MASTER'S PROGRAMME

PUBLIC POLICY AND

HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

MAASTRICHT GRADUATE SCHOOL OF GOVERNANCE

MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

This report was finalized on 16-03-2018

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME PUBLIC POLICY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development

Name of the programme:	Public Policy and Human Development
CROHO number:	60328
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	
Location(s):	Maastricht
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Joint programme:	
partner institutions involved:	United Nations University
type of degree awarded:	double degree
Language of instruction:	English
Expiration of accreditation:	31/12/2018

The visit of the assessment panel Public Administration to the Maastricht Graduate School of Governance of Maastricht University took place on 15/11/2017 - 16/11/2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 16 October 2017. The panel that assessed the master's programme Public Policy and Human Development consisted of:
- Prof. dr. T. (Tony) Bovaird, professor emeritus of Public Management and Policy at the University of Birmingham (United Kingdom) [chair];
- Prof. dr. M. (Marleen) Brans, professor at the Public Governance Institute of the KU Leuven (Belgium) [vice-chair];
- Prof. dr. H.M.C. (Harrie) Eijkelhof, professor emeritus of Physics Education at Utrecht University;
- Prof. dr. Lan Xue, professor and dean of the School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University (China);
- Prof. dr. J.P. (Jan) Pronk, professor emeritus in Theory and Practice of International Development at the International Institute of Social Studies in The Hague of the Erasmus University Rotterdam. Former Minister for Development Co-operation (1973-1977 and 1989-1998) and former Minister of Environment, Spatial Planning and Housing (1998-2002).
- S. (Sophie) van Wijngaarden, master's student Complex Systems Engineering and Management at the Delft University of Technology [student member].

The panel was supported by Mark Delmartino MA, who acted as secretary.
Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

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

The panel consists of seventeen members:
- Prof. T. (Tony) Bovaird, professor emeritus of Public Management and Policy at the University of Birmingham (United Kingdom) [chair];
- Prof. A. (Adrian) Ritz, professor for Public Management at the University of Bern (Switzerland) [vice-chair];
- Prof. M. (Marleen) Brans, professor at the Public Governance Institute of the KU Leuven (Belgium) [vice-chair];
- Prof. H.M.C. (Harrie) Eijkelhof, professor emeritus of Physics Education at Utrecht University;
- Prof. P.B. Peter Sloep, professor emeritus in Technology-Enhanced Learning, in particular Learning in Social at the Open Universiteit Nederland;
- Prof. T. (Tiina) Randma-Liiv, professor of Public Management and Policy and vice-dean for Research at Tallinn University of Technology (Estonia);
- Prof. L. (Lan) Xue, professor and dean of the School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University (China);
- Prof. E. (Esther) Versluis, professor of European Regulatory Governance at Maastricht University.
- Prof. W. (William) Webster, professor of Public Policy and Management at the Stirling Management School, University of Stirling (UK);
- Prof. J.J.A. (Jacques) Thomassen, emeritus professor of Political Science at the University of Twente;
- Prof J. E. (Jenneke) Bosch-Boesjes, emeritus professor of Development and Differentiation in Academic Education at the University of Groningen;
- Drs. B. (Bertine) Steenbergen, interim director at the Ministry of Security and Justice.
- Prof. J.P. (Jan) Pronk, professor emeritus in Theory and Practice of International Development at the International Institute of Social Studies and former Minister for Development Co-operation and Minister of Environment, Spatial Planning and Housing;
- Drs. C. (Cees) Vermeer, town clerk of the city of Breda;
- Drs. H. (Henk) de Jong, director of Strategy and Policy of the Dutch National Police;
- J.C. (Jasper) Meijering BSc, master's student Engineering and Policy Analysis at Delft University of Technology [student member];
- S. (Sophie) van Wijngaarden BSc, master's student Systems Engineering, Policy Analysis & Management at the Delft University of Technology [student member].

