet: [www.qanu.nl](http://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

<b>REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME CRISIS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE COMBINED NVAO-EAPAA FRAMEWORK 2016.....	11
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>25</b>
APPENDIX 1: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	27
APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE .....	29
APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	35
APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM .....	37
APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT .....	38
APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL .....	39

This report was finalized on 06-04-2018





# REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME CRISIS AND SECURITY MANAGEMENT OF LEIDEN UNIVERSITY

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

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

### Master's programme Crisis and Security Management

Name of the programme:	Crisis and Security Management
CROHO number:	60417
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	-
Location(s):	The Hague
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
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 master's programme Crisis and Security 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 student Systems Engineering, Policy Analysis & Management at the Delft University of Technology [student member].

The panel was supported by Peter Hildering MSc, who acted as secretary.

Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.

## WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The assessment of the master's programme Crisis and Security Management is part of a cluster assessment. From October to December 2017, a panel assessed seven bachelor programmes and seventeen master 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 developments 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 programme 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

The master's programme Crisis and Security Management is an interdisciplinary programme with a distinctive and unique profile. It approaches crisis and security management from a multidisciplinary, multi-level, multi-actor and multi-threat perspective. The intended learning outcomes of the programme are in line with the requirements of the international field. In the view of the panel, they are well formulated and convincingly geared towards academic master's level.

The programme is based on two didactic approaches: research-led teaching and problem-based learning. Core courses familiarise students with key topics in this new domain, and research courses focus on the most often used research techniques. The core courses borrow insights from and educate students in (among other fields) the field of Public Administration. Elective courses have attractive subjects that tie in well with the core courses and, if used as a subject for the master's thesis, with the thesis project.

The panel concludes that the programme has strong links with the professional field of security studies and crisis management; through its central location, its close collaboration with its external partner ISGA, its focus on real-life cases in different teaching formats and connections with the professional field by means of guest lectures, site visits, and so forth. The panel believes that this practical approach helps to adequately prepare students for their future jobs. However, given the fact that a quarter of students follow an extracurricular internship, the panel suggests that the programme might want to reconsider if it could accommodate a short internship.

Intake numbers have more than doubled within half a year. The panel concludes that this rapid growth has had an effect on the teaching and learning experience. It was pleased to hear that programme management is well aware of the problem and is taking measures to lower the staff-student ratio and the pressure on staff. Limiting student intake through stricter admissions criteria might remedy this, and could also have a positive effect on study success within the programme.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the teaching staff in the programme and it is impressed with the high scores that students gave the teachers in CSM evaluations. Staff members are highly experienced researchers, and the panel values the strong link in the programme between ISGA research and teaching.

The programme has an adequate assessment system in place. The panel is enthusiastic about the changes that the previous Board of Examiners has made to assessment in the programme and quality control. As a result, the programme now has an assessment plan which links assessment to learning objectives, all courses have two assessments and the overall diversity of assessment has increased. The programme has recently greatly improved the thesis assessment procedure, which was in need of change in terms of quality assurance. It designed a trajectory in which great care is taken to arrive at a well-documented and truly independent quality check. The panel feels that the programme could make more progress by regularly and randomly checking the quality of thesis assessment.

The panel concludes that students achieve the intended learning outcomes. Theses show that students have good writing and academic skills. The panel was impressed with the high employability rates of the programme, with over half of students finding a job within three months. Most graduates work in the private sector, followed by consultancy companies and local and national government.

The programme has a clear policy for diversity among staff and students. The panel concludes that the number of male and female students is well balanced. At staff level, the gender mix is less balanced. Though currently not very unequal, the panel advises the programme to keep paying attention to this balance in the future. Regarding internationalisation, the panel is content to see that the programme has formulated various strategies to better include international students in the communities of the programme and the University. The number of international staff is the



programme is small. The panel again recommends attention to this imbalance in future recruitment and allocation of staff to the programme.

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

*Master's programme Crisis and Security 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 master's programme Crisis and Security Management at Leiden University is embedded in the Faculty of Governance and Global Affairs. Between 2012 and 2016, teachers from Public Administration delivered the programme together with staff at the Centre for Terrorism and Counterterrorism (CTC). As of from 2016 the programme is taught entirely by staff associated with CTC's successor, the Institute of Security and Global Affairs (ISGA). In September 2017 a bachelor's programme Crisis and Security Management was launched, which will prepare students for this (or another) master's programme. Until 2016 the programme shared its Educational Committee and Examination Board with the other master's programmes Public Administration at Leiden University. Since the move to the Institute of Security and Global Affairs in 2016 the programme has had its own Board of Examiners.

