



**Public Policy and Human Development**  
**Maastricht University**

© 2024 Academion

[www.academion.nl](http://www.academion.nl)  
[info@academion.nl](mailto:info@academion.nl)

Project code P2219

# Contents

Summary .....	4
Score table .....	5
Introduction.....	6
Procedure.....	6
Panel .....	7
Information on the programme .....	8
Description of the assessment.....	9
Organization .....	9
Recommendations previous accreditation panel .....	9
Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes .....	9
Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment.....	12
Standard 3. Student assessment .....	17
Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes .....	20
Standard 5. Diversity .....	21
General conclusion .....	22
Development points .....	22
Appendix 1. Intended learning outcomes .....	23
Appendix 2. Programme curriculum.....	25
Appendix 3. Programme of the site visit.....	26
Appendix 4. Materials .....	27

# Summary

## Organization

The Master of Science in Public Policy and Human Development (MSc PPHD) is a one-year full-time master's programme taught in English, offered by Maastricht University. MSc PPHD is a dual degree programme in collaboration with United Nations University (UNU). The UNU regulations for the programme have been built specifically to replicate Dutch laws and regulations within the UN legal context.

## Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes

The MSc PPHD programme features a distinct profile and a clear mission, aiming to prepare master's students to contribute to public policies supporting sustainable human development. The panel values the significant benefits arising from the collaboration with UNU-MERIT. The programme's emphasis on applying fundamental concepts and principles of public policy in specific areas, along with the option for students to personalize their experience by choosing a specialization, adds to the positive evaluation of the panel. While acknowledging the programme's strong profile, the panel suggests that it could enhance it further by more effectively leveraging its integration within SBE. The panel recommends exploring opportunities for synergies and enhancements to reinforce the programme's profile.

The panel is pleased with the revisions made to the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and sub-learning outcomes in response to the recommendations of the previous accreditation panel. The ILOs and sub-learning outcomes constitute a well-structured overview of the programme's primary objectives, are suitable for a master's programme, and demonstrate a clear academic orientation. The values of diversity, cooperation, and good governance are integrated throughout the ILOs, highlighting that the entire programme is structured around these principles.

## Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment

The curriculum effectively reflects the programme's ILOs, maintaining a delicate balance between theoretical courses and methodological skills courses. It follows a clear structure, progressing from foundational training to specialization. The five specializations are appealing, encompassing a wide range within the realms of public policy and human development. The panel commends the steps taken in response to the previous panel's recommendation to achieve a more consistent level of development across the five specializations. Nevertheless, the panel believes that there is still room for further improvement and encourages programme management to persist in focusing on ensuring coherence across specializations. The programme thoughtfully incorporates Problem-Based Learning (PBL), ensuring that students not only derive benefits from teaching-learning activities but also face appropriate challenges and learn from each other.

The teaching staff is well-qualified, engaged, and passionate about their role in the programme, fostering a high-quality and dedicated teaching environment. Students feel adequately supported both in preparing for the programme and navigating through it. The study load is demanding, but considering the students' commitment and qualifications, it is appropriate for this programme, which is also reflected in the favourable recent success rates. The recent revision of the thesis track has already demonstrated a positive impact in reducing the time required for students to graduate. The decision to offer the programme in English is well-supported and aligns with the international character of the field.

## Standard 3. Student assessment

The programme has established a valid, transparent, and reliable assessment system. The assessment methods are diverse and align with the programme's objectives. The programme benefits from solid quality

assessment procedures and an effective, proactive Board of Examiners (BoE). Various measures have been implemented to enhance transparency in assessments. To further enhance the transparency of the assessment process, the panel recommends incorporating assessment matrices into all courses and ensuring that each assignment is accompanied by a grading rubric, provided at the beginning of the course. The panel noted inconsistencies in the availability of this information in the documents it reviewed. Furthermore, the panel suggests implementing a guideline specifying the maximum percentage (e.g., 50%) by which course assessments can be attributed to group work.

The thesis assessment is well-designed, employing an insightful evaluation system with two assessors assessing the thesis. Assessors adeptly pinpoint strengths while offering constructive feedback on areas for improvement. Nevertheless, the panel also highlights certain areas that need enhancement. First, the panel advises paying sufficient attention to the independence of the first versus second assessor of the thesis. Second, the panel advises simplifying the rubric and restructuring sub-rubrics to reduce complexity and eliminate any overlapping elements.

#### Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

The panel concludes that the master theses show that the intended learning outcomes of the programme are achieved. In general, the theses demonstrated commendable quality. The programme prepares students for relevant positions in the professional field and graduates reflect positively on the programme.

#### Standard 5. Diversity

Diversity is a fundamental principle of the MSc PPHD, encompassing the promotion and support of diversity within the student body, academic and support staff, and curriculum. The programme conscientiously incorporates the educational methodology of PBL while efficiently harnessing the benefits of the international classroom setting.

### Score table

The panel assesses the programme as follows:

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
Standard 5: Diversity	meets the standard

General conclusion	positive
--------------------	----------

Prof. Andrew Massey Chair	Esther Poort MSc Secretary
------------------------------	-------------------------------

Date: 22 February 2024

# Introduction

## Procedure

### Assessment

On November 27 and 28 2023, the master's programme Public Policy and Human Development of Maastricht University was assessed by an independent peer review panel as part of the cluster assessment Public Administration. The assessment cluster consisted of 20 programmes, offered by the institutions Utrecht University, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Radboud University, University of Twente, Maastricht University, Tilburg University, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and Leiden University. The assessment followed the procedure and standards described in the NVAO-EAPAA agreement signed on 18 May 2021, and is aimed at double accreditation by EAPAA and NVAO.

Quality assurance agency Academion coordinated the assessment upon request of the cluster Public Administration. Peter Hildering acted as coordinator and Mark Delmartino and Esther Poort acted as secretaries in the cluster assessment. They have been certified and registered by the NVAO.

### Preparation

Academion composed the peer review panel in cooperation with the institutions and taking into account the expertise and independence of the members as well as consistency within the cluster. The composition of the panel was approved by EAPAA on 11 September 2023 and by the NVAO on 14 September 2023. The coordinator instructed the panel chairs on their role in the site visit according to the Panel chair profile (NVAO 2016).

The programme composed a site visit schedule in consultation with the secretary (see appendix 3). The programme selected representative partners for the various interviews. It also determined that the development dialogue would be organized at the end of the site visit. A separate development report was made based on this dialogue.