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

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

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

Preparation
Before the assessment panel's site visit to Maastricht University, the project coordinator received the self-evaluation reports that the programmes wrote based on the joint NVAO-EAPAA framework. He sent it to the panel after checking it for completeness of information. Upon reading the self-evaluation reports, the panel members formulated their preliminary findings. The panel also studied a selection of 15 theses and the accompanying assessment forms for each programme. This selection was made by the panel's chair, in cooperation with the secretary, from a list of graduates from the past three years. The chair and secretary took care that all tracks and specializations within the programmes were covered, and made sure that the distribution of grades in the theses selection matched the distribution of grades over all theses.

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

Site visit
The site visit to Maastricht University on 15 and 16 November 2017 followed a visit to Tilburg University that took place on 13 and 14 November 2017. At the start of the week, the panel held a preparatory meeting during which it was instructed regarding the assessment framework and procedures. On 15 November, the panel discussed its working method and its preliminary findings for the Maastricht site visit, and reflected on the content and use of the programme's domain-specific framework of reference (Appendix 2).

During the site visit, the panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes, and examined materials provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials is given in Appendix 6. The panel provided students and staff with the opportunity to speak informally with the panel outside the set interviews. No use was made of this opportunity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Good
The programme systematically surpasses the current generic quality standard.

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

The Master of Science programme in Public Policy and Human Development (MPPHD) is a one-year full-time master's programme taught in English and offered since 2013 as a double degree in collaboration with the United Nations University. The programme embodies core values of Maastricht University such as internationalisation, problem-based learning and diversity. The intended learning outcomes reflect adequately the level and orientation of the programme. However, although there is already an explicit link with the curriculum structure, the programme learning outcomes could be formulated in more detail and in a more measurable way. Similarly, the courses on the curriculum and the specialisation tracks would benefit from a more explicit alignment within the overall programme.

MPPHD is delivered in an adequate teaching and learning environment. The structure of the curriculum with its three consecutive phases is fine, and so is the quality of the staff and the educational approach. Moreover, the programme targets students with a broad variety of disciplinary backgrounds and ensures they are levelled up at an early stage in the curriculum. At the time of the site visit, however, not every specialisation track is developed to a similar extent. A lot of effort has already been put in, but the Programme Board and the track coordinators should continue monitoring - and where necessary adjusting - the content, workload and internship opportunities of the respective tracks. Furthermore, the growth of the programme has led to an expansion of the academic and support staff in recent years. However, the programme features many temporary staff and doctoral fellows, which may jeopardise its viability in the long run.

The assessment of both courses and theses was done adequately in the past and is currently being adjusted in line with central university and faculty policies. Programme Board and course coordinators are developing an assessment programme and a testing plan. The Board of Examiners has the necessary competences to fulfil its legal responsibilities and the programme benefits from the input of a testing expert.

Based on its review of a theses sample, the panel is satisfied with the way thesis evaluation was performed in the recent past. The evaluation form was adequate, as it could – and very often did - generate insightful comments to justify the scores. The panel suggests that the envisaged new format of this thesis evaluation form is adjusted to guarantee an independent assessment by both graders and to generate adequate written feedback. Having established that each thesis in the sample fulfils at least the minimum criteria required, the panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes of the MPPHD programmes are achieved by the time of graduation.

Students not only receive substantive and methodological knowledge on public policy and human development, but also acquire professional skills to prepare for the labour market. Alumni and employers have highlighted that the programme equips students for the labour market in a very effective way. Moreover, MPPHD goes at lengths to follow-up its graduates, a commendable practice that is worth developing further.

The programme has an adequate system in place to monitor and improve the quality of the individual courses, specialisations and overall curriculum. Nonetheless, it would benefit from a more systematic involvement of alumni and employers in discussing course and curriculum developments. Moreover, the programme may want to organise a mid-term review to evaluate the quality of the specialisation tracks, thereby involving UNU representatives as peer reviewers.

MPPHD is not only committed to diversity, but also realises this goal in terms of staff, students and educational philosophy. The panel is impressed by the international composition of the student body and by the large presence of female staff and the senior positions they hold in the programme. Given the focus on human development, the programme could recruit students and staff from an even wider geographical range, notably from Developing Countries.

