

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION**

FACULTY OF ARTS

UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0722

© 2020 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN	5
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 ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	13
APPENDICES	24
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	26
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	28
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	30
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	31

This report was finalized on 27 February 2020



REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY OF GRONINGEN

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for the Higher Education Accreditation System of the Netherlands for limited programme assessments as a starting point (September 2018).

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization

Name of the programme:	International Relations and International Organization
CROHO number:	50627
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specializations or tracks:	
Location(s):	Groningen
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01-05-2020

The visit of the assessment panel History to the University of Groningen took place on 15-17 April 2019.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	University of Groningen]
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 4 February 2019. The panel that assessed the bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization consisted of:

- Dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig (chairman) is senior lecturer in War Studies, Department of War Studies, King's College London;
- Prof. dr. W.J.H. (Jan Hein) Furnée is full professor European Cultural History at Radboud University;
- Prof. Dr. P. (Peter) Bursens is full professor at the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences of the University of Antwerp;
- Prof. R. V. (Violet) Soen is associate professor Early Modern Religious History at KU Leuven;
- Mel Schickel MA, alumni Master History of Society from Erasmus University Rotterdam. He is now working as a Research Assistant at the Faculty of Behavioral and Social Sciences at the University of Amsterdam.

The panel was supported by dr. A.H.A.M. (Alexandra) Paffen, who acted as secretary.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The site visit to the bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization at the University of Groningen was part of the cluster assessment History. Between April 2019 and December 2019 the panel assessed 24 programmes at eight universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Maastricht University, Radboud University, University of Groningen, Leiden University, Utrecht University, University of Amsterdam and VU Amsterdam.

On behalf of the participating universities, quality assurance agency QANU was responsible for logistical support, panel guidance and the production of the report[s]. Dr. A.H.A.M. (Alexandra) Paffen, dr. F. (Floor) Meijer, J. (Jaïra) Azaria MA, R V.L. (Victor) van Kleef MA and drs. R.L. (Renate) Prenen acted as secretary in the cluster assessment.

During the site visit at University of Groningen, the panel was supported by dr. A.H.A.M. (Alexandra) Paffen, a certified NVAO secretary.

Panel members

The members of the assessment panel were selected based on their expertise, availability and independence. The panel of the whole cluster consisted of the following members:

- Dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig, senior lecturer in War Studies at King's College London (United Kingdom) [chair];
- Prof. dr. I.B. (Inger) Leemans, professor in Cultural History and director of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU) Graduate School [chair];
- Prof. dr. J.F.J. (Jeroen) Duindam, professor of Early Modern History at Leiden University;
- Prof. dr. W.J.H. (Jan Hein) Furnée, professor and chair of European Cultural History at the Radboud University;
- Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Bursens, professor in Political and Social Sciences at the Antwerp Centre for Institutions and Multilevel Politics and vice dean Social Sciences at University of Antwerp (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. W.P. (Wim) van Meurs, professor and chair of the Political History at Radboud University;
- Prof. dr. E. (Eric) Vanhaute, professor in Economic History and World History and co-chair of the research group Economies-Comparisons-Connections (ECC) at Ghent University (Belgium);
- V. (Vicky) Marissen LL.M., Managing Director at PACT European Affairs and partner at consultancy company EPPA;
- Dr. N. (Nico) Randeraad, associate professor in History and European Studies at Maastricht University and interim director at the Social Historical Centre Limburg;
- Prof. dr. N. (Nanci) Adler, professor in Memory, History, and Transitional Justice at the University of Amsterdam Program Director Genocide Studies at the Institute for War, Holocaust and Genocide Studies (NIOD);
- Prof. dr. K. (Koenraad) Verboven, professor of Ancient History at Ghent University (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. V. (Violet) Soen, associate professor in Early Modern Religious History and chair of the research group Early Modern History at KU Leuven (Belgium);
- Prof. dr. C.A. (Claire) Dunlop, professor in Politics and Public Policy and head of research at the Department of Politics of the University of Exeter (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. E.B.A. (Erik) van der Vleuten, professor in the History of Technology at the School of Innovation Sciences of the Eindhoven University of Technology and Scientific Director at the Foundation for the History of Technology;
- Mel Schickel MA, alumnus of the master's programme History of Society at Erasmus University Rotterdam. He is now working as an external relations officer at the Faculty of Science and Engineering of Maastricht University (MU) [student member];
- Rikst van der Schoor, student master's programme Intellectual History, University of St. Andrews (United Kingdom) [student member].

- Rico Tjepkema, bachelor's student International Relations & International Organisation at the University of Groningen [student member].

Preparation

On March 11 2019, the panel chair was briefed by QANU on his role, the assessment framework, the working method, and the planning of site visits and reports. A preparatory panel meeting was organised on 14 April 2019. During this meeting, the panel members received instruction on the use of the assessment framework(s). The panel also discussed its working method and the planning of the site visits and reports.

The project coordinator composed a schedule for the site visit in consultation with the Faculty. Prior to the site visit, the Faculty selected representative partners for the various interviews. See Appendix 3 for the final schedule.

Before the site visit to University of Groningen, QANU received the self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the panel. A thesis selection was made by the panel chair and the project coordinator. The selection consisted of 15 theses and their assessment forms for the programmes, based on a provided list of graduates between 2017-2018. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project coordinator and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

After studying the self-evaluation report, theses and assessment forms, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings. The secretary collected all initial questions and remarks and distributed these amongst all panel members.

At the start of the site visit, the panel discussed its initial findings on the self-evaluation report(s) and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit.

Site visit

The site visit to University of Groningen took place on 15-17 April 2019. Before and/or during the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No requests for private consultation were received.

The panel used the final part of the site visit to discuss its findings in an internal meeting. Afterwards, the panel chair publicly presented the panel's preliminary findings and general observations.

Consistency and calibration

In order to assure the consistency of assessment within the cluster, various measures were taken:

1. The panel composition ensured regular attendance of (key) panel members, including the chair;
2. The coordinator was present at the panel discussion leading to the preliminary findings at all site visits;

Report

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to another secretary for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project coordinator sent the draft report(s) to the Faculty in order to have it/these checked for factual irregularities. The project coordinator discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty and University Board.