The programme provided the secretary with a list of graduates over the period 2020-2021. In consultation with the coordinator, the panel chair selected 15 theses. He took the diversity of final grades and examiners into account, as well as the five specializations in the programme. Prior to the site visit, the programme provided the panel with the theses and the accompanying assessment forms. They also provided the panel with the self-evaluation reports and additional materials (see appendix 4).

The panel members studied the information and sent their findings to the secretary. The secretary collected the panel's questions and remarks in a document and shared this with the panel members. In a preliminary meeting, the panel discussed the initial findings on the self-evaluation report and the theses, as well as the division of tasks during the site visit. The panel was also informed on the assessment framework, the working method and the planning of the site visits and reports.

### Site visit

During the site visit, the panel interviewed various programme representatives (see appendix 3). The panel also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. No consultation was requested. 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 preliminary findings.

## Report

The secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to the coordinator for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel for feedback. After processing this feedback, the secretary sent the draft report to the programme in order to have it checked for factual irregularities. The secretary discussed the ensuing comments with the panel chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The panel then finalized the report, and the coordinator sent it to Maastricht University.

## Panel

The following panel members were involved in the cluster assessment:

- Prof. Andrew Massey, professor of Government, King's College London – chair;
- Prof. Monique Kremer, professor of Active Citizenship, University of Amsterdam – chair;
- Prof. Ernst ten Heuvelhof, emeritus professor of Public Administration, Delft University of Technology;
- Prof. Peter Bursens, professor of Political Science, University of Antwerp;
- Prof. Ellen Wayenberg, professor of Public Governance and Management at Ghent University and member of the EAPAA Accreditation Committee;
- Prof. Calin Hintea, professor of Public Administration and Management at Babes-Bolyai University and member of the EAPAA Accreditation Committee;
- Prof. Thurid Hustedt, professor of Public Administration and Management at Hertie School Berlin and member of the EAPAA Accreditation Committee;
- Dr. Hester Glasbeek, advisor Leadership Development at Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, and Senior Partner of Reflect Academy: For Leadership in Learning;
- Anje-Margreet Woltjer MSc, director of SPO Utrecht;
- Prof. Ria Janvier, professor of Social Law, University of Antwerp;
- Prof. Leo Huberts, emeritus professor of Public Administration, Vrije Universiteit;
- Prof. Heinrich Winter, professor of Public Administration, University of Groningen;
- Wim de Boer MSc, lecturer Public Administration and Governance at Haagse Hogeschool;
- Prof. Tanja Klenk, professor of Public Administration and Public Policies, Helmut-Schmidt-University Hamburg;
- David Van Slyke PhD, Dean and professor of Public Administration, The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University;
- Prof. Geske Dijkstra, emeritus professor of Governance and Global Development, Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Prof. Esther Versluis, professor of European Regulatory Governance, Maastricht University;
- Prof. Zoe Radnor, professor of Service Operations Management, Aston University;
- Prof. Sophie Van hoonacker, professor of Administrative Governance, Maastricht University;
- Prof. Kees van Paridon, emeritus professor of Economics, Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Prof. Tannelie Blom, emeritus professor of European Integration, Maastricht University – referee;
- Tom Hillenaar BSc, master student Engineering and Policy Analysis, Delft University of Technology – student member;
- Sibel Gökbekir BSc, master student of Complex Systems Engineering and Management at Delft University of Technology, and of International and European Union Law at Erasmus University Rotterdam – student member.

The panel assessing the master's programme Public Policy and Human Development at Maastricht University consisted of the following members:

- Prof. Andrew Massey, professor of Government and Academic Director, International School for Government, King's College London – chair;
- Prof. Peter Bursens, professor of Political Science, University of Antwerp;
- Prof. Ellen Wayenberg, professor of Public Governance and Management, Ghent University;
- David Van Slyke PhD, Dean and professor of Public Administration, The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Syracuse University;
- Prof. Geske Dijkstra, emeritus professor of Governance and Global Development, Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- Sibel Gökbekir BSc, master student of Complex Systems Engineering and Management at Delft University of Technology, and of International and European Union Law at Erasmus University Rotterdam – student member.

### Information on the programme

Name of the institution:	Maastricht University
Status of the institution:	Publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	Positive
Programme name:	M Public Policy and Human Development
CROHO number:	60328
Level:	Master
Orientation:	Academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Global Governance for Development Governance of Innovation Migration Studies Risk and Vulnerability Social Protection Policy
Location:	Maastricht
Specifics:	United Nations University (dual degree)
Mode(s) of study:	Fulltime
Language of instruction:	English
Submission date NVAO:	1 May 2024



## Description of the assessment

### Organization

The Master of Science in Public Policy and Human Development (MSc PPHD) is a one-year full-time master's programme taught in English, offered by Maastricht University. MSc PPHD is a dual degree programme in collaboration with United Nations University (UNU). With 13 specialized institutes across 12 countries, the UNU system functions as think tanks for UN agencies, dedicated to advancing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Given that UNU operates outside the framework of traditional national laws governing universities, steps have been taken to ensure and uphold the quality of education in the programme. The UNU regulations for the programme have been built specifically to replicate Dutch laws and regulations within the UN legal context. Due to the special status of UNU and the fact that the UN is not subject to legislation, the programme management has requested the panel to look at all courses as if they were provided by Maastricht University, as it was done in 2018. Since UNU has agreed to subject all its courses to the same quality control mechanisms as those applied to Maastricht University courses, the panel considered this a logical choice.

Since the last reaccreditation, the MSc PPHD moved from the Faculty of Science and Engineering (FSE) to the Faculty of Business and Economics (SBE). SBE has a broad scope with areas of expertise in economics, international business, management, public policy, governance, and sustainability. SBE is a Triple Crown accredited business school (AACSB, EQUIS, AMBA). As a long-standing member of the Triple Crown accreditation, SBE ensures the MSc PPHD programme maintains a robust educational quality assurance model.

### Recommendations previous accreditation panel

The documentation included an overview of how the programme followed up on the recommendations given by the previous accreditation's panel (2018). Also, several recommendations and their follow-up actions were discussed with the programme during the site visit. The panel concludes that the programme management demonstrates an impressive commitment to continuous improvement across all levels, effectively addressing previous external review recommendations. The panel is content with the improvement measures taken and sees that these have contributed to improved quality of the programme. Some examples will be discussed under the relevant standards.

### 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

#### *Mission and profile*

The MSc PPHD aligns with the SBE mission to combine excellent research and research-based education to make a strong societal impact on the immediate and global environment. SBE educates and trains undergraduates, graduates, and professionals to act as responsible, ethical, and influential individuals. Aligned with SBE's mission, the MSc PPHD aims to prepare master's students to contribute to public policies

supporting sustainable human development. The vision of the programme is to equip students with the knowledge and competencies needed for evidence-informed policymaking, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, methods, and tools.