In sum, MPPHD is an interesting programme that is up to standard on all accounts, hence the panel's overall positive conclusion. Because it clearly delivers on diversity, which is key to both MPPHD and Maastricht University, the panel considers this standard to be good.

In so far as the Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development is concerned, the panel assesses the standards from the combined NVAO-EAPAA framework 2016 in the following way:

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

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

Date: 16-03-2018

Prof. Tony Bovaird   Mark Delmartino MA

DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM NVAO-EAPAA ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK 2016

Organisational context

The Maastricht Graduate School of Governance is part of the Faculty of Humanities and Sciences at Maastricht University. The Master of Science in Public Policy and Human Development (MPPHD) was created to train public policy professionals and was accredited by NVAO in 2005. The programme is a one-year full-time master's programme taught in English. In 2010 the MPPHD was re-accredited by NVAO and started to formally collaborate with the United Nations University, Maastricht Economic and Social Research institute on Innovation and Technology (UNU-MERIT). Since 2013, MPPHD is offered as a double degree in collaboration with UNU. The UNU regulations for the programme have been built specifically to replicate Dutch laws and regulations within the UN legal context. Since UNU is not a traditional university that is subject to national laws, several steps have been taken to safeguard the quality of education in the programme. 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.

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes of the programme have been detailed with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements. As for level and orientation (bachelor's or master's; professional or academic), the intended learning outcomes fit into the Dutch qualifications framework. In addition, they tie in with the international perspective of the requirements currently set by the professional field and the discipline with regard to the contents of the programme. Insofar as is applicable, the intended learning outcomes are in accordance with relevant legislation and regulations. The programme should clearly state its educational philosophy in reaching these outcomes and identify a clear mission.

Findings

To assess the objectives of the programme, the panel studied the domain-specific reference framework (Appendix 2) and the intended learning outcomes (Appendix 3) of the MPPHD.

The MPPHD programme aims to contribute to human development through the analysis and evaluation of public policies. It offers training in making and analysing evidence-based policy with the goal of strengthening governance capacity in domestic and international organisations. The programme emphasises the connection between public policy and decision-making processes, i.e. the effectiveness and efficiency of governance. The panel noticed that the programme embodies the core values of Maastricht University – problem based learning (PBL), internationalisation and diversity. Students come from a wide variety of countries and the majority of academic staff is non-Dutch. This cultural diversity contributes to the university-wide concept of the 'International Classroom'. Moreover, the MPPHD puts a strong emphasis on developing professional skills and on equipping students with substantive and methodological knowledge to enable them to work as policy designers and policy analysts.

The learning outcomes of the programme are aligned with the three educational elements that compose the programme: (i) the fall semester with core courses common to all students; (ii) the spring semester with sets of specialised elective courses; and (iii) the summer period with supervisory assistance for thesis writing. Although the panel notices that the intended learning outcomes reflect the (master's) level and (academic) orientation of the programme, it has mixed feelings about the way the intended learning outcomes are formulated. On the one hand the five learning outcomes are powerful: if graduates are meeting these objectives, then they are very well equipped for the envisaged jobs on the labour market. Moreover, the panel appreciates the close link between the outcomes and the programme structure. On the other hand, the learning outcomes are difficult to measure due to their abstract formulation. In the view of the panel, the intended learning

outcomes should be unpacked and made more detailed and measurable. There is also room for clarification with regard to the link between the individual outcomes and also between the set of programme outcomes and the learning goals of individual courses.

The programme focuses primarily on evidence-based policy, and provides substantive and methodological training in policy design, implementation and analysis. During the learning process, the substantive and methodological training is applied to policy problems recognised by the international community as important for human development. However, the panel felt that intended learning outcomes in relation to an understanding of human development issues could be included more specifically within the MPPHD programme (that is, in addition to those intended learning outcomes listed in Appendix 3). Graduates are knowledgeable in public policy and its application and contribution to human development issues at regional, national and international level. In this way, the MPPHD distinguishes itself from programmes in public administration.