Definition of judgements standards

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited programme assessments, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the standards:

Generic quality

The quality that, from an international perspective, may reasonably be expected from a higher education Associate Degree, Bachelor's or Master's programme.

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard to a significant extent, but improvements are required in order to fully meet the standard.

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

The panel used the following definitions for the assessment of the programme as a whole:

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

The programme meets standard 1 and partially meets a maximum of two standards, with the imposition of conditions being recommended by the panel.

Negative

In the following situations:

- The programme fails to meet one or more standards;
- The programme partially meets standard 1;
- The programme partially meets one or two standards, without the imposition of conditions being recommended by the panel;
- The programme partially meets three or more standards.

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Standard 1

The panel believes the profile of the bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization (IRIO) is truly international, multidisciplinary, and academic (research-based), with attention being paid to professional skills. The ILOs are linked to the profile and the Dublin Descriptors at bachelor's level. They are very well chosen and formulated with a great eye for detail and depth. However, the programme's multidisciplinary goals could be expressed in the ILOs. Furthermore, the programme could benefit from an Advisory Board that can advise on how the visibility of professional skills and thereby the labour market orientation in the programme can be improved.

Standard 2

In accordance with the profile and ILOs, the bachelor's programme comprises several disciplinary learning trajectories: students acquire knowledge within the areas of history and theory of international relations, in political science, in international law, and in international economics. These disciplinary learning trajectories are brought together to allow for a multidisciplinary understanding of the complexities of international affairs, although the panel believes that the multidisciplinary perspective could be strengthened in some courses. The programme is research-based, in the sense that courses establish links between the specialisation of the staff members and the interests of the students, and in the sense that students are taught research and writing skills. Professional skills are also part of the programme. Finally, the study of a modern foreign language is mandatory. Parts of the curriculum are flexible, giving students the opportunity to follow their specific interests. On the basis of the material studied, both the curriculum content and structure appear satisfactory to the panel.

Although the language component is seen as a stumbling block by students, the programme can be justifiably proud of the relatively high pass rates of both the first year (BSA) and of the bachelor's programme as a whole. The programme has already taken several measures to address the study delay problems students face with the language component.

The programme has a matrix in which the connection between the courses and the ILOs is visualized and another one for the courses and their assessments. The matrices clearly specify the relationship between the ILOs and the courses, as well as that between the courses and their assessments. The panel does advise to harmonise both matrices with the information in Ocasys (study guide).

The panel was impressed by the strong international character of both the programme and the curriculum, symbolized for instance by the non-western focus of many courses, but also by an international student body, a high proportion of non-Dutch staff, and multiple student exchanges. This international as well as the multidisciplinary character of the programme are greatly valued by the students. However, as with all multi- or interdisciplinary programmes, there should be a constant awareness of the danger of breadth and variety leading to a loss of intellectual depth.

The panel believes the international composition of the staff, in combination with their diversity in expertise, is one of the main assets of the programme. The lecturers are driven, committed, enthusiastic, eager, and willing to seek continuous improvement in the curriculum. Furthermore, they are open to feedback and suggestions from students and peers. Their English language skills are highly rated by the students.

The programme prizes active learning and the associated assessment methods, but the panel believes – in agreement with the students of the programme – that more emphasis should be put on turning these ambitions into practical reality. For instance, the progression and variety in assessments can be improved further and the programme should make use of constructive alignment. This will help stimulate and activate student learning. Furthermore, the panel noted an adverse relationship between the workload and the assessment practices as well as one between the workload and the large group sizes – especially of the *Core Module* –, and the high number of these



supervised by each staff member. Partly as a consequence of these large numbers and the apparent workload, the third-year students seem to lack supervision that in some theses appears to lead to a lack of analytical and critical depth. It was encouraging to hear that measures are being taken to address these issues and that there are plans to increase the teaching capacity.

Standard 3

The Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER) of the bachelor's programme IRIO contain (1) a matrix linking the Dublin Descriptors of the programme to the ILOs and the specific courses and (2) an assessment plan with detailed information per course about the type of assessments and the weeks in which exams and resits take place. This information is also made available and transparent to the students through the course manuals. The ILOs are assessed by different assessment methods, both formative and summative. All examiners must ensure that an assessment dossier is made available to the Board of Examiners (BoE) after a course is completed.

The system of assessment is adequate. The matrix is insightful, although the research skills in particular could be tested more frequently. Furthermore, too many assessments are still focused too much on the reproduction of knowledge rather than testing understanding and developing critical, analytical insight. The staff is working on this and the panel recommends asking advice from experts (toetsingsdeskundigen) in this field.

The bachelor thesis (10 EC) assesses many of the programme's ILOs. Every thesis is submitted to the plagiarism detector Ephorus and is graded by the supervisor and a second reader. The supervisor and second reader assess the student's performance independently based on a standardized assessment form. The panel considers the assessment procedure of the thesis thorough and the assessment form as such very good, although the bar is set too high concerning the degree of independence expected from a bachelor student. There should be a real difference between the requirements imposed on bachelor graduates and master graduates. Furthermore, the panel did observe a great variety in the quantity and quality of the feedback (especially by the second reader). It was sometimes difficult for the panel to see how the grade was established. The panel noted with satisfaction that the assessment form was recently adjusted so that the second readers have to deliver a more qualitative judgement.

The BoE acts in accordance with a three-yearly cycle as laid down in the quality assurance protocol of the RUG. This means that the quality of the assessment of all courses (based on the assessment dossiers supplied by lecturers) is guaranteed once every three years. In addition, each semester the Board evaluates a number of bachelor's theses and courses. The panel thinks the current BoE functions adequately and performs its statutory duties.

Standard 4

Each one of the 15 bachelor theses sampled was of a passable level and met the requirements associated with a bachelor's thesis. The theses addressed an impressive range of topics and issues, doing justice to the breadth and ambition of the programme, even though a substantial number of students found the application of theory, method and critical analysis challenging.

The programme thus demonstrates that it meets the ILOs. However, the theses are in general embedded within one discipline. There may be a missed opportunity here for a programme with an explicit multidisciplinary profile. Although the ILOs do not mention multi- or interdisciplinarity, at the least, the panel would like to see some reflection by the students on the chosen method/disciplinary perspective in the thesis.