The panel values the unique characteristics of the MSc PPHD programme, stemming from its collaboration with the United Nations University (UNU). The programme derives substantial benefits from the involvement of researchers at UNU-MERIT, whose work contributes to educational materials and exposes students to ongoing policy research and contemporary debates. The emphasis on the SDGs is evident in the programme's profile, as it incorporates a sustainable human development approach aligned with the SDGs.

Another important feature of the programme is that it applies fundamental concepts and principles of public policy to specific policy domains or subject areas. Students have the flexibility to tailor their experience by choosing courses from one specialization among five directions: *Global Governance for Development*, *Governance of Innovation*, *Migration Studies*, *Risk and Vulnerability*, and *Social Protection Policy*. The panel finds the five specializations appealing to students and believes that they contribute significantly to the distinctive profile of the programme.

Furthermore, the panel observed that the programme commits to values of a) diversity, b) cooperation, and c) good governance. The MSc PPHD adopts a multi-stranded approach to diversity, encompassing the encouragement and support of diversity within the student body, the group of academic and support staff, the curriculum, the connected methods of education, and in research that either feeds into or complements the MSc PPHD. The value of diversity is addressed in depth under *Standard 5*. Cooperation is key to how learning occurs: the MSc PPHD incorporates the Problem-Based Learning (PBL) method into educational activities. This collaborative learning approach provides a structured framework for real-life problem-solving, both within and beyond the classroom. The utilization of the PBL method in the programme is further detailed under *Standard 2*. The programme defines good governance as governance in the pursuit of just and transparent outcomes in an efficient and effective manner. The MSc PPHD teaches these principles while problematising the definition and measurement of fairness and equity within specific contexts.

The panel concludes that the programme possesses a strong and distinctive profile. However, the panel believes that the programme could further strengthen its profile by benefiting more from the embedding within SBE. The panel recommends exploring areas where synergies and enhancements are feasible. The programme management could explore how some integrative elements about the importance of governance being intergovernmental, cross-sectoral, and global can be introduced in some of the courses. Furthermore, the programme could explore further how to benefit more for the community network around SBE.

#### *Intended learning outcomes*

The previous accreditation panel recommended a more detailed and measurable formulation of the intended learning outcomes (ILOs). In response, the programme management collaborated with all course coordinators to revise the ILOs. This joint effort resulted in the formulation of five overarching ILOs and corresponding sub-learning outcomes (see Appendix 1).

An overview provided by the programme demonstrates that the ILOs align with the Dublin descriptors for master's programmes, thereby demonstrating their level and academic orientation. The sub-learning outcomes cover various levels of student mastery, encompassing technical and soft skills, along with domain-specific knowledge. Aligned with the MSc PPHD's goal, the ILOs focus on equipping students with the insights and tools necessary to influence policies and related programming in diverse institutions,

including government agencies, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, and the private sector. Recognizing the contextual nature of public policy, the ILOs ensure students acquire overarching competencies to understand policy processes in different environments.

The panel studied the ILOs and sub-learning outcomes and concluded that they are well-formulated and sufficiently concrete. They constitute a well-structured overview of the programme's primary objectives, adequately reflecting the master's level and academic orientation of the programme. The three core values of diversity, cooperation, and good governance are embedded throughout the ILOs, indicating that the entire programme is built around these principles.

Since the programme has been integrated into SBE, it is evaluated in the Assurance of Learning (AoL) cycle. Every three years, a programme is audited by a neutral AoL panel, consisting of an educational scientist, internal SBE experts who are not involved with the programme, external alumni, and work field experts. The AoL panel conducts a thorough assessment of the programme objectives—determining whether they remain current, align with contemporary societal and labour market requirements, and effectively address what students should know and be able to do upon graduation. In addition, an Advisory Board meets every year, composed of practitioners in the field of policy analysis who work with international organizations, along with an education expert. The panel appreciates that the ILOs are regularly reviewed by external entities, including work field experts. It encourages the programme to make optimal use of this process to ensure that the ILOs are sufficiently future-oriented.

#### Considerations

The MSc PPHD programme features a distinct profile and a clear mission, aiming to prepare master's students to contribute to public policies supporting sustainable human development. The panel values the significant benefits arising from the collaboration with UNU-MERIT. The programme's emphasis on applying fundamental concepts and principles of public policy in specific areas, along with the option for students to personalize their experience by choosing a specialization, adds to the positive evaluation of the panel. While acknowledging the programme's strong profile, the panel suggests that it could enhance it further by more effectively leveraging its integration within SBE. The panel recommends exploring opportunities for synergies and enhancements to reinforce the programme's profile.

The panel is pleased with the revisions made to the Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and sub-learning outcomes in response to the recommendations of the previous accreditation panel. The ILOs and sub-learning outcomes constitute a well-structured overview of the programme's primary objectives, are suitable for a master's programme, and demonstrate a clear academic orientation. The values of diversity, cooperation, and good governance are integrated throughout the ILOs, highlighting that the entire programme is structured around these principles.

#### Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 1.

## 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

#### *Curriculum*

The curriculum is structured into an autumn semester (semester 1), a spring semester (semester 2), and a summer period. An overview of the curriculum is provided in Appendix 2.

In the autumn semester, following a standardized format for all students, the students acquire foundational skills and knowledge essential for the analysis of policies in general. This semester includes three substantive courses directly related to the content of public policy, as well as two methodological courses designed to equip students with the necessary tools and methods for analysing complex social phenomena relevant to public policy.

During the spring semester, students specialize in a globally relevant policy area. They can opt to pursue one of five predefined specialization tracks, each comprising four courses. Alternatively, students may choose to blend courses from two or more specializations, creating a personalized elective track. Throughout these specialization courses, the skills and knowledge acquired in the autumn semester are deepened, applied, and tailored to the specific subject matter. Students also acquire additional methods for data collection and analysis, practising these techniques in the field.

The thesis plays a crucial role as a bridge between semesters and substantive/methodology courses. The master's thesis is a largely independent research work that students conduct and express in a written scientific paper. The thesis may be based on research of varying designs, including primary qualitative or quantitative data collection and analysis, or the analysis of secondary qualitative or quantitative data. Students are free to select a specific topic and research design that matches their field of interest, as long as it relates to the role of public policy in fostering better human development outcomes. The process starts in October with a thesis track kick-off event in which students are introduced to the structure of the thesis track, milestones, and deadlines. Subsequently, a thesis market is held, where academic staff present various policy problems that can be researched. In January, students participate in specific methodology workshops covering both basic and advanced methods for data collection and analysis, applicable to diverse research questions. Following this, students draft a research proposal, which receives feedback from a supervisor and a second reader. Thereafter, students work independently, guided by the supervisor, to complete the final thesis.