The panel discussed to what extent this programme falls within the remit of the domain-specific reference framework for Public Administration and within the scope of EAPAA. On both accounts, the panel found that this is the case: the programme has a specific focus on competencies (regarding policy formulation, implementation, analysis, advice and evaluation) that are important for governance, which fit the framework for Public Administration, Public Governance and Governance and Organisation (PAGO) programmes. Moreover, the programme addresses the disciplines (such as economics, political science and law) that EAPAA thinks are crucial for a Public Administration degree. Nonetheless, the panel noticed that some disciplines are integrated in a rather implicit way and it suggests that these components should become a more explicit part of the curriculum. This could happen for instance by bringing to the fore more public administration and governance issues, as well as attention to institutional contexts.

Considerations

Because of its particular profile, the MPPHD programme stands somewhat apart from other PAGO programmes assessed in the framework of this cluster exercise. Nonetheless, the panel is convinced that this programme falls within the remit of both the domain-specific reference framework and the scope of EAPAA.

The programme addresses in an interesting way both components of its name: public policy and human development. It provides students not only with substantive and methodological knowledge, but also with professional skills that will give graduates a head start when entering the labour market. The panel also appreciates the programme's alignment with the core values of Maastricht University.

The intended learning outcomes reflect adequately the (master's) level and (academic) orientation of the programme. Although there is already an explicit link with the curriculum structure, the panel considers that the learning outcomes could be formulated in more detail and in a more measurable way. By doing so, there will be more coherence with the learning goals of individual courses.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 1, intended learning outcomes, of the Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment
The curriculum, staff and programme-specific services and facilities enable the incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The contents and structure of the curriculum enable the students admitted to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The quality of the staff and of the programme-specific services and facilities are essential to that end. Curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitute a coherent teaching-learning environment for the students.

Findings

To assess the content and structure of the programme, the panel studied the curriculum (Appendix 4) and the content of several core courses (Appendix 6) of the MPPHD.

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

The MPPHD programme consists of core content courses (16 EC), core skills courses (12 EC), a set of specialisation electives (16 EC) and a master's thesis (16 EC). The content courses train students in the disciplines of policy, economics and policy analysis. The skills courses include a quantitative methods component featuring statistics, data science and regression analysis, as well as a module on research design.

Discussing the core course contents with several interviewees, the panel learned that fundamental disciplines such as law, economics and political science are addressed – and assessed - in the content courses. As discussed under Standard 1, the panel found that MPPHD can be considered a Public Administration degree. Further to this consideration, the panel suggests that the programme makes these components more visible in the course outlines and the assessment plan. Moreover, in order to achieve the intended learning outcomes on human development issues (which the panel recommended to be strengthened under Standard 1), the panel suggests that one of the core courses in the first semester should focus directly on human development, at least partly, to give an overview of the issues which many of the specialisations will pick up in the second semester.

While the orientation of the programme and faculty is quite international, the course contents are still mostly focused on developed countries. Moreover, issues related to sustainable development goals do not feature strongly in the programme, although they have become top priority for all UN agencies. The panel recommends the programme to consider widening the contents of both core courses and specialisations to reflect a wider range of issues relevant to developing countries in general and SDGs in particular.

The core courses are all taught in the fall semester and prepare students with the skills and knowledge needed to design and analyse policies in general. Given the broad intake of students with very different educational backgrounds (which will be addressed explicitly under sections 2.7 and 2.8), the core courses in period 1 start at a rather basic level before moving on very quickly to the envisaged master's level. Following the discussions on site, the panel acknowledged that the level of all individual courses – both substantive and methodological – is sufficiently challenging.

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

The spring semester is dedicated to a coherent set of four courses per specialisation track, combining contents and methods. The specialisation amounts to 16 EC and contributes to the understanding of public policy in relation to a human development topic. Usually students choose a thesis topic that is

related to the specialisation track. Students who do not wish to follow a particular specialisation can opt for a free-elective track, taking courses from different specialisations, subject to approval by the Programme Board.