The panel congratulates the programme on its pro-active alumni association. This is a strong asset that perhaps can be used to good advantage more frequently. The panel spoke with a number of master students and alumni who had completed the IRIO bachelor's programme. They all expressed satisfaction and felt well prepared for their master's programmes. The programme has no precise exit data. It only knows that around 20% of its bachelor graduates enter the master's programme

IR at the RUG. The panel urges the programme to perform an alumni survey of its bachelor graduates.

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

Bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes meets the standard

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment meets the standard

Standard 3: Student assessment meets the standard

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes meets the standard

General conclusion

positive

The chair, dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig, and the secretary, dr. A.H.A.M. (Alexandra) Paffen, 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: 27 February 2020

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the expectations of the professional field, the discipline, and international requirements.

Findings

Profile

The bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization (IRIO) of the Faculty of Arts (RUG) is a full-time academic programme that prepares graduates for both further academic training and the labour market. It intends its graduates to become "internationalists", who are fit to continue their academic training through the pursuit of a master or research master in International Relations or a closely associated discipline, or who can enter the labour market in professions that require knowledge and skills at the bachelor's level, such as policy-making and policy-advising functions (junior) at the local, national, international, and supranational level. The focus of the programme is on international relations and especially on the role of international organisations from four perspectives: historical, political, economic and legal. It adheres to the principle that bringing these multiple disciplinary perspectives together offers students a better understanding of global challenges.

Because of this focus, the programme is characterized by a number of features:

- *Its international character*: the study of a modern foreign language is an integral part of the programme, throughout the curriculum attention is paid to issues and perspectives that go beyond the Dutch or European contexts (see Standard 2), and the composition of both its student body and that of its staff is increasingly diverse.
- *Its multidisciplinary understanding of international relations*. Students acquire knowledge from different disciplines. As they progress through the programme, these disciplines are brought together (see Standard 2).
- *Its attention to both academic and professional skills*. The programme is research-based: in most courses a link is made between the specialisation of the staff members and the interests of the students and by incorporating elements such as writing policy briefs, participating in a negotiation simulation game, and conducting group work, the programme contributes to the employability of its graduates (see Standard 2).

The language component is one of the characteristics that sets this IRIO bachelor apart from other IR programmes. Also, the international law and international economics components tend to be smaller at some other IR programmes.

The panel appreciates the programme's goals of educating internationalists and its focus on a global context beyond Dutch and European issues. The same applies to its multidisciplinary profile with a solid and partly unique language component. The latter component is also seen by students and graduates as an important element. Furthermore, the panel heard that for students and alumni, the international atmosphere as well as the multidisciplinary analysis of international relations are important reasons for choosing this particular IR programme.

Intended learning outcomes (ILOs)

The ILOs of the programme are modelled on the Dublin Descriptors (DD) at the bachelor's level (for an overview, see appendix 1). In addition, they have been guided by the internationally agreed Tuning Sectoral Framework for the Social Sciences and benchmarked with the Subject Benchmark Statement 'Politics and International Relations' that is part of the UK Quality Assurance Code for Higher Education.



The panel found the ILOs to be well chosen and formulated. Although they are modelled on the DD, they are more specific and detail in depth what is expected from students upon graduation, especially with regard to the first descriptor, 'Knowledge and Understanding'. Within the DD Communication, the ILOs explicitly make clear what level of language skills is expected.

The last visitation panel suggested emphasising professional skills more strongly in the ILOs. The programme picked up on this but, according to the panel, could consider setting up an Advisory Board with stakeholders and alumni to advise on this issue. It is striking that both the National Student Enquiry (NSE) and the self-evaluation report signal that the labour market orientation could be strengthened further. This could probably be addressed by making the ways in which the skills are taught and how they contribute to employability more explicit throughout the programme and have this reinforced further by an Advisory Board.

The panel has one important remark: the profile of the programme explicitly refers to multidisciplinary, but none of the ILOs mentions multidisciplinary or the integration of perspectives (interdisciplinarity). The programme should either downplay this claim in the profile or think of ways of integrating this firmly in the ILOs. The panel would recommend the latter.

Connection with the professional field

Although no exact data are available, the programme thinks that almost all of the graduates choose to continue their education by starting a master's programme at RUG or elsewhere. Current students told the panel that they do not see the bachelor's programme as a final step. This suggests that there is a mismatch between student (and possibly staff) expectations and the independent, free-standing value of a bachelor's degree that is integral to the ILOs and DD. This issue is not unique to this programme, but it does highlight that some attention should be paid to communicating the independent value of a bachelor's degree.

Considerations

The panel believes the profile of the bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organisations (IRIO) is truly international, multidisciplinary, and academic (research-based), with attention being paid to professional skills. The ILOs are linked to the profile and the Dublin Descriptors at bachelor's level. They are very well chosen and formulated with a great eye for detail and depth. However, the programme's multidisciplinary goals could be expressed in the ILOs. Furthermore, the programme could benefit from an Advisory Board that can advise on how the visibility of professional skills and thereby the labour market orientation in the programme can be improved.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Findings

Vision on education and curriculum

The programme's vision on education, as presented in the self-evaluation report, is student-centred, employs active and research-based learning methods, and develops professional skills. This student-centred approach presupposes that the teaching, learning, and assessment methods are not only activating in nature, but that the student has significant responsibility for his or her own learning process. If the programme prizes active learning and the associated assessment methods, then the panel believes – in accordance with the students of the programme – that more emphasis could be put on turning these ambitions into practical reality. For example, a great number of assessments are multiple choice (MC) and mostly focused on testing knowledge through a final examination

(especially in the first year). In addition, some advanced courses have large group sizes that do not necessarily stimulate active learning.

In accordance with the profile and ILOs, the programme comprises several disciplinary learning trajectories (for an overview of the curriculum, see appendix 2):

- students acquire knowledge within the areas of history and theory of international relations (for example, in the *History of International Relations I and II*, *International Politics*, *International Organization* and *Theory of International Relations* courses),
- in political science (in *Political Science* and *Policy and Governance*),
- in international law (in *Introduction to International and European Law*, *IRIO European Law* and *IRIO International Law*),
- and in international economics (in *Introduction to Economics*, *International Political Economy of Monetary Relations* and *International Political Economy of Trade*).