After reviewing the documents and conducting interviews, the panel holds a favourable opinion of the curriculum. It strikes a well-balanced blend between theoretical courses and methodological skills courses and follows a clear structure of foundational training followed by specialization. The programme adequately addresses research ethics and the programme sufficiently prepares students to deal with real-life ethical dilemmas. The thesis track is meticulously crafted, and the thesis plays an essential role in the learning process of the students. The teaching and courses are inherently structured to provide robust support for students in this aspect. Overall, the panel considers the curriculum to be an appropriate representation of the programmes ILOs.

The panel finds the five specializations to be attractive, covering a broad field within public policy and human development. In the prior reaccreditation, it was noted that not every specialization track had attained a consistent level of development. The academic programme director and track coordinators were advised to consistently monitor and, if necessary, adjust the content and workload of the respective tracks. In response, the programme introduced sub-learning programme objectives and an assessment program, ensuring more efficient monitoring and alignment of the specializations. Moreover, specialization coordinators actively participated in training, workshops, and meetings to assess and improve the specializations. The current panel is pleased with the implemented measures and recognizes that the development of sub-learning outcomes and the assessment programme played a crucial role in enhancing alignment across all five tracks with the programme's ILOs. The panel acknowledges the inherent challenge in ensuring coherence across specializations given that distinct skill sets are required and trained within those specializations that are related to specific policy areas.

Nevertheless, the panel believes that there is still room for further improvement and encourages programme management to persist in addressing this challenge. The panel noted that some specialization tracks put more emphasis on skills training than others and that there could be more levelling-out in this regard. Moreover, students noted that there is ongoing unevenness across specializations, attributing it to the rigidity of the fall curriculum. They often find it challenging to comprehend the specializations, offerings within each, employment market opportunities, and thesis possibilities during this period.

#### *Teaching methods*

The educational vision of the MSc PPHD aligns with Maastricht University's core principles, which are rooted in the Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach and guided by the CCCS principles: constructive education, collective learning, contextual learning, and self-directed education. Teaching activities emphasize the importance of cultivating and balancing individual responsibility and leadership in education alongside group interaction and collaborative learning. The methods promote student participation and the active construction of meaning from shared content. Few of the teaching-learning activities focus solely on the transfer of knowledge from teachers to learners.

Courses in the programme utilize a variety of teaching methods, including traditional lectures, PBL format tutorials, workshops, and stakeholder-based challenges. Particularly during the spring semester, students deepen their involvement with institutions, stakeholders, and networks associated with specific policy areas. This engagement takes the form of activities such as scenario-building workshops, simulations, model conferences, and guest lectures or field visits featuring specialists in the respective areas.

In both interviews and the student chapter, students emphasize the exceptional utility of the PBL setting for comprehending concepts and gaining diverse perspectives on the same topic. Students feel actively engaged and highly value the collaborative learning activities. Furthermore, they stress that the programme's diverse student body plays a crucial role in fostering engaging discussions during PBL meetings. The teaching staff is also positive about PBL and the way it unfolds in this particular student body, which is not only diverse in disciplinary background but also has a very diverse geographical background. Additionally, the staff emphasize that PBL enhances students' academic and personal development, as well as the development of their general and professional skills.

The panel fully agrees that the PBL format seamlessly aligns with the small-scale, interdisciplinary, and international nature of the programme. The programme adopts this format thoughtfully, ensuring that all students not only benefit from teaching-learning activities but also are appropriately challenged and motivated to actively contribute to interdisciplinary challenges and to learn from each other. Furthermore,

the panel appreciates the additional value of the PBL concept in preparing students for policymaking. It offers them opportunities to practice essential skills such as argumentation, communication, critical analysis of information, and the generation of solutions for real-life challenges. The panel suggests that the programme could strengthen this additional value of PBL by explicitly outlining the professional skills associated with policymaking that students develop throughout the courses. It suggests considering implementing learning lines on professional skills tailored to the various specializations.

#### *Teaching staff*

The MSc PPHD has approximately 30 course coordinators and 32 tutors, supported by 5.4 full-time equivalent (FTE) key support staff. In addition, the programme receives support from SBE staff. Instructors, responsible for delivering educational content, encompass course coordinators who typically design the course curriculum and supervise teachers, lecturers, and tutors within courses. The programme also features guest lecturers, who contribute to courses through thematic modules or practical lectures. The panel recognizes the practice of inviting external speakers as a key distinguishing feature of the programme.

During the previous reaccreditation, the panel observed that the programme had experienced growth, resulting in an expansion of both academic and support staff. The previous panel expressed concern about the substantial presence of temporary staff, which could potentially threaten the long-term viability of the programme. The current panel is pleased to see that the programme management has taken positive steps by investing in the recruitment of permanent teaching staff. Currently, all courses in the autumn semester, as well as the specializations and the thesis track, are overseen by permanent staff members.

The programme employs various strategies to ensure the quality of teaching staff. Ongoing training is a key approach, requiring tutors to attend a basic PBL training course, with additional tailored interventions provided as needed. Course coordinators must either possess the UTQ (university teaching qualification), be currently enrolled in the course, or demonstrate past experiences equivalent to the UTQ. Engaging in SBE's quality assurance cycle is another strategy, involving annual "fact sheet" meetings between the SBE Educational Institute and the academic programme director to discuss suggested improvements. The programme conducts four to five meetings a year with teaching staff to discuss programme updates and student evaluations. Individual meetings between the academic programme director and coordinators are held to jointly evaluate the course and determine necessary changes. Additionally, the programme supports information sharing among coordinators through an Instructors Canvas page, facilitating the exchange of programme-related information, updates, templates (such as course manuals and inspection forms), and teaching tools.

During the site visit, the panel gathered the impression that the teaching staff is very engaged, enthusiastic, and passionate about teaching in the programme. Students perceive the teaching staff as accessible and committed and they are positive regarding the amount of feedback teachers provide to students on assignments. It is evident to the panel that the staff members truly feel part of an educational team. The panel concludes that students are part of a high-quality and committed teaching environment.