### **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**

### *Mission and profile*

The founding principle of the master's programme Crisis and Security Management (CSM) is that crisis and security are not fixed entities, but the outcome of processes that are influenced and heavily mediated by politics, society, economics, culture and technology. These processes can only be understood in their specific historical setting. The programme approaches crisis and security practices as techniques that governmental and private organisations use to tackle crisis and security issues. As well as understanding this founding principle, students learn to deal with political sensitivity and complexity, and to develop a critical attitude and awareness of the ethical dilemmas related to crisis and security management. The programme is taught in English and the educational approach is that of research-led teaching.

The programme adopts a multidisciplinary approach and borrows insights from the fields of public administration, political science, sociology and social psychology, as well as from more technically oriented disciplines. It looks at both 'traditional' public security actors (for instance the police, border guards and intelligence services) and 'a mosaic of public-private, private and transnational agencies and informal networks'. Finally, the programme looks at current crises and security challenges from a transboundary perspective, while broadening the concepts of 'crisis' and 'security' to include for instance pandemics and cyber security risks. The substantive profile is summarized in four 'multi'-themes: multidisciplinary, multi-actor, multi-level and multi-threat.

In the view of the panel, the master's programme Crisis and Security Management is a unique and, as evidenced by the rapidly growing number of students, attractive programme. By choosing a multidisciplinary, multi-level perspective and by taking into account various actors and various threats, the programme approaches crisis and security as constantly evolving topics that call for certain academic and professional skills and attitudes (such as political sensitivity and ethical awareness). The programme has strong links with research conducted at the Institute of Security



and Global Affairs and with professional practice. The programme aims for its graduates to be employed in organisations dealing with crisis and security management. The panel notes that the programme does not yet describe what kind of roles they will be able to fulfil in such organisations, and suggests specifying this in the programme's goals.

Based on the five categories of the Dublin Descriptors (Knowledge and understanding, Applying Knowledge and Understanding, Making Judgements, Communication & Learning Skills), the programme has formulated 23 intended learning programmes (see Appendix1). A table in the self-evaluation report shows how these intended learning outcomes map the various themes of the substantive and educational programme profile. The panel has studied the intended learning outcomes and concludes that these match the domain-specific framework of reference. The intended learning outcomes are in line with the requirements set by the national and international field. According to the panel, the intended learning outcomes are phrased in a concise manner and they are clearly geared towards master's level, thus reflecting the academic orientation of the programme in a convincing manner.

### **Considerations**

The master's programme Crisis and Security Management has a distinctive and unique profile, approaching crisis and security management from a multidisciplinary, multi-level, multi-actor and multi-threat perspective. The intended learning outcomes are in line with the requirements of the international field. According to the panel, they are well formulated and convincingly geared towards academic master's level.

### **Conclusion**

*Master's programme Crisis and Security 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 curriculum of the master's programme Crisis and Security Management consists of four parts: five core courses; two research courses; two elective courses, and the master's thesis. Except for the master's thesis (15 EC), all courses account for 5 EC. The academic year is divided into four blocks in which students (mostly) follow three courses at a time. All courses have a numeric code ranging from 100 to 600, indicating the intended level of the programme. Master's courses start at level-500. The core courses deal with subjects such as 'Security in Historical Context' (borrowing from history, international relations and political science), 'Europeanisation of Crisis and Security Management' and 'Local Security Networks'. The thesis trajectory is separated in three parts: two research courses (research design and thesis preparation) and the thesis project itself. The self-evaluation report mentions strengthening the research-learning pathway even more in the near future, by following developments in the professional field (for instance, offering a course on social media analysis).

The panel concludes that the programme offers a coherent set of courses. The core courses familiarise students with key topics in this new and interdisciplinary domain, whereas the research

courses focus primarily on the most often used research techniques (interviewing, theory-testing process tracing, agenda setting, et cetera). All core courses borrow insights from and educate students in the field of Public Administration and Governance. The panel considers this sufficient to qualify this as a programme in the public administration domain, although it notes that the main disciplines of this programme are crisis management and security studies.

### **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).*

The programme does not offer any specialisation tracks yet, but it is considering to in future offer four tracks in line with the ISGA research groups: (1) Terrorism and Political Violence, (2) Governance of Crises, (3) Security and Cyber Space, and (4) Diplomacy and Global Affairs.

The current programme contains two elective courses. Students can choose two electives out of the seven elective courses that the programme offers. The elective courses have been brought forward and are now scheduled in the first two blocks. Subjects range from cyber security to privatisation of CSM. The reason for offering the elective courses at the start of the programme, the self-evaluation reports clarify, is that these courses can then help prepare students choosing a subject for their master's thesis.

The panel concludes that the elective courses have attractive subjects that tie in well with the core courses and, if used as a subject for the master's thesis, with the thesis project. The elective courses have clearly defined goals and provide students with the opportunity to pursue their own interests in this already specialist programme. The panel sees the elective courses as a strong element of the programme. From talking to the students, it learned that the students value the electives as well.