These disciplinary learning trajectories are not studied in isolation but are brought together to allow for a multidisciplinary understanding of the complexities of international affairs. In the *Core Modules* (year 3), for instance, conflicts are studied from historical, political and economic perspectives.

The programme is research-based, in the sense that courses establish links between the specialisation of the staff members and the interests of the students, and in the sense that students are taught research and writing skills that are put to use in the various assignments throughout the different courses. It also includes a research and writing trajectory that spans courses in all three years. The first-year course *Academic Skills for International Relations* introduces students to research and writing skills, which are developed further in the second-year course *Theory of International Relations*. The *Statistics for IR* course (year 1) trains students in quantitative approaches to research. The second-year course *Methodology and Research Practice* improves research and writing skills in preparation for the *Bachelor's Thesis*.

Professional skills are also part of the programme. An example is the policy brief that is written in preparation for the negotiation simulation game in the *Policy and Governance* course (year 2). The panel understood that students would like more attention paid throughout the curriculum to professional skills training. Although it does not fully agree with this remark, since it does believe that sufficient attention is paid to professional skills training for a bachelor's programme, student comments suggest that making more use of the well-organised alumni network (e.g. for guest lectures) should be considered. The panel learned that the programme already tried this – unfortunately unsuccessful – in the past, but thinks the programme should give it another try. This would offer an opportunity to underline the degree and effectiveness of the professional skills component.

Finally, the study of a modern foreign language is mandatory. Students can choose from a wide variety of languages: Chinese, Dutch, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Swedish, and Russian. Among other languages, Arabic will be an option in the future.

Parts of the curriculum are flexible, giving students the opportunity to follow their specific interests. One opportunity for choice is the language track (30EC). The same applies to the *Core Module* (10EC): while a mandatory module, students can choose from a variety of topics in it. They are required to write their *Bachelor's Thesis* (10EC) on a topic related to the theme of the *Core Module* they elected. Given the wide variety of topics addressed in these modules, this provides students with the opportunity to focus more in depth on the region/issue/perspective that interests them the most. In the first semester of the third year, there is a free space of 30EC which students can use to do, for example, an exchange programme, an internship or a minor.

In recent years the programme has paid attention to strengthening the formulation of the course-specific learning goals. The ILOs guide these learning goals. Where applicable, they build upon each



other and jointly cover the ILOs. The programme has a matrix in which the connection between the courses and the ILOs is visualized and another one for the courses and their assessments.

The panel believes the matrices clearly specify the relationship between the ILOs and the courses, as well as that between the courses and their assessments. It advises the programme to harmonise both matrices with the information in Ocasys (study guide) as there are some inconsistencies. Also, specific ILOs are mentioned and referred to in some course descriptions, but in others, course-specific learning objectives are formulated with no clear reference to the ILOs.

The panel was impressed by the strong international character of the curriculum, symbolized for instance by the non-western focus of many courses. This feature as well as the multidisciplinary character of the programme are also greatly valued by the students. However, as with all multi- or interdisciplinary programmes, both management and lecturers should constantly be on guard against the danger of breadth and variety leading to a loss of intellectual depth. The panel suggests therefore that the programme management and programme committee seek interaction with the students on their perceived lack of time for in-depth critical analysis and reflection within the current curriculum.

On the basis of the material studied, both the curriculum content and structure appear satisfactory to the panel. The first year consists of introductory courses (in History, IR, etc.) and academic skills and the start of the language skills trajectory. The second year involves a deepening immersion in theory/methodology, language and more specific themes, and the final year concludes with a minor and preparation for the thesis. However, before the site visit, the panel had questions concerning the learning trajectories, especially regarding research skills and methodology. It was unclear from the material studied (e.g., self-evaluation, selected courses) how the learning trajectories progressed in terms of both content and assignments and assessments. The panel was also unsure about which courses (other than the *Core Modules*) paid attention to the integration of the various disciplines.

These issues were clarified during the visit, although the panel still believes that the multidisciplinary perspective could be strengthened in some courses. The interviews with management, lecturers and students were open, at times animated and always informative. It emerged that in practice, much informal interaction and oral exchange (both institutionalized and informal) occurs among staff members regarding the curriculum. Everyone agreed, however, that room for improvement continues to exist. The panel was convinced by both students and lecturers that the curriculum content does contain structure and progressions and that a pronounced skills trajectory exists. The progression and variety in assessments can be improved further, despite the changes and improvements that have already been made in the last years. The panel would urge the programme organisers to pursue this track and, for instance, make use of 'constructive alignment'. This will help stimulate and activate student learning. It would also assist the programme management in more clearly formulating learning trajectories, for instance, in study and course guides.

Regarding the third year, the panel judged from the sample of theses it read that a number of students struggle with applying theory and methodology in their theses. It urges the programme to develop ways of addressing this and consider strengthening the preparatory trajectory leading to the thesis. According to the lecturers, the formulation of a good research question and the development of a design for a research project are explicitly addressed, in the methodology courses and the *Core Module*, respectively. But many students still seem to lose these skills somewhere along the way. The panel also noted that most theses are, although thematic, still mono- instead of multidisciplinary, and many apply what appears to be a rather randomly chosen variety of methods. The panel can accept that applying multidisciplinary presents a significant practical challenge to bachelor students, but at the very least, for a programme that claims multidisciplinary as a central goal, the students can be required to reflect on this challenge in their thesis. It could help to state the goals of the thesis and what is expected from students clearly and explicitly in the thesis manual. The current manual is not very helpful in this regard because of its length and detail.

Feasibility

According to the programme management, there are no major stumbling blocks in the current programme, although students can experience challenges, because of differing levels of preparedness and aptitude, that are more pronounced and varied in a broad, multidisciplinary programme than may be the case in a specific law, economics or history programme. From the student chapter in the self-evaluation, it emerged that although the experiences vary per chosen language, the language component can pose a major stumbling block and therefore constitutes the main reason for study delay. The programme has sought to address this by offering the language courses in every semester instead of in just one, by providing students with better information, and by better calibrating the student's existing language proficiency with that of the level of the language course (because there are different entry levels, see ILO 11).