#### *Guidance*

The programme accepts students with an academic bachelor's degree from a wide variety of disciplines. This results in diverse student cohorts with exposure to different disciplinary perspectives and professional experiences. The programme offers students both mandatory and voluntary preparation, including links to (online) resources to strengthen their expected pre-knowledge. Additionally, course coordinators provide catch-up sessions and Q&A sessions, particularly in the autumn semester.

The autumn semester also includes extra learning opportunities to address gaps in basic and intermediate academic skills, such as optional workshops on referencing, academic writing, and conducting a systematic literature review. Furthermore, the programme has established mechanisms to support more advanced students in furthering their knowledge and skills. For instance, an annual voluntary course on advanced econometric techniques, named Econometrics +, is available for students seeking to advance in quantitative techniques.

The students and alumni interviewed by the panel expressed high satisfaction with the opportunities available for receiving additional support or facing extra challenges. The panel commends the programme for effectively addressing the diversity within the student cohorts and highly values the fact that the programme not only prevents students from falling behind but also provides additional challenges for those who seek them.

Throughout the programme, students can seek additional guidance and advice from various sources, including the study advisor, the academic programme director, mentors, and tutors. The study advisor plays a crucial role in supporting students throughout the programme. Moreover, the study advisor collaborates with students facing personal circumstances that may impact their ability to navigate the programme effectively. In such cases, tailored study plans are developed to help students complete the programme. The students with whom the panel engaged spoke highly of the assistance provided by the study advisor.

The mentoring program, while voluntary, serves as an additional support service. Academic mentors and students meet three times a year to engage in discussions about the student's progress in the program, explore career options, and identify both hard and soft skills that students aspire to develop within and beyond the program.

Based on the documentation and interviews conducted during the site visit, the panel concludes that students feel adequately supported both in preparing for the programme and navigating through it. The panel commends the programme for its emphasis on study guidance, noting that this focus has translated into high levels of student satisfaction.

### *Feasibility*

The programme management notes in the self-evaluation report that student workload can be substantial. The programme implements various measures to monitor and manage this workload, ensuring that students can successfully keep up with the fast pace of the programme. Students interviewed by the panel confirmed that, although the workload is demanding, the programme remains feasible and conducive to study.

The self-evaluation report highlights a measure implemented in response to the high workload, namely the revision of the thesis track. This revision was prompted by the programme's observation that only a minority of students who commenced their studies before 2020 completed the master's programme within a year. The prolonged study duration was primarily attributed to students dedicating excessive time to their theses.

The revised thesis track now incorporates smaller mandatory milestones, such as registering a supervisor, submitting an ethics review, and completing skills courses. In the current format, students dedicate the month of January to their theses, submitting proposals early in the second semester after participating in selected methodological workshops. Enhanced support mechanisms include a "thesis market" and a booklet featuring researchers' projects, providing master's students with ample options for independent research. The thesis team offers continuous support through one-on-one advising, (digital) Q&A sessions, and Town Hall meetings with students.



The students with whom the panel spoke expressed feeling well-supported in selecting the topic for their master's thesis. They mentioned that they receive individualized support on this matter early in the programme. The panel was pleased to note that these adjustments in the thesis track have yielded positive results, with almost two-thirds of students graduating within the academic year for both the 2020-21 and 2021-22 academic years, despite some COVID-19-related delays affecting student progress.

The panel concludes that the study load is high but given the level of commitment and qualifications of the student population, it appears suitable for this type of programme. The panel is positive about the recent revision of the thesis track and its positive effect on reducing the time students need to graduate.

### *Language*

The MSc PPHD is exclusively taught in English and uses an English-language name. The programme management justifies this language choice by underscoring the programme's emphasis on human development in an international context. Furthermore, the programme actively fosters an international classroom to equip students for future careers in diverse, multicultural environments. Additionally, the demand in the labour market is internationally oriented, and career paths in public policy and human development often necessitate collaboration among international organizations, governments, private businesses, and civil society. English, being a key UN language, is the most prevalent language for such interactions. The panel fully endorses this decision and its rationale.

### *Facilities*

Students have sufficient access to adequate library facilities. Adequate spaces are available for both courses and independent work for faculty and students. Furthermore, faculty and students have access to suitable IT equipment and software.

### *Considerations*

The curriculum effectively reflects the programme's ILOs, maintaining a delicate balance between theoretical courses and methodological skills courses. It follows a clear structure, progressing from foundational training to specialization. The five specializations are appealing, encompassing a wide range within the realms of public policy and human development. The panel commends the steps taken in response to the previous panel's recommendation to achieve a more consistent level of development across the five specializations. Nevertheless, the panel believes that there is still room for further improvement and encourages programme management to persist in focusing on ensuring coherence across specializations. The programme thoughtfully incorporates Problem-Based Learning (PBL), ensuring that students not only derive benefits from teaching-learning activities but also face appropriate challenges and learn from each other.

The teaching staff is well-qualified, engaged, and passionate about their role in the programme, fostering a high-quality and dedicated teaching environment. Students feel adequately supported both in preparing for the programme and navigating through it. The study load is demanding, but considering the students' commitment and qualifications, it is appropriate for this programme, which is also reflected in the favourable recent success rates. The recent revision of the thesis track has already demonstrated a positive impact in reducing the time required for students to graduate. The decision to offer the programme in English is well-supported and aligns with the international character of the field.

### *Conclusion*

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 2.



### Standard 3. Student assessment

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

#### Findings

##### *Assessment system*

The programme management has devised and regularly updates an assessment programme and curriculum map to ensure coherence in terms of the types of assessments utilized, the levels of competence they reflect, and how they are conducted (e.g., on an individual or group level) across courses.

A fundamental principle of the programme's assessment policy is that examiners provide ongoing feedback, for example, through offering partial submissions, partial presentations, moments of self-reflection, peer feedback, and portfolio assessment. In addition, the programme incorporates summative assessment methods, including, essays, closed-book written exams (including computerized exams), open-book/take-home exams, group written assignments, individual oral presentations, group oral presentations, individual oral exams, attendance/ oral participation, self-reflection, peer grading, and debates.

The panel established that the assessment methods are sufficiently varied and suitable for the final qualifications that they are meant to assess. The panel appreciates the balance between assessments with a formative and a summative function, though it suggests that this balance could be more explicitly documented throughout the assessment programme.

The programme has several procedures in place to optimize assessment quality. Guidelines for assessment and quality standards are outlined in the faculty-level (SBE) assessment policy. The self-evaluation report outlines that examiners also receive programme-specific guidance, covering elements such as the allowable number and types of assessments within courses and the weights assigned to different assessment types in determining the overall course grade. The panel appreciates the presence of such guidelines but observed significant variations among courses, particularly regarding the weight of the group assignments in the final grade. The panel identified a concern regarding the weighting of group assessments in determining the final grades for several specialization courses. Among the twenty specialization courses, two have their assessments entirely based on group work. The panel suggests implementing a guideline specifying the maximum percentage (e.g., 50%) by which course assessments can be attributed to group work.