In the view of the panel, the structure of the curriculum with core components and specialisations is straightforward. Students indicated in the report and on site that the programme content was consistent and very policy-oriented throughout the year. While the individual specialisations are clear as such, their respective contribution to the human development component of the programme could be made more explicit. This finding is in line with the input of the students in the critical reflection section of the Self-Evaluation Report, who commented that there were not enough aspects of human development in the programme. In fact, the programme may want to consider translating this attention to human development in a horizontal way across the curriculum, rather than integrating it in every separate course/track.

The individual course descriptions feature learning goals that are formulated and organised according to the Dublin Descriptors. However, there is little information on how each specialisation contributes in its own right to the programme objectives. Further to the consideration under intended learning outcomes, the panel thinks that the coherence of the programme would be enhanced by a clearer link between the learning goals of the individual tracks and the overall programme.

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

The curriculum focuses on content, methods and research skills from different disciplines. In this regard the programme is clearly multidisciplinary. While students will reportedly encounter a multi-cultural and interdisciplinary work environment after their studies, the panel did not gather very clearly from the discussions on site in which parts of the curriculum students have to combine knowledge from different disciplines. This could be made clearer in the programme documentation.

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

Based on the information materials and the discussion on site, the panel confirms that the MPPHD programme is a one-year full-time programme that starts early September and finishes by the end of August.

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

The programme puts a strong emphasis on developing professional skills. The teaching approach prepares students to work in an international environment by allowing them to practice collaboration within a diverse group setting. The panel understood from several testimonials that during problem-based learning tutorials, students learn to voice their opinion and to listen to and elaborate on the opinions of others.

Several (guest) lecturers on the programme, notably in the specialisation tracks, are academics who combine an academic career with professional positions. These external staff provide not only substantive knowledge but teach students to contextualise how their current study material is used in practice.

During the thesis track, students are encouraged to combine the thesis work with an internship. In these cases, the topic is likely to have greater real-life relevance and may present a potential benefit to the internship provider. Some of the alumni during the visit indicated that their internship organisation had offered them a job. Employers from their side mentioned that they hired these interns because of their ability to write policy reports.

Although students were quite critical in the report about the lack of support and encouragement they received from the programme in organising an internship, the panel has noticed that at the time of the site visit, the Programme Board was taking several measures to facilitate such internships and to offer various forms of employability support to students. One of these measures is the appointment of an internship officer who will guide students to internship opportunities with partner organisations.

> ### 2.6 Structure and didactics of the programme
> *The programme is coherent in its contents. The didactic concepts are in line with the aims and objectives of the programme. The teaching methods correspond to the didactic philosophy of the programme. The programme is 'doable' in the formal time foreseen for the programme in the respective years.*

Lecturers use a collaborative learning approach to education. This approach is mainly based on the philosophy of the problem-based learning (PBL) model that is used to stimulate team-based problem solving and to emphasise the individual responsibility of students to contribute to a multi-cultural and multi-disciplinary team tackling a policy problem. The panel acknowledges that PBL is indeed a relevant approach for this programme.

The programme monitors carefully the feasibility of individual courses through course evaluations, informal meetings with students and in sessions organised by the study association. This systematic approach has helped the programme in identifying and addressing some of the severe problems that students mentioned in the Self-Evaluation Report: while the workload is equal for all students in the first semester, it differed extensively between individual courses and among specialisation tracks. The panel observed in the discussions with both Programme Board and Education Committee that these bodies are taking the issue very seriously. It encourages the Programme Board and the track coordinators to continue monitoring - and where necessary adjusting - the content, workload and internship opportunities of the respective tracks.

> ### 2.7 Admission of students
> *Admission goals, admission policy and admission standards, including academic prerequisites, are in line with the mission and programme objectives. They are clearly and publicly stated, specifying any differences for categories of students.*

The rules for admission are included in the Education and Examination Regulations. The programme attracts students from all over the world, reaching out and seeking diversity. The admission process is designed to evaluate students on the likelihood of successful completion of the programme. It recognises prior experience that is useful for studying public policy. The programme has defined substantial language requirements and basic academic competences as must-have criteria.

The panel was initially somewhat hesitant about the admission process and its concept of selection based on the likelihood of successful programme completion. This process, however, is well documented and decisions are motivated based on strict criteria which have been summarised in a note the programme director presented to the panel during the site visit.