For the thesis project, students can enrol in a capstone project that closely relates to ISGA staff research. The panel notes that the use of thesis capstone groups has the associated risk that it might lead to a different level of support between those students within these 'capstone' groups and those students that pursue their own thesis topics. It recommends that the programme continues to ensure that students who prefer to choose their own topic are facilitated to do so (see 2.6).

### **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.*

To assess the multidisciplinary character of the programme, the panel studied the curriculum and the content of a number of core courses (see Appendix 6). It concludes that the programme uses research methods, concepts and theories from an array of disciplines. Prominent disciplines in the curriculum are international relations, crisis management, political science and security studies. Supportive disciplines are for instance public administration, history, social psychology (fear management) and criminology. Multidisciplinarity is one of the hallmarks of the programme. In different courses, different disciplines are brought in to approach the topic at hand. Further integration of the various disciplines is the goal of the master's thesis project, where students answer a research question while selecting theories and insights from various fields. The panel concludes that the programme is fittingly multidisciplinary.



#### **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 master's programme Crime and Security Management has 60 EC worth of courses. This is a regular length for academic 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.*

The CSM programme has various links with the professional field of crisis and security management, which is very closely interrelated with (and is becoming an increasingly important subfield in) public administration. Teaching in the CSM programme is provided by staff who work at the Institute of Security and Global Affairs. ISGA has four research groups that approach security practices and crisis management from different angles. Because of this strong involvement of CSM lecturers in research projects and professional networks, they are able to show the students how the programme connects to the work field. The staff also has a good view of the knowledge and skills that students will need in crisis and security organisations, among other things a broad overview of the field, an ability to connect various specialists and a thorough knowledge of new technology. Being situated in the heart of The Hague, the programme is close to the city's public institutions: the ministries are just around the corner, and so are many international organisations dealing with crisis and security management. This makes it relatively easy for the programme to bring in expertise from outside (such as highly placed civil servants and security experts) and to send students into the public sector.

The programme does not offer internships, but does facilitate and offer supervision for an extracurricular internship of 15 EC, providing the internship matches the goals of the programme and has an academic character. An estimated 25% of students make use of this option. The programme does regularly invite practitioners from the professional field to give a guest lecture, it organises field trips and lets students study and analyse real-life cases. One course lets students practice finding solutions in the digital environment of a serious game. In the course Thesis Preparation students enrol in something the programme calls 'professional skills labs'. Here they learn communication skills that are essential in the working field. Finally, the programme benefits from the faculty's (extracurricular) activities geared towards job preparation, opportunities that the programme often exploits.

The panel concludes that the programme offers a good range of job preparation activities. However, the panel also read in the student evaluation that students were not entirely satisfied about job preparation in the programme. During the site visit, the panel checked with the students whether they feel sufficiently prepared for the job market. The student representatives felt that an internship does not fit the timeframe of the programme. They were on the other hand very enthusiastic about the guest lecturers in some of the courses (for instance in the Crisis Management course, where they participated in a discussion with five experts) and thought that these provided them with a good view of what their work might be. The students also valued the practical and interdisciplinary approach and contemporary character of the programme. They really liked to be able to talk about the news the next day during class, and to apply knowledge directly.

The panel concludes that the programme has strong links with the professional field of security studies and crisis management; through its central location, its close collaboration with partner ISGA, its focus on real-life cases in different teaching formats and connections with the professional field by means of guest lectures, site visits, and so forth. The panel believes that this practical approach helps to adequately prepare students for their future jobs. However, given the fact that a quarter of students follow an extracurricular internship, the panel suggests that the programme might want to reconsider if it could accommodate a short internship.

## **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.*

The programme is based on two didactic approaches: research-led teaching and problem-based learning. The first didactic approach, the link between the courses and ISGA-research, has been described in section 2.5. The other approach, also known as learning by doing, is described as 'by actively engaging with complex problems and situations, students will have a more intense learning experience compared to passively processing knowledge provided by lecturers'. The self-evaluation report also explains that this approach has been chosen to prepare students for the professional environment where students will need 'an independent and critical mindset, creativity and problem-solving competencies'. The didactic approaches have been implemented in three learning pathways: substantive courses, security practices oriented courses and the thesis trajectory. The panel concludes that the didactic approaches are fitting for the programme and have been implemented well in the courses. The overall structure is clear and coherent.

Students can enter the programme in September and February. For that reason, all courses (including elective courses) are being offered twice a year. Recently, intake numbers have more than doubled within half a year (see 2.7). From talking to the students, the panel concludes that this rapid growth has had an effect on how well teaching methods work in the courses. Problem-based learning, for instance, requires small working groups, and it is almost impossible to have a productive debate with over a hundred students. (The panel learned that the group size in the elective courses is more appropriate in this sense.) When discussing the topic of group size with programme management and teachers, the panel was pleased to hear that they are well aware of the problem and are taking measures to lower the staff-student ratio and the work pressure on staff. While programme management is in the process of attracting new lecturers, the teachers have implemented new teaching methods: for instance, moderating discussions instead of lecturing for a big group, organising a collective interview with experts (students had to hand their questions in beforehand), and introducing a serious game as the key element of teaching in one course. The panel is of the opinion that the rapid growth of the number of students is dealt with as well as can be expected. It appreciates these alternative ways of teaching, but also recommends taking additional measurements such as setting stricter admissions criteria (2.7) to better manage the intake of students.

According to the students and alumni, the programme is doable within one year, although some had difficulties to plan all assignments. Some said that the level of challenge could be higher in some courses. This comment was also made in the student evaluation. In response, the programme has revised one of the courses that drew the most criticism from students, namely the Security Networks course. The student representatives were very satisfied with the quality of the lectures in the programme and appreciated the level of feedback they got on written papers.

From talking to the students and studying the programme as a whole and some core courses in more detail (Appendix 6), the panel concludes that there are no obstacles preventing students from successfully completing the programme within one year. This is not yet reflected in the success rates of the programme. 32% of students graduate after one year, 78% after two years. Programme management identifies three reasons for this delay: students combining their study with an (extracurricular) internship, administrative reasons (students registering for the programme before they start, due to financial reasons) and study delays in the thesis trajectory. The thesis trajectory has been revised in academic year 2016/2017 by introducing (compulsory) capstone projects, projects in which up to five students work on one thesis subject and regularly meet with their supervisor. The thesis trajectory was also addressed during the site visit. Students explained that, in the past, the quality of supervision and the grading seemed to depend a great deal on which supervisor students were assigned to. This process, the students thought, needed to be more



standardised, as now has been done. The panel can understand why the programme has chosen to introduce the thesis circles in the light of the current student – staff ratio within the programme. At the same time, it wants to encourage the programme to ensure that students who want to choose their own topic get the same amount of support as students in the thesis circles.

### **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 master's programme Crisis and Security Management directly admits students with a Leiden University bachelor's degree in Public Administration to the programme. All other students must first complete a 15 EC pre-master programme. This pre-master programme is organised by the Institute of Public Administration. Students are admitted to the pre-master programme on the basis of demonstrated academic capacity, English proficiency and affinity with the subject of security and crisis management.

As previously mentioned, the programme has seen a large increase in student numbers, from 22 students in 2011/2012 to 178 students in 2015/2016. More recent numbers are not provided, but from talking to the students the panel concludes that numbers have gone up again after the programme moved to the Institute of Security and Global Affairs (September 2016). This has had an effect on the teaching formats used in the programme (see 2.6) as well as on the teaching experience that is offered to students (2.8).

The panel concludes that the admission criteria are clear and in line with the aims of the programme. It also concludes, however, that the premaster programme is quite small in comparison with other Public Administration premaster programmes in the Netherlands. From studying the numbers provided in the self-evaluation report, the panel concludes that students who have taken this premaster graduate considerably less often than students who previously followed a bachelor's programme at Leiden University (22% compared to 89%). This raises the question whether the premaster is adequate preparation for the programme. Given the high intake numbers and low overall success rates, the panel thinks that programme management should also consider setting stricter admission criteria. It could do so by either selecting students on grades and motivation, or by relevant skills such as proficiency in English and writing skills.

### **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.*

The programme organises information sessions and taster days so that students who decide to apply for the programme have a clear idea of what it is about. After students enter the programme, the programme holds special introductory activities for international students (20% of students come from abroad) who are not yet accustomed to the specific culture of Dutch education. The didactic philosophy of problem-based learning further helps to get students from various backgrounds levelled up, as does the first course that has this as an explicit learning objective.

During the site visit, the panel asked the teachers, students and alumni how the mix of students from a wide range of backgrounds influences the teaching and learning experience. The teachers thought that in the Midterm assessment it soon becomes clear which students need more support. They also felt that the skill labs (part of the thesis trajectory) help to provide this support, though they also admitted that there is an ongoing discussion about the place of these courses in the curriculum. The students said that, compared to their previous bachelor's programme, in this master's programme there was more emphasis on critical thinking at a more abstract level and seeing the interconnectedness of theories. The students appreciated the mix of Dutch and international students in the courses, because this resulted in them also getting other views on security and crisis



issues. Graduates did feel that some groups of international students had to work harder than Dutch students because they needed to get used to a new study environment. However, they did not know which formal type of support might have helped these fellow-students to cope more easily.

The panel concludes that the structure, contents and didactics of the programmes match the students' qualifications. It is pleased to see that the programme is aware of and addresses possible differences between Dutch and international students, as well as between students with a different disciplinary background.

### **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 teachers delivering the programme hold a doctorate degree and have a University Teaching Qualification (BKO). Those who do yet have this qualification are in the process of acquiring it, which must be done within two years of being appointed at Leiden University. Teachers in the CSM programme come from various disciplinary backgrounds, such as Public Administration, History, Law, Criminology, International Relations and Sociology. Senior staff members coordinate the courses in the programme. They are internationally renowned experts in their fields with close links to the international academic community and professional field.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the teaching staff in the programme and it is impressed with the high scores that students gave the teachers in CSM evaluations (between 4 and 4.5 out of 5). Staff are highly experienced researchers, and the panel values the strong link between ISGA research and teaching. The panel is pleased to see that the high staff-student ratio (1:41) is being addressed. Not only is it important to keep the workload for staff manageable, the panel also points out that huge student numbers make it harder for students to acquire certain learning outcomes.

### **Considerations**

The master's programme Crisis and Security Management is an interdisciplinary programme with a clearly structured and coherent curriculum. The programme is based on two didactic approaches: research-led teaching and problem-based learning. Core courses familiarise students with key topics in this new domain, and research courses focus on the most often used research techniques. The core courses borrow insights from and educate students in (among other fields) the field of Public Administration. Elective courses have attractive subjects that tie in well with the core courses and, if used as a subject for the master's thesis, with the thesis project. The elective courses have clearly defined goals and provide students with the opportunity to pursue their own interests in this already specialist programme. The panel sees the elective courses as a strong element of the programme.

The panel concludes that the programme has strong links with the professional field of security studies and crisis management; through its central location, its close collaboration with external partner ISGA, its focus on real-life cases in different teaching formats and connections with the professional field by means of guest lectures, site visits, and so forth. The panel believes that this practical approach helps to adequately prepare students for their future jobs. However, given the fact that a quarter of students follow an extracurricular internship, the panel suggests that the programme might want to reconsider if it could accommodate a short internship.



From talking to the students, the panel learned that recently intake numbers have more than doubled within half a year. It concludes that this rapid growth has had an effect on the teaching and learning experience. It was pleased to hear that programme management is well aware of the problem and is taking measures to lower the staff-student ratio and the pressure on staff. Limiting student intake through stricter admissions criteria might remedy this, and could also have a positive effect on study success within the programme.

The panel is satisfied with the quality of the teaching staff in the programme and it is impressed with the high scores that students gave the teachers in CSM evaluations. Staff are highly experienced researchers, and the panel values the strong link in the programme between ISGA research and teaching.

### **Conclusion**

*Master's programme Crisis and Security Management:* the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'satisfactory'.

### **Standard 3: Student 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 programme, the panel looked at the assessment policy, the assessment of theses and it spoke with the Examination Board that was previously responsible for this programme. Representatives of the current Board of Examiners, which started up in September 2016, were also present at this meeting.

#### *Board of Examiners*

The Board of Examiners PA is responsible for all Public Administration programmes at Leiden University. It was responsible for the CSM programme until September 2016, when CSM moved to the Institute of Security and Global Affairs. The decision to speak to the previous Board of Examiners was made because this Board was responsible for the programme for most of the assessment period, and because this Board has made some important changes to the assessment process.

The Board of Examiners 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.

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, in 2016, what the panel thinks is an excellent thesis assessment protocol for the Public Administration programmes. In the view of the panel, the Board of Examiners have strict rules that are clearly set out. Judging by the new thesis manual which has been produced, the panel is confident that the new Board of Examiners will keep up the good work that has already been achieved by its predecessor.

### *Assessment policy*

The programme's assessment policy 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 programme. 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. 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 CSM programme's assessment plan and concludes that this can be a very helpful tool 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 CSM programme most often lets students write assignments (papers or essays) individually. Four courses are assessed with a written exam combined with writing assignments. The panel concludes that assessment methods tie in well with the course objectives, but that assessment methods could be more diverse.

### *Thesis assessment*

The assessment procedure for the theses has been revised after the Midterm review (see 5.2) to enhance transparency and uniformity of grading. An important instrument in this process is a standardised form for thesis assessment 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.

After students have submitted the final draft of their thesis, the first supervisor checks the thesis for plagiarism, and sends it to the second supervisor, if the primary supervisor has graded 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 supervisor's grades differ more than one point. First and second supervisors both fill in assessment forms independently and have to give written feedback. Master's students defend their thesis and receive their grade afterwards.

The panel is very impressed with the process of thesis quality assurance and considers this as good practice. Asking supervisors to fill in forms independently safeguards the independence of both supervisors. The panel notes that recording extensive, written feedback not only gives insight into 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. However, the panel was a bit surprised to hear that students do not get to see the feedback form but only receive oral feedback. It pointed out that students could also benefit from receiving a copy of the assessment forms.

From talking to the Board of Examiners and the teachers in the master's programme Public Administration, the panel understood that for this programme thesis quality control goes further than having new assessment forms. Together with the Board of Examiners the management of the master's programme Public Administration has started organising annual peer review sessions, 'norming sessions', where eight to ten thesis supervisors meet to discuss a random sample of 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 similar way. The panel praises these 'thesis carousels'. At the time of the site visit, the thesis carousel process had not yet been implemented in the CSM programme. The panel strongly encourages this programme to join as soon as possible to further improve the thesis quality control.



Though the panel is very impressed with the current state of affairs, it also thinks that changes to the thesis process were much needed; from talking to students and graduates and looking at student evaluations the panel learned that students in the CSM programme previously perceived a serious lack of transparency in the grading process of the theses and felt that the level of supervision and feedback depended a lot on the supervisor to whom they had been matched. Students also did not know whom to go to if problems arose on the way. The panel discussed this topic in more detail with the CSM teachers during the site visit. The panel congratulated the programme on the new thesis manual, which they thought looks excellent. The panel was also pleased to hear that the programme took action when they received negative student feedback and that they have appointed a thesis coordinator to help students find a supervisor at an early stage of the programme. However, as mentioned before (2.6), the panel finds it important that students who want to choose their own topic receive the same amount of support as students who participate in a capstone project. A better streamlining of the process is especially important, the panel thinks, because of the rapidly growing number of students in this programme. Finally, the panel is pleased to hear that, in the view of the Educational Committee, things have improved.

### **Considerations**

The programme has an adequate assessment system in place. The panel is enthusiastic about the changes that the previous Board of Examiners has made to assessment in the programme and quality control. As a result, the programme now has an assessment plan which links assessment to learning objectives and all courses have two assessments. The overall diversity of assessment has increased, although the programme could improve this further by limiting the number of written assignments in favour of other assessment methods. The thesis assessment procedure has improved greatly. However, the programme could make more progress by regularly and randomly checking the quality of thesis assessment.

### **Conclusion**

*Master's programme Crisis and Security 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 and interviewed several alumni in order to assess whether the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

As mentioned above, the panel thought that in the sample of theses that they studied the accompanying old feedback forms were not satisfactory. The boxes to be ticked on this form were not very detailed, and gave little space for comments on the degree of supervision given and level of independent research by the student. This made it hard for the panel members to understand how the supervisors had arrived at the final grade. However, from studying the theses, the panel concludes that the quality of the theses ranges from satisfactory to good. It was impressed with the extensive primary data collection in some of the theses and the clear conceptual framework to which students linked their data. The panel thought that the majority of theses in their sample was also clearly structured and well written. The panel concludes that the theses show that students have achieved the intended learning outcomes.

According to the data provided, graduates from this programme find a job with relative ease: 57% of graduates find a job within three months, 86% within a year, and 97% within two years. Most graduates currently work for a private sector company (20%) or a consultancy company (17%). Of a substantial number of graduates (19%) the current job is unknown. Other employers for which a

substantial amount of graduates work are government institutes (9%), education/research institutes (8%) and the national government (9%). The panel concludes that employability seems particularly high for this programme, and sees this as a sign that the programme delivers graduates who fit the expectations of the professional field well. The alumni to whom the panel talked felt that their programmes connected well to their current job. They were enthusiastic about the wide range of subjects that enabled them to choose different paths, and felt that they had been properly trained in different aspects of decision-making processes. The panel concludes that the programme is successful in adequately preparing students for the professional field. This is also seen as proof that the intended learning outcomes have indeed been achieved.

### **Considerations**

The panel concludes that students achieve the intended learning outcomes. These show that students have good writing and academic skills. The panel was impressed with the high employability rates of the programme, with over half of students finding a job within three months. Most graduates work in the private sector, followed by consultancy companies and local and national government.

### **Conclusion**

*Master's programme Crisis and Security 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.*

The CSM programme has seen several changes. As described in more detail above, some of the most prominent changes are the revised thesis trajectory with a new thesis coordinator linking students to supervisors at an earlier stage and a more transparent assessment, the introduction of new teaching and assessment methods, and the introduction of seven elective courses in the first half of the programme, from which students can take two. These are all changes about which the panel was very positive.