The programme has implemented various procedures to foster transparency in assessments. The course manual/Canvas page is mandated to incorporate details on assessment requirements, grading criteria, and the alignment between ILOs and assessments. Additionally, it should provide information to students about inspection opportunities and procedures for grade appeals. The panel values the commitment to transparency but acknowledges that there is still room for improvement in enhancing the transparency of the assessment process. It recommends ensuring that all courses include assessment matrices and ensuring that all assignments are accompanied by a grading rubric, presented at the beginning of the course. The panel observed that, in the documents it examined, this information was not consistently available.

##### *Board of examiners*

The Board of Examiners (BoE) for SBE consists of several chambers representing different types of programmes within the faculty. These include a 'main' chamber for the majority of bachelor and master

programmes, a chamber for executive education programmes, and a chamber for the MSc PPHD programme which is fully responsible for the assessment and final level of all courses in the MSc PPHD.

To fulfil its responsibilities, the BoE collaborates with the Educational Programme Committee (handling concerns such as assessment-related issues raised by students and concerns about examiner performance) and the academic programme director (addressing matters like assessment programme revisions and elective track compositions). Furthermore, the SBE assessment committee reviews the quality of assessments and assures the BoE that there is an established quality assurance process in place.

The BoE appoints examiners based on standardized criteria established at the UM. It provides comprehensive information to examiners about their quality assessment obligations, fraud prevention, inspection facilitation, and feedback provision. During educational adjustments, such as those implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic, the BoE offers tailored guidance and supports programme management in devising measures for quality assessment. The BoE actively engages in fraud prevention. While course coordinators primarily handle fraud detection, the BoE periodically reviews assessments, placing a particular emphasis on the master thesis.

The BoE also supports and monitors the quality of the final thesis. It has contributed to revisions in the master thesis track and assessment procedures. Additionally, it conducts an annual review of the thesis course manual to ensure alignment with regulations like the Education and Examination Regulations (EER). The BoE also performs reviews of master theses through sampling, aiming to identify potential fraud signals, including plagiarism, and ensuring alignment between thesis content and the overall learning outcomes of the MSc PPHD programme in terms of expected mastery or competence levels.

Based on the documentation and the interview during the site visit, the panel concludes that the BoE functions effectively. It is well-informed about programme assessment and plays a proactive role in ensuring the quality of assessments. The programme's integration into the SBE-wide BoE allows members of the MSc PPHD chamber to glean insights from other programmes and adopt well-considered procedures established by the SBE.

#### *Assessment thesis*

Students receive support in creating their thesis from a dedicated coordination team and an academic supervisor. The thesis coordination team, led by a thesis track coordinator who also serves as an examiner, also includes an ethics officer. The ethics officer can advise students on ethical concerns in the thesis and, along with others, may review the ethics applications submitted by students. Students select a supervisor from the list posted on Canvas, and the thesis coordination team assigns the second reader.

The assessment of the master thesis consists of two distinct components: the thesis proposal (20%) and the final master thesis, which includes an oral defense (80%). In the past, a failing grade in the final thesis could be offset by a higher grade of the thesis proposal. However, the programme recently implemented a more rigorous policy, mandating a minimum grade of 5.5 for the final thesis. The panel fully supports this recently implemented policy.

The thesis proposal and the final thesis are assessed by both the supervisor and the second reader. A comprehensive assessment rubric for all components is provided to the supervisor and second reader, encompassing various dimensions weighted according to their relative importance to ILOs demonstrated by the thesis. If the marks provided by the supervisor and second reader significantly differ (e.g., by over one point, or with one assessor granting a passing mark while the other assigns a failing mark), the thesis

coordination team will review the assessments. They will then engage in discussions with the assessors to determine the areas of disagreement regarding the quality and demonstrated mastery of the student.

As part of its preparation for the site visit, the panel reviewed the final theses of 15 students, along with the accompanying assessment forms. The panel found the assessments insightful, with assessors highlighting strengths and providing constructive feedback on areas for improvement. Furthermore, the assessors' concise yet meaningful comments indicate a serious and well-motivated approach to scoring.

However, the panel also identifies areas for improvement. First, the panel noted that complete independence in the assessment by the first and second readers is not assured. First and second reader are allowed to discuss the quality of the thesis and the range of possible grades before their assessment. Second, the panel considers the rubric to be too complex, with numerous sub-matrices containing overlapping content. It recommends restructuring the sub-matrices and suggests aligning the rubrics more closely with the chapters of the thesis (e.g., research question, literature review, conceptual framework, methodological approach and methods, presentation of findings, discussion of findings, conclusion, and policy recommendations). Another point of consideration is that assessors currently provide their narrative feedback on the thesis in a single comprehensive textual paragraph. The committee suggests distributing feedback across the specific criteria (sub-matrices) being assessed independently by each faculty member.

#### Considerations

The programme has established a valid, transparent, and reliable assessment system. The assessment methods are diverse and align with the programme's objectives. The programme benefits from solid quality assessment procedures and an effective, proactive Board of Examiners (BoE). Various measures have been implemented to enhance transparency in assessments. To further enhance the transparency of the assessment process, the panel recommends incorporating assessment matrices into all courses and ensuring that each assignment is accompanied by a grading rubric, provided at the beginning of the course. The panel noted inconsistencies in the availability of this information in the documents it reviewed. Furthermore, the panel suggests implementing a guideline specifying the maximum percentage (e.g., 50%) by which course assessments can be attributed to group work.

The thesis assessment is well-designed, employing an insightful evaluation system with two assessors assessing the thesis. Assessors adeptly pinpoint strengths while offering constructive feedback on areas for improvement. Nevertheless, the panel also highlights certain areas that need enhancement. First, the panel advises paying sufficient attention to the independence of first versus second readers of the thesis. Second, the panel advises simplifying the rubric and restructuring sub-rubrics to reduce complexity and eliminate any overlapping elements.

#### Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 3.

## Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

### Findings

#### *Master thesis*

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied the theses of 15 master graduates, ensuring coverage across all five specializations. Overall, the panel was satisfied with the quality of the theses and agreed with the assigned grades. It acknowledged the strong commitment of students to their respective topics, highlighting their motivation to contribute to a better world. Furthermore, the theses were generally well-written, demonstrating a proficient command of the English language and a well-structured format. While recognizing the well-organized structure of the theses, the panel believes that the format occasionally seems overly standardized. Especially with the higher-scoring theses, the panel anticipated a greater demonstration of innovation and creativity from students.