The panel appreciates these pro-active measures and believes that offering the language courses twice a year will likely help to remedy the study delay. It also believes that, although it may cause delay, the language component is a strong selling point of this programme, and students view it as an important element.

The panel also noted study delays that occur because of extracurricular activities as well as internships. Nonetheless, in general, it believes the programme can be justifiably proud of the relatively high pass rates of both the first year (BSA) and of the bachelor's programme as a whole.

Intake

With an average of 750 registered students overall, the bachelor's programme IRIO has grown to become the largest programme within the Faculty of Arts. The programme currently has a numerus fixus with a maximum intake of 260 students per year. It has a system of decentralized selection: applicants need to submit a dossier with supporting evidence including a list of grades, an essay addressing a question about an assigned academic article, an overview of relevant extracurricular activities, and answers to questions about their interest in the programme.

The students who enter the programme mostly come from the Netherlands or other EU countries. Students with a non-EU background also increasingly find their way to the programme, although their number continues to be small. The panel is impressed by both the diversity of the student population and the way they seem to fit in, and by the thorough admissions and introduction process, which in its view contributes to the good pass and progression rates.

Staff and supervision

The teaching staff is mostly drawn from the five Professorial Chair Groups that make up the Cluster IRIO. The law modules involve staff from the Law Faculty, and some courses on economics draw on economic historians from the History Department. The foreign language components are taught by staff from the Language departments. Staff members actively participate in and shape academic debates in their respective fields in order to connect their own research interests with their teaching. Of the staff members, 39% is Dutch, 47% is from the EU, and 14% is non-EU. In terms of teaching expertise: 75% of the teaching staff possesses a University Teaching Qualification (UTQ), and 13% is in the process of obtaining one. Of the people who do not have a UTQ, the majority are temporary staff.

The panel believes the international composition of the staff, in combination with their diversity in expertise, is one of the main assets of the programme. From the meetings with the staff during the site visit, it became clear that the lecturers are driven, committed, enthusiastic, eager, and willing to seek continuous improvement in the curriculum. Furthermore, they are open to feedback and suggestions from students and peers. Their English language skills are highly rated by the students. The panel believes that this relatively young group of lecturers can benefit from advice from experienced educational experts, in particular with respect to a clearer formal expression on paper of the curriculum design that operates already informally in practice (e.g., study guide and course syllabi).



The panel was struck by the fact that students, both in interviews and in the student chapter, expressed concern about the workload and work pressure imposed upon lecturers. It also noted a connection between the workload and assessment practices, for example, the already noted reliance on digital multiple-choice exams, the large group sizes of especially the *Core Module*, and the high number of theses supervised by each staff member. The public, student awareness of this issue underlines that the workload and its attendant pressures need to be addressed by the Faculty.

Another point requiring attention, and one that is clearly connected to the previous one, is the supervision of students in the third year. Third-year bachelor students need more supervision than master students, especially during the thesis process. The number of students in the *Core Module* and the number of supervisees per lecturer are too large, and partly as a consequence, the panel noted a lack of analytical and critical depth in some theses. It was encouraged to hear that measures are being taken and that there are plans to increase the teaching capacity.

Considerations

In accordance with the profile and ILOs, the bachelor's programme comprises several disciplinary learning trajectories: students acquire knowledge within the areas of history and theory of international relations, in political science, in international law, and in international economics. These disciplinary learning trajectories are brought together to allow for a multidisciplinary understanding of the complexities of international affairs, although the panel believes that the multidisciplinary perspective could be strengthened in some courses. The programme is research-based, in the sense that courses establish links between the specialisation of the staff members and the interests of the students, and in the sense that students are taught research and writing skills. Professional skills are also part of the programme. Finally, the study of a modern foreign language is mandatory. Parts of the curriculum are flexible, giving students the opportunity to follow their specific interests. On the basis of the material studied, both the curriculum content and structure appear satisfactory to the panel.

Although the language component is seen as a stumbling block by students, the programme can be justifiably proud of the relatively high pass rates of both the first year (BSA) and of the bachelor's programme as a whole. The programme has already taken several measures to address the study delay problems students face with the language component.

The programme has a matrix in which the connection between the courses and the ILOs is visualized and another one for the courses and their assessments. The matrices clearly specify the relationship between the ILOs and the courses, as well as that between the courses and their assessments. The panel does advise to harmonise both matrices with the information in Ocasys (study guide).

The panel was impressed by the strong international character of both the programme and the curriculum, symbolized for instance by the non-western focus of many courses, but also by an international student body, a high proportion of non-Dutch staff, and multiple student exchanges. This international as well as the multidisciplinary character of the programme are greatly valued by the students. However, as with all multi- or interdisciplinary programmes, there should be a constant awareness of the danger of breadth and variety leading to a loss of intellectual depth.

The panel believes the international composition of the staff, in combination with their diversity in expertise, is one of the main assets of the programme. The lecturers are driven, committed, enthusiastic, eager, and willing to seek continuous improvement in the curriculum. Furthermore, they are open to feedback and suggestions from students and peers. Their English language skills are highly rated by the students.

The programme prizes active learning and the associated assessment methods, but the panel believes – in agreement with the students of the programme – that more emphasis should be put on turning these ambitions into practical reality. For instance, the progression and variety in assessments can be improved further and the programme should make use of constructive

alignment. This will help stimulate and activate student learning. Furthermore, the panel noted an adverse relationship between the workload and the assessment practices as well as one between the workload and the large group sizes - especially of the *Core Module* -, and the high number of theses supervised by each staff member. Partly as a consequence of these large numbers and the apparent workload, the third-year students seem to lack supervision that in some theses appears to lead to a lack of analytical and critical depth. It was encouraging to hear that measures are being taken to address these issues and that there are plans to increase the teaching capacity.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

The programme has an adequate system of student assessment in place.