The self-evaluation report lists five ways in which it uses students' input for curriculum development: through regular course evaluations, extra meetings with students, thesis supervision evaluation, programme evaluation and the National Student Survey ('Nederlandse Studenten Enquête', NSE). The regular course evaluations are organised by the Programme Committee. During the site visit, the panel spoke to the Programme Committees that was responsible for this programme until September 2017. With the move of the programme to the research institute ISGA, the programme now has its own Board of Examiners and Programme Committee, that serve both the new bachelor's programme and the master's programme CSM. The previous Programme Committee consisted of three students – one for the master's programme Public Administration, one for the master's programme Public Sector Management (MPS) and one for the CSM programme. The Programme Committee had an advisory role for the Course and Examinations Regulations, and it organised individual course evaluations. The panel concludes that this Programme Committee has functioned well as part of the quality control chain. Student members were elected and they were properly involved in the committees. However, from talking to the students, the panel learned that students do not experience the feedback cycle as very transparent. They did not know what was being done



with the course evaluations. The panel recommends the programme to communicate the results from student evaluations more clearly to the students. One way of doing this could be to incorporate students' feedback in the course manuals.

### **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.*

The programme has an active alumni policy and it has good connections to the professional field. In the past six years the programme has 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 most prominent changes that were made are mentioned above. These all followed from the Midterm Review. The Midterm Review committee also recommended specifying the 'final terms' (intended learning outcomes) of the programme and regulating the uncontrolled growth of student numbers. This panel again commented that the programme could be clearer on the kind of graduates it proposes to deliver, and should try to strive for a lower student-staff ratio to make problem-based learning work. On the whole, however, the panel is impressed with the changes sparked by the Midterm Review. It sees this as a sign the programme is open and responsive to curriculum improvement suggestions from internal and external stakeholders.

### **Considerations**

The programme has an adequate system of quality assurance in place, and students are properly involved in the process of quality control; through course evaluations, regular meetings and – most importantly – through the old and new Programme Committee. The programme reviews of 2011 and 2014 have led to numerous improvements to the programme, most prominently to a better and clearer thesis trajectory and to an impressive overall improvement of the assessment process.

### **Conclusion**

*Master's programme Crisis and Security 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'. The percentage of male/female students is more or less equal. However, at staff level the balance is more uneven: 38% of CSM staff are female and 62% are male. The panel concludes that gender diversity at staff level can still be improved.

Approximately a quarter of students come from abroad, mostly from other countries within the European Union. The programme explains that it is a challenge to make international students feel part of the Leiden community, both because of the language barrier and because they are in the Netherlands for a period of one year only. One of the proposed strategies to make international students feel more included is to regularly invite them to programme activities such as conferences and social activities organised by the study association B.I.L. In addition, the programme suggests organising special events to foster the CSM community feeling among both Dutch and international students. The panel finds the inclusion of international students important and believes that all students should feel properly included. For this reason, it is positive about the suggested strategies to make international students feel more part of the programme.

The core of the CSM programme consists of 13 ISGA staff members. Ten of them have a Dutch background, and three have an international background. The panel concludes that this imbalance also requires more attention.

### **Considerations**

The CSM programme has a clear policy for diversity among staff and students. The panel concludes that the number of male and female students is well balanced. At staff level, gender balance is less complete. Though currently not very unequal, the panel advises the programme to keep paying attention to this balance in the future. Regarding internationalisation, the panel is content to see that the programme has formulated various strategies to better include international students in the communities of the programme and the University. The number of international staff in the programme is small. The panel again recommends attention to this imbalance in future recruitment and allocation of staff to the programme.

### **Conclusion**

*Master's programme Crisis and Security Management*: the panel assesses Standard 6 as 'satisfactory'.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

### **Conclusion**

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 *master's programme Crisis and Security 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 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 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

### ***Knowledge and understanding***

The graduate of the Master program Crisis and Security Management (CSM) will have acquired:

- 1 Advanced knowledge and understanding of the multidisciplinary body of literature/ state of the art of studies in the field of governance and management of crises and security issues.
- 2 Advanced knowledge and understanding of the societal, political and administrative dynamics of crises and security issues; at the local, national and international level, as well as of the concept of security as a political, social and mental construction.
- 3 Advanced knowledge and understanding of the distinctive nature of governance in relation to crises and security issues, including the functioning of relevant stakeholders, including local (non) governmental actors and the public, private actors, as well as (inter) national governmental actors in a multi-actor and multi-level context.
- 4 Advanced knowledge and understanding of the principles of scientific research, with awareness about the main design and methodological choices commonly used studies in the field of governance and management of crises and security issues.