The panel observed a broad spectrum of quality among the theses, acknowledging the excellent quality of the upper echelon of work but also identifying instances of weaker quality. The panel determined that one thesis did not meet the passing standard. This particular thesis was found to be theoretically and methodologically weak, with a weak presentation. Based on the discussions during the site visit and the convincing quality of the other theses, the panel regards this unsatisfactory thesis as an outlier, not representative of the overall quality of the theses. Moreover, the programme had also assessed this thesis as unsatisfactory, and this unsatisfactory grade could be offset at that time by a higher grade for the thesis proposal. The panel anticipates that the recently implemented stricter rules for achieving a passing grade for the thesis (see standard 3) will effectively decrease the likelihood of similar outliers in the future. Overall, the panel concludes that the theses compellingly demonstrate the achievement of the intended learning outcomes by the programme's graduates. It recommends the programme to continue focusing on the quality of the theses, particularly for theses that score around the pass mark.

#### *Alumni*

The programme analysed the alumni cohort from the class of 2019, utilizing publicly available data published on LinkedIn. A noteworthy proportion of alumni from this cohort have secured employment within the public sector (27%) and international organizations (24%). Prominent employers within these sectors include the World Food Programme, the World Bank, and the European Commission. Additionally, graduates are employed in academia (11%), research-based organizations (15%), and the private sector (24%).

During the interview, alumni indicated that they all found positions relevant to the domain and level of the MSc PPHD programme. They were very satisfied with their education and noted that the emphasis on developing a broad range of skills prepared them well for their future careers. Furthermore, they considered the wide diversity within the student cohort as a key asset of the programme. The panel therefore concludes that the programme prepares students for relevant positions in the professional field.

The panel appreciates the establishment of an alumni committee as a response to the previous accreditation panel's recommendation to actively involve alumni in discussions regarding curriculum developments. The panel encourages the programme to further engage with these alumni, especially considering their suggestion for more alumni-oriented events initiated by the programme.

## Considerations

The panel concludes that the master theses show that the intended learning outcomes of the programme are achieved. In general, the theses demonstrated commendable quality. The programme prepares students for relevant positions in the professional field and graduates reflect positively on the programme.

## Conclusion

The panel concludes that that the programme meets standard 4.

## Standard 5. Diversity

Staff and student populations should adequately reflect society, in various ways. The programme has an adequate strategy for dealing with the diverse backgrounds of students.

## Findings

As outlined in Standard 1, diversity constitutes a core value of the MSc PPHD, involving the encouragement and support of diversity within the student body, academic and support staff, curriculum, educational methods, and research that contributes to or complements the MSc PPHD.

Promoting diversity in the student cohort involves globally recruiting students from diverse disciplines and educational backgrounds. Adhering to Dutch government regulations, the programme utilizes international marketing channels for recruitment, and the admissions assessment assesses the likelihood of participants with varied educational backgrounds successfully navigating the programme.

Each year, the programme draws applicants from over 40 countries. The 2021-2022 cohort was predominantly represented by students from the Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the United States, India, and Spain. The programme is actively working to increase representation from various global regions and low-income countries, especially from the global south. In May 2022, UNU-MERIT introduced the MPP scholarship, jointly funded by alumni, to provide financial support for a student from low- and medium-income countries in the upcoming cohort.

The programme tends to employ a basic standard to address the diversity in students' backgrounds. However, greater attention should be devoted to avoiding excessive standardization, particularly concerning the format of the master's thesis.

The gender distribution among academic staff members is nearly equal, with females comprising 49%. The faculty and support staff represent a diverse cultural group, including 35% non-European staff members. Their diversity promotes the inclusion of broader perspectives in the curriculum, achieved through PBL tasks, workshops, guest lecturers, policy examples, and readings from authors and contexts across different world regions. The interactive PBL method allows students to work in small groups of various nationalities, cultural backgrounds, and prior training to explore and discuss problems from different perspectives and backgrounds.

Based on the interviews and documentation, the panel concludes that international diversity and intercultural education play a central role in the classroom, curriculum, and acquiring knowledge and skills. The educational concept implicitly underscores that diverse backgrounds and perspectives are assets contributing to the meaningfulness of education. This, in turn, creates a welcoming environment for a diverse group of students, including those from different nationalities, and socio-cultural backgrounds.

### Considerations

Diversity is a fundamental principle of the MSc PPHD, encompassing the promotion and support of diversity within the student body, academic and support staff, and curriculum. The programme conscientiously incorporates the educational methodology of PBL while efficiently harnessing the benefits of the international classroom setting.

### Conclusion

The panel concludes that the programme meets standard 5.

### General conclusion

The panel's assessment of the MSc PPHD is positive.

### Development points

1. Explore areas where synergies and enhancements within SBE can further strengthen the programme's profile;
2. Enhance the added value of Problem-Based Learning (PBL) by explicitly outlining the professional skills related to policymaking that students cultivate throughout the courses. Consider implementing learning lines on professional skills tailored to the various specializations;
3. Ensure that assessment matrices are included in all courses and that a grading rubric accompanies each assignment;
4. Ensure that the assessment conducted by the first and second assessors is entirely independent;
5. Simplify the rubric for the final thesis by restructuring the sub-rubrics and eliminating overlap;
6. Continue focusing on the quality of the theses, particularly for theses that score around the pass mark;
7. Strengthen alumni engagement in the programme by organizing activities with and for them, ensuring that they serve as effective ambassadors.