The panel thinks the admission process is adequate. Indeed, specifically because it allows for a potentially broad variety of student inflow, the programme could potentially be more successful in recruiting students from 'the South'. The panel therefore recommends that the programme works together with faculty and university to develop a scheme that takes away non-academic obstacles of admission for people from developing countries.

> **2.8 Intake**
> *The structure, contents and the didactics of the programme are in line with the qualifications of the students that enter into the programme.*

Through the admission process, the programme ensures that students that are accepted have the previous education and skills needed to meet the learning objectives of the first courses. Students who enrol on the programme often have very different educational backgrounds. In order to address possible deficiencies, the programme offers a range of refresher courses at the very start of the fall semester covering political science, economics and quantitative skills. Moreover, the regular courses in the first semester such as public policy and introductory data science and statistics start off from a very basic level. Students with a background in these disciplines are encouraged to mentor their fellow students during the first weeks of the course.

The panel understood from the discussions that this approach to levelling is new, operating since the start of this academic year, and will be evaluated in due course. The students, who at the time of the site visit had just started their second block, indicated to the panel that their respective educational backgrounds had given them some advantages in one domain, but not necessarily on all accounts. They mentioned that the first courses were indeed starting from a very basic level but reached the appropriate, more challenging, level quite quickly. Furthermore, the panel was assured by the lecturers that all students must pass the same tests and eventually reach the same level of competencies.

> **2.9 Faculty qualifications**
> *A substantive percentage of the professional faculty nucleus actively involved in the programme holds an earned doctorate or other equivalent terminal academic degree in their field. Any faculty lacking the terminal degree must have a record or sufficient professional or academic experience directly relevant to their assigned responsibilities. The field of expertise and experience of the faculty reflects the needed expertise to deliver the programme as intended. All faculty with teaching assignments have at least proven basic educational skills. The educational skills are adapted to the didactics of the programme and its components. Where practitioners teach courses, there is satisfactory evidence of the quality of their academic qualifications, professional experience and teaching ability.*

Since the previous accreditation visit, the number of students has grown considerably. As a result, the number of academic and support staff has been expanded: according to the Self-Evaluation Report, the number of internal academic staff increased over the past six years from 5 to 22, while the number of support staff has grown by more than 75% in the same period.

In addition to these internal staff members, who are delivering the core teaching load, the programme also uses external academic staff. The Programme Board and course coordinators ensure that external staff meet the specific teaching requirements and receive an in-person briefing about the programme, the context in which their contribution takes place, and the educational philosophy of the curriculum.

Most academic staff members have a PhD and are encouraged to obtain the university teaching qualification (UTQ). The didactic qualities and the language proficiency of all lecturers are assessed in the course evaluations. The panel observed from the faculty data sheets in the Self-Evaluation Report that lecturers have adequate qualifications in the domain they are covering in the curriculum.

Students mentioned both in the report and during the visit that most lecturers had excellent knowledge of the subject they were teaching, that their didactic skills were fine and their language proficiency was up-to standard. However, students suggested that they would appreciate having more senior staff teaching the core courses in the fall semester. When students encountered and reported problems, they believed that adequate corrective measures were taken.

The panel has noticed that the quality of the individual staff is fine and that the number of staff is sufficient to implement the programme. However, the programme features many temporary contributors and several staff are rather junior (doctoral fellows). The panel supports the suggestion of the students that more senior permanent staff could be involved in the programme and recommends the programme to find a better balance between permanent and temporary staff.

Considerations

The panel considers that the MPPHD programme is delivered in an adequate teaching and learning environment. The structure of the curriculum is fine, and so is the quality of the staff and the educational approach.

Moreover, the panel appreciates the efforts of the programme to admit students with a broad variety of educational backgrounds and to ensure they are levelled up at an early stage in the curriculum. Similarly, the panel supports the recent initiatives of the Programme Board to facilitate internship opportunities.

In terms of curriculum, the panel thinks the programme would benefit from a more explicit alignment of courses (and their respective learning goals), specialisation tracks and learning outcomes at programme level. Moreover