### ***Applying knowledge and understanding:***

The graduate of the Master program CSM is able to independently:

- 1 Identify and apply effectively a relevant theoretical or analytical framework to analyse real life (complex, multilevel, or so-called 'wicked') problems and cases in a conceptually rigorous manner.
- 2 Define and analyse problems in the field of governing and managing crises and security issues, as well as of the concept of security as a political, social and mental construction.
- 3 Discuss the main challenges and opportunities that relevant stakeholders, including local (non) governmental actors and the public, private actors, as well as (inter) national governmental actors are confronted in a multi-actor and multi-level context.
- 4 Formulate a (societal and/or academic) relevant research question. 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***

The graduate of the Master program CSM is able to:

- 1 Critically evaluate empirical research in the area of expertise, from a conceptual, theoretical and methodological viewpoint.
- 2 Reach conclusions, make judgments and/or provide solutions to concrete problems or societal issues based on empirical 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 negative side effects and unintended consequences of the governance and management of crises and security issues, within the framework of democracy and the rule of law.
- 4 Critically evaluate the effect of the social, political and administrative context and complexity on the perception and governance and management of crises and security issues.

### ***Communication***

The graduate of the Master program CSM is able to:

- 1 Present results of a research project at the level expected from academic work in the field of study of governance and management of crises and security issues.
- 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 public debates about the issues related to (the study of) crises and security issues.
- 6 Functioning effectively in a team, potentially in a multi-disciplinary and multi-cultural setting.



### ***Learning skills***

The graduate of the Master program CSM demonstrates (or is encouraged to demonstrate):

- 1 Ability to effectively identify and synthesize existing primary and secondary literature in order to address a question or problem at hand.
- 2 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.
- 3 Ability to effectively identify and use the appropriate (and new) research technologies in order to address a question or problem at hand
- 4 A mind-set to seek evidence and draw from empirical or theoretical experiences for an informed (and, when applicable, critical) judgement.
- 5 Awareness of the challenges of functioning in a complex (international) academic or professional environment in a research, advisory or executive position.

## APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Block 1	Block 2	Block 3	Block 4		
Introducing CSM	Crisis Management	Europeanization of CSM	Thesis		
Security in Historical Perspective	Research Design CSM	Local Security Networks	Thesis		
Elective ** (1) Governance of Cyber Security (2) World of Intelligence (3) Interpersonal Violence	Elective* (1) Dealing with Terrorism and Foreign Fighters (2) Security and the Rule of Law (3) Governance of Crime and Social Disorder (4) Privatization of CSM	Thesis preparation	Thesis		
<i>September intake (above)</i>		Block 3	Block 4	Block 1	Block 2
	<i>February intake (right)</i>	Introducing CSM	Crisis Management	Europeanization of CSM	Thesis
		Security in Historical Perspective	Research Design CSM	Local Security Networks	Thesis
		Elective ** (1) Governance of Cyber Security (2) World of Intelligence (3) Interpersonal Violence	Elective* (1) Dealing with Terrorism and Foreign Fighters (2) Security and the Rule of Law (3) Governance of Crime and Social Disorder (4) Privatization of CSM	Thesis preparation	Thesis

The master's consists of 5 mandatory core courses of 5 EC each, and 2 mandatory research courses of 5 EC. The thesis counts for 15 EC. Students are expected to choose 2 elective courses (each 5 EC) out of the 6 electives that are offered.

## 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	<b>Programme management</b>
11.15 – 11.30	Break
11.30 – 12.00	<b>Education Committee bachelor</b>
12.00 – 12.45	Lunch
12.45 – 13.15	<b>Students BSK</b>
13.15 – 13.45	<b>Teachers BSK</b>
13.45 – 14.15	Internal consultation
14.15 – 14.45	<b>Students PA</b> incl. alumnus BSK
14.45 – 15.15	<b>Teachers PA</b>
15.15 – 15.45	<b>Alumni and employers PA</b>
15.45 – 17.00	Internal consultation
17.00 – 17.30	<b>Students MPS</b> incl. alumnus BSK
17.30 – 18.00	<b>Teachers MPS</b>
18.00 – 18.30	<b>Alumni and employers MPS</b>
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	<b>Education Committee master</b>
09.45 – 10.15	<b>Students CSM</b> incl. alumnus BSK
10.15 – 10.45	<b>Teachers CSM</b>
10.45 – 11.00	Break
11.00 – 11.30	<b>Alumni and employers CSM</b>
11.45 – 12.15	<b>Board of Examiners</b>
12.15 – 13.30	Internal consultation (incl. lunch)
13.30 – 14.30	<b>Concluding conversation programme management</b>
14.30 – 16.30	Internal assessment panel
16.30 – 16.45	<b>Oral presentation</b>
16.45 – 17.00	Break
17.00 – 18.00	<b>Development conversation</b>

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

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 10 theses of the master's programme Crisis and Security Management. 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 CSM
- 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
- CSM Programme evaluations
- CSM Independent student assessment of the programme
- NSE 2017 FGGA opleidingen kleurverloop
- University Educational Vision Outlines 2013
- Research – Programme