# Appendix 1. Intended learning outcomes

## **1. Understand, use and assess leading theories and concepts in the field of public policy and human development**

- 1.1 Explain and argue for the relevance of public policy for human development
- 1.2 Recognize and apply public policy and human development as a multidisciplinary field of study drawing primarily from economics, political science, sociology, international relations, public administration and law
- 1.3 Identify, classify and explain the role of actors and institutions involved in the public policy process and their influence on developmental outcomes
- 1.4 Comprehend and interpret key conceptual frameworks relevant to at least one of the following areas: global governance, innovation, migration, social protection, and risk
- 1.5 Identify and analyse different actors' preferences for public policy in the context of human development regarding at least one of the following areas: global governance, innovation, migration, social protection, and risk
- 1.6 Understand and explain the relation between institutional failures and policy responses

## **2. Analyse and evaluate public policies and provide recommendations for policy design**

- 2.1 Explain the translation of theory and concepts into measurement options relevant to at least one of the following areas: global governance, innovation, migration, social protection, and risk
- 2.2 Analyse research results and translate those results into policy recommendations
- 2.3 Appraise, negotiate and recommend policy options relating to at least one of the following areas: global governance, innovation, migration, social protection, and risk

## **3. Understand, assess and apply public policy research methods**

- 3.1 Explain the characteristics of evidence-based policy and its rationale
- 3.2 Understand and assess the quality of different research designs
- 3.3 Understand different methodologies and identify the appropriate methods for a particular policy research question
- 3.4 Understand and differentiate causality from correlations and use appropriate tools to identify the causal effects in policy-relevant research
- 3.5 Recognize and explain the data requirements that are appropriate in different research contexts
- 3.6 Compare, select and apply different quantitative and qualitative methodologies to public policy research

## **4. Undertake analytical and independent research on public policy and human Development**

- 4.1 Appraise, evaluate, and address ethical challenges that arise in research on public policy related social challenges
- 4.2 Identify and formulate relevant and feasible research questions for policy-relevant research
- 4.3 Undertake independent research, select relevant concepts and theories, and present findings in original academic output using a critical analytical approach
- 4.4 Express, written and orally, a critical analysis on a policy topic

## **5. Constructively work in multicultural and multidisciplinary teams**

5.1 Reflect on own contributions to and performance within multicultural teams, e.g., through seeking feedback

5.2 Create and foster a safe and effective team environment (e.g. respectfully contribute to team discussions, encourage knowledge sharing, facilitate discussion with a clear conclusion/summary), taking into account diverse backgrounds, talents, and values

5.3 Contribute to a productive atmosphere, encourage knowledge sharing, and facilitate discussion with a clear conclusion/summary, when taking up different roles in collaborative learning.

5.4 Deliver informed feedback in a meaningful and responsible way, respond to received feedback recognizing the relevance & transfer to new settings/contexts (feedback cycle).



## Appendix 2. Programme curriculum

Semester 1	1a.	Public Policy (4 ECTS)	Methods for Policy Analysis (6 ECTS)	
	1b.	Public Economics (4 ECTS)		
	2a	Public Policy Analysis (8 ECTS)	Advanced Methods for Policy-Relevant Research and Analysis (6 ECTS)	
	2b			
		Thesis track		
Semester 2	4a	Specialization Course 1 (4 ECTS)	Thesis Track (16 EC)	
	4b	Specialization Course 2 (4 ECTS)		
	5a	Specialization Course 3 (4 ECTS)		
	5b	Specialization Course 4 (4 ECTS)		
	6	Thesis track		

Specialization courses

### Global Governance for Development

- Global Governance and Human Development
- The Law and Policy of the World Trade Organization
- Governance of Peacebuilding and Development
- Global Governance of Planetary Challenges

### Governance of Innovation

- Innovation and Innovation Policy from a System Perspective
- Local Knowledge, Systems and Policy
- Managing the Fourth Industrial Revolution
- Innovation for Sustainability

### Migration studies

- Introduction to Migration Studies
- Migration and Remittance Effects
- The Migration Lifecycle: Journeys, Integration, Return
- Comparative Migration Policy

### Risk and Vulnerability

- Risk and Vulnerability Assessment
- Building Resilience and Adaptive Governance
- Risk Management in Crisis Situations
- Behavioral Insights for Policy Design in Risky and Vulnerable Situations

### Social Protection Policy

- The Global Social Challenge: Beyond Poverty and Inequality
- Understanding Social Protection
- Quantitative Techniques for Social Protection Policy Design
- Financing Social Protection

## Appendix 3. Programme of the site visit

Monday 27 November 2023

11.00 – 11.15	Welcome and arrival
11.15 – 13.00	Panel preparation (including consultation hour)
<b>13.00 - 13.45</b>	<b>Interview management</b>
13.45 - 14.00	Break/internal panel meeting
<b>14.00 – 14.45</b>	<b>Interview students</b>
14.45- 15.15	Break
<b>15.15 – 16.00</b>	<b>Interview teaching staff</b>
16.00 -16.30	Break/ Internal panel meeting
<b>16.30- 17.15</b>	<b>Interview Board of Examiners</b>
17.15 -17.30	Break
<b>17.30 -18.15</b>	<b>Representatives of the Advisory Board &amp; alumni</b>

Tuesday 7 November 2023

08.45 – 09.15	Internal panel meeting
<b>09.15 - 10.00</b>	<b>Final interview management</b>
10.00 - 11.15	Concluding panel session
<b>11.15 - 11.45</b>	<b>Oral feedback</b>
<b>11.45 - 12.30</b>	<b>Development Dialogue</b>

## Appendix 4. Materials

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses. Information on the theses is available from Academion upon request. The panel also studied other materials, which included:

- Programme SWOT Analysis
- Follow-up Previous NVAO-EAPAA Accreditation
- MSc PPHD Admission Requirements
- MSc PPHD Programme Website
- UN General Assembly Resolution
- Programme Delivery Structure
- SBE Strategy
- Complete List of ILOs
- Schematic Overview of the Curriculum vs. ILOs
- Course Guide 2023-2024
- Course Descriptions 2023-2024
- Assurance of Learning
- Curriculum Overview 2023-2024
- Curriculum Changes (2018/19 – 2023/24)
- Composition of the Teaching Staff
- Faculty Data Sheets
- Programme Support Staff
- Teacher-Student Ratio
- University Teacher Qualification
- Overview Academic Advisor
- Information on Problem-Based Learning
- SBE Assessment Policy 2019-2020
- PPHD Assessment Plan
- Assessments Programme
- EER 2022-2023 / 2023-2024
- Recent Minutes Education Programme Committee (from 208-2019 until 2022-2023)
- Recent annual reports Board of Examiners (from 2017-2018 until 2021-2022)
- Board of Examiners -SMM-SBE chamber- Annual Report 2021-2022
- List of Examiners
- Board of Examiners Structure
- Master Thesis Supervisor Handbook
- Course Manual Thesis Track
- SBE Assessment Policy
- PPHD Assessment Plan
- Assessments Programme
- EER 2022-2023 / 2023-2024
- Recent Reports and Minutes
- List of Examiners
- Board of Examiners Structure
- Master Thesis Supervisor Handbook
- Course Manual Thesis Track 2023-2024
- Enrolments and Graduation Rates
- MPP Scholarship
- International Classroom

- SBE Internationalisation Strategy 2020-2025
- Academic Staff Nationalities and Gender