Findings

System of assessment

A new type of assessment plan has been developed by the Faculty of Arts, which will be introduced in 2019-2020. The plan provides a detailed breakdown of the course-specific learning outcomes and assessment types in each individual course, as well as a detailed overview of the ways in which each individual course contributes to the achievement of the programme's learning outcomes. This information is currently available and transparent for the students through the course manuals and the Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER). The current OER contains (1) a matrix for the bachelor's programme IRIO linking the Dublin Descriptors to the ILOs and the specific courses and (2) an assessment plan with detailed information per course about the type of assessments and the weeks in which exams and resits take place.

The ILOs are assessed by different assessment methods in various courses, both formative and summative. Some courses rely on more traditional written exams with essay questions (often in the form of digital exams), other courses employ written exams that are a combination of multiple-choice questions, open questions, true/false statement questions, timeline questions, and questions that make use of maps (again often in digital form). Over the years, the number and types of written assignments have increased. Oral types of assessment are used to assess a student's ability to give a presentation or participate in a negotiation simulation game.

All examiners must ensure that an assessment file is made available to the Board of Examiners (BoE) after a course is completed, which includes the course manual with assessment criteria, model answers, assignment instructions, grades, and the student assessment feedback forms.

The panel finds the system of assessment adequate. The matrix is insightful, although the panel maintains that the research skills in particular could be tested more frequently. Furthermore, it agrees with the students that too many tests are still focused too much on the reproduction of knowledge rather than testing understanding and developing critical, analytical insight. It learned that the staff is working on this and recommends asking advice from experts (toetsingsdeskundigen) in this field.

Thesis assessment

The bachelor thesis (10 EC) assesses many of the programme's ILOs. Students first write a thesis proposal. If this is not satisfactory, a second attempt will be allowed. Once the proposal is approved, the individual research process begins. The first draft of the thesis is not assessed by the supervisor but by fellow students after its presentation during a symposium. After the symposium the students have the opportunity to process the comments and thereafter hand in the final version to their supervisor. Every thesis is submitted to the plagiarism detector Ephorus and is graded by the supervisor and a second reader. The supervisor grades the student's performance based on a



standardized assessment form. In the assessment form the student's performance on the different ILOs is assessed, and feedback is provided. The second reader is meant to double check and confirm independently whether the thesis is of sufficient quality and the assessment is consistent with the standards set for the programme and module. If the supervisor and the second reader disagree by more than half a grade point, they first see if they can come to an agreement, if not, the thesis is referred to the BoE, which appoints a third reader.

The panel considers the assessment procedure of the thesis thorough in theory. It studied 15 theses and their assessment forms and noticed a great variety in the quantity and quality of the feedback. There were cases in which the feedback was so minimal that it was difficult for the panel to see how the grade was established. There were also cases in which the qualitative judgement seemed to contradict the formal criteria on the form. The second reader assessments at times had a pro forma quality about them and did not offer clear evidence of an independent judgement. The latter could be remedied if the second reader used a more extensive, separate assessment form. The panel noted with satisfaction during the site visit that the assessment form was recently adjusted so that the second readers have to deliver more qualitative judgement.

The panel found the assessment form as such to be very good. The connection with the ILOs was very clear, and the distribution of the grades in six categories affords a good degree of nuance in the grading process, although the bar was set too high concerning the degree of independence expected from a bachelor student. There should be a real difference between the requirements imposed on bachelor graduates and master graduates. It would also advise the supervisors and especially the second readers to make better use of this exemplary form and give students adequate, reasoned written feedback and avoid merely 'ticking the boxes' – although it learned from both students and lecturers during the site visit that substantial oral feedback is habitually offered to students. Although the panel recognises that this might add to the workload, the 'zessenregeling' that is used in the History Department to adequately assure the fairness and consistency of borderline pass/fail marks might also be of value to IRIO.

Board of Examiners (BoE)

The BoE acts in accordance with a three-yearly cycle as laid down in the quality assurance protocol of the RUG. This means that the quality of the assessment of all courses (based on the assessment dossiers supplied by lecturers) is guaranteed once every three years. In addition, each semester a number of bachelor's theses and courses are evaluated by the Board. The panel thinks the current BoE functions adequately, although a lot of the interaction is informal in nature. It performs its statutory duties, thereby making a contribution to ensuring the quality of the programme and its curriculum. In addition to its statutory duties, the BoE is also proactive and regularly advises the cluster board. The panel finds this admirable, certainly in view of the aforementioned workload challenges.

Considerations

The Teaching and Examination Regulations (OER) of the bachelor's programme IRIO contain (1) a matrix linking the Dublin Descriptors of the programme to the ILOs and the specific courses and (2) an assessment plan with detailed information per course about the type of assessments and the weeks in which exams and resits take place. This information is also made available and transparent to the students through the course manuals. The ILOs are assessed by different assessment methods, both formative and summative. All examiners must ensure that an assessment dossier is made available to the Board of Examiners (BoE) after a course is completed.

The system of assessment is adequate. The matrix is insightful, although the research skills in particular could be tested more frequently. Furthermore, too many assessments are still focused too much on the reproduction of knowledge rather than testing understanding and developing critical, analytical insight. The staff is working on this and the panel recommends asking advice from experts (toetsingsdeskundigen) in this field.

The bachelor thesis (10 EC) assesses many of the programme's ILOs. Every thesis is submitted to the plagiarism detector Ephorus and is graded by the supervisor and a second reader. The supervisor and second reader assess the student's performance independently based on a standardized assessment form. The panel considers the assessment procedure of the thesis thorough and the assessment form as such very good, although the bar is set too high concerning the degree of independence expected from a bachelor student. There should be a real difference between the requirements imposed on bachelor graduates and master graduates. Furthermore, the panel did observe a great variety in the quantity and quality of the feedback (especially by the second reader). It was sometimes difficult for the panel to see how the grade was established. The panel noted with satisfaction that the assessment form was recently adjusted so that the second readers have to deliver a more qualitative judgement.

The BoE acts in accordance with a three-yearly cycle as laid down in the quality assurance protocol of the RUG. This means that the quality of the assessment of all courses (based on the assessment dossiers supplied by lecturers) is guaranteed once every three years. In addition, each semester the Board evaluates a number of bachelor's theses and courses. The panel thinks the current BoE functions adequately and performs its statutory duties.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Theses

Each one of the sample of 15 theses was of a passable level according to the panel and met the requirements associated with a bachelor's thesis. As a whole, the theses addressed an impressive range of topics and issues, doing justice to the breadth and ambition of the programme. The marking was in general considered fair and consistent, even though the panel judged it as tending to be on the high side. While the English proficiency varied, it was generally considered good, especially considering the bachelor level. The theses showed a strong empirical quality, even though a substantial number found the application of theory, method and critical analysis challenging – which again is not unusual in bachelor's theses. This could partly be remedied by more supervision hours in the third year (see Standard 2).

While the programme thus demonstrates that it meets the ILOs, one issue requires clarification. Although the ILOs do not mention multi- or interdisciplinarity, the programme itself is explicitly advertised as multidisciplinary. However, as indicated above, the theses are in general embedded within one discipline. This is not a problem in itself (especially considering that the ILOs do not at present demand multidisciplinary), but it may be a missed opportunity for a programme that prides itself in its profile on its multidisciplinary offering. At the least, the panel would like to see some more reflection by the students on the chosen method/disciplinary perspective in the thesis.

Alumni and professional field

The programme has an active alumni association. It functions as a link between the programme (both bachelor and master) and its graduates. It organizes numerous social events in which networking and experience-sharing take centre stage. In 2018, the alumni association analysed the employment of graduates among its 939 members. Most graduates (40%) work in the public sector (national and regional government, education or international organisations), followed by the private sector (34%), the non-profit sector (10%) and other (16%).



The panel congratulates the programme on this pro-active alumni association. This is a strong asset that perhaps can be used to good advantage more frequently. Both the programme management and the panel regretted that this alumni survey did not make a distinction between bachelor and master graduates. That is one reason why the programme has no exact data on the bachelor graduates, and this reinforces the lack of clarity regarding the already noted independent value of a bachelor's degree. The panel urges the programme to introduce its own survey. The idea that most graduates continue their studies is now anecdotal, and the programme only knows that around 20% of its bachelor graduates enter the master's programme IR at the RUG. It may be the case that greater numbers of graduates than now known do not decide to continue to an master's degree and consider an IRIO degree a fully satisfactory higher education end-point; or it may be that many graduates are lost to Groningen and move to master's programmes at other universities. It could be beneficial to the programme to do some research on these numbers.

During the site visit, the panel met a number of master students and alumni who had completed the IRIO bachelor's programme. They all expressed satisfaction and felt well prepared for their master's programme, but echoing comments from current students, they also felt that more attention could be paid to professional skills training and that perhaps internships should receive more encouragement.

Considerations

Each one of the 15 bachelor theses sampled was of a passable level and met the requirements associated with a bachelor's thesis. The theses addressed an impressive range of topics and issues, doing justice to the breadth and ambition of the programme, even though a substantial number of students found the application of theory, method and critical analysis challenging.

The programme thus demonstrates that it meets the ILOs. However, the theses are in general embedded within one discipline. There may be a missed opportunity here for a programme with an explicit multidisciplinary profile. Although the ILOs do not mention multi- or interdisciplinarity, at the least, the panel would like to see some reflection by the students on the chosen method/disciplinary perspective in the thesis.

The panel congratulates the programme on its pro-active alumni association. This is a strong asset that perhaps can be used to good advantage more frequently. The panel spoke with a number of master students and alumni who had completed the IRIO bachelor's programme. They all expressed satisfaction and felt well prepared for their master's programmes. The programme has no precise exit data. It only knows that around 20% of its bachelor graduates enter the master's programme IR at the RUG. The panel urges the programme to perform an alumni survey of its bachelor graduates.

Conclusion

Bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel's assessment of Standards 1, 2, 3 and 4 for the bachelor's degree programme IRIO is "meets the standard". According to the decision rules of the NVAO, the general final opinion about this programme is therefore "positive".

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Dublin Descriptors	plo	A Bachelor's graduate has demonstrated:
<p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>1. Students have demonstrable knowledge and understanding in a field of study that builds upon their general secondary education, and is typically at a level that, whilst supported by advanced textbooks, includes some aspects that will be informed by knowledge of the forefront of their field of study.</p>	1	knowledge and understanding of the most important classic and contemporary theories and approaches in the analysis of international relations
	2	knowledge and understanding of key concepts and concept structures in the study of political phenomena, such as politics, the state, society, political systems and power
	3a	basic knowledge and understanding of the political and diplomatic history of international relations since 1815 and knowledge and understanding of the political, legal and economic aspects of international organization and of international organizations since 1945, as well as of these aspects within the relations between states, international governmental and non-governmental organizations and multinational enterprises
	3b	knowledge and understanding of the political, legal and economic aspects of European cooperation and integration
	3c	knowledge and understanding of international law and European law
	3d	knowledge and understanding of the theories and models of international economics
	4	advanced knowledge and understanding of one of the focus areas of the degree programme, including Global Governance, International Political Economy, European Integration and International Security
	5	knowledge of methods of historical, legal, social-scientific and national/international economic research.
<p>Applying knowledge and understanding</p> <p>2. Students can apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner that indicates a professional approach to their work or vocation, and have competences typically demonstrated through devising and sustaining arguments and solving problems within their field of study.</p>	6a	ability to independently formulate a research problem definition and develop it into a research design
	6b	ability to conduct a small-scale research project under supervision and process the results into an analytical report, and mastery of social-scientific and/or historical research techniques
	7	ability to think in a problem-oriented way and to place processes and structures relevant to the problem into a theoretical context
	8	mastery of generic academic skills such as logical reasoning, the ability to adduce arguments, the ability to arrange unstructured problems in an academic way
<p>Making judgements</p>	9	ability to apply knowledge, understanding and skills to the systematic and critical evaluation of a wide variety of concepts, ideas and data and to the identification and analysis of complex problems and issues

<p>3. Students have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgements that include reflection on relevant social, scientific or ethical issues.</p>	10	<p>ability to grasp the social implications of opinions and taking moral responsibility for opinions formed and given, while taking into account other cultures and ideas</p>
<p>Communication</p> <p>4. Students can communicate information, ideas, problems and solutions to both specialist and non-specialist audiences.</p>	11	<p>ability to communicate information, ideas and solutions both orally and in writing in at least two of the following languages: Dutch, German, English, French and Spanish or another language taught at the Faculty of Arts, at a minimum level of B2 for German, C1 for English, B2 for French and B1 for Spanish or any other language</p>
	12	<p>ability to communicate in discussions or negotiations about international political issues in a reliable and accurate way, for example by providing oral and written feedback on research conducted by fellow students and orally presenting and defending their own research, thereby taking the opinions and feelings of others into consideration</p>
<p>Learning skills</p> <p>5. Students have developed those learning skills that are necessary for them to continue to undertake further study with a high degree of autonomy.</p>	13	<p>ability to acquire and process large amounts of information and knowledge in effective and efficient ways</p>
	14	<p>ability to read and comprehend English at a level such that an academic debate in that language can be followed</p>
	15	<p>ability to write well-structured, clearly formulated and linguistically correct texts</p>
	16	<p>ability to effectively use IT applications</p>



APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Ba 1 IRIO			
Semester 1		Semester 2	
Block 1a	Block 1b	Block 2a	Block 2b
History of International Relations I (5 ECTS)	Academic Skills for IR (5 ECTS)	Political Science (5 ECTS)	International Organization (10 ECTS)
International Politics (5 ECTS)	Statistics for IR (5 ECTS)	Introduction to Economics (5 ECTS)	
Introduction to International and European Law (5 ECTS)	History of International Relations II (5 ECTS)	Language 1a (5 ECTS)	Language 1b (5 ECTS)
Ba 2 IRIO			
Semester 1		Semester 2	
Block 1a	Block 1b	Block 2a	Block 2b
Theory of International Relations (10 ECTS)		Methodology and Research Practice (10 ECTS)	
Policy and Governance		IRIO European Law (5 ECTS)	IPE of Monetary Relations (5 ECTS)



(10 ECTS)			
Language 2a (5 ECTS)	Language 2b (5 ECTS)	Language 3a (5 ECTS)	Language 3b (5 ECTS)
Ba 3 IRIO			
Semester 1		Semester 2	
Block 1a	Block 1b	Block 2a	Block 2b
Students take one of the following minors (all 30 ECTS) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor Abroad • Career Minor • University Minor • Pre-Master's Minor 		IPE of Trade (5 ECTS)	IRIO International Law (5 ECTS)
		Core Module (10 ECTS)	Bachelor's Thesis (10 ECTS)

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Dag 1 Geschiedenis (voltijd en deeltijd)

10.45 – 11.00	Aankomst en welkom
11.00 – 12.30	Intern overleg en inzage documentatie
12.30 – 13.00	Lunch
13.00 – 13.45	Interview inhoudelijk verantwoordelijken
13.45 – 14.30	Interview studenten bachelor (incl. OC-lid)
14.30 – 14.45	Uitloop/pauze
14.45 – 15.30	Interview docenten bachelor (incl. OC-lid)
15.30 – 15.45	Pauze / intern overleg
15.45 – 16.30	Interview studenten master (incl. OC-lid)
16.30 – 17.15	Interview docenten master (incl. OC-lid)
17.15 – 17.30	Pauze
17.30 – 18.00	Interview alumni

Dag 2 IRIO/IR

08.45 – 10.15	Aankomst en voorbereiding
10.15 – 11.30	Interview inhoudelijk verantwoordelijken IR
11.30 – 12.15	Interview studenten bachelor (incl. OC-lid)
12.15 – 12.45	Lunch
12.45 – 13.30	Interview docenten bachelor (incl. OC-lid)
13.30 – 14.15	Interview studenten master (incl. OC-lid)
14.15 – 14.30	Uitloop/pauze
14.30 – 15.15	Interview docenten master (incl. OC-lid)
15.15 – 16.00	Interview examencommissie Geschiedenis
16.00 – 16.15	Uitloop/pauze
16.15 – 17.00	Interview examencommissie IR
17.00 – 17.30	Interview alumni IR

Dag 3

08.45 – 09.45	Aankomst en voorbereiding/overleg
09.45 – 10.30	Slotinterview formeel verantwoordelijken Geschiedenis
10.30 – 11.15	Slotinterview formeel verantwoordelijken IR
11.15 – 12.30	Opstellen oordelen
12.30 – 13.00	Lunch
13.00 – 13.30	Opstellen oordelen
13.30 – 14.00	Mondelinge terugkoppeling Geschiedenis/IR
14.15 – 14.30	Uitloop/pauze
14.30 – 15.30	Ontwikkelsprek Geschiedenis
15.30 – 16.30	Ontwikkelsprek IR
16.30 –	Afronding

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the bachelor's programme International Relations and International Organization. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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

Courses:

Bachelor 1:

International Politics LYX001P05: an introductory course right at the start of the programme, and part of the writing trajectory.

International Organization LYX003P10: a course in the fourth block of the first year, part of the writing trajectory.

Bachelor 2:

Policy & Governance LYX001B10: a course in the second year, of importance to the professional trajectory.

Methodology and Research Practice LYX076B10: a course in the second year, important to the writing trajectory.

Bachelor 3:

Core Module (Visual Global Politics LYX108B10): the Core Module is an important course in the third year, (relatively) small-scale, students can choose between various Core Modules, following the completion of the Core Module the thesis is written under the supervision of the Core Module lecturer and on a related topic.

From all above mentioned classes the following is made available on paper and through Nestor (digital learning environment):

- Course Manuals
- Literature
- assignments + matching assessment forms
- Course Evaluations
- Relevant course material
- Exams and Answer Models
- any other course relevant course materials
- Selection of made (re)exams

Inspection other material IRIO

- Reports Programme Committee (PC) IRIO from 2017-2018 until now
- Annual Reports PC IRIO 2016-2017 and 2017-2018
- Fixed Minutes Exam Board International Studies 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 (till 1 January 2019) and Minutes Expertise team International Studies (IS) (from 1 January 2019).
- Annual Reports Exam Board International Studies (IS) 2016-2017 and 2017-2018
- Rules & Regulations Exam Board 2016-2017 and 2017-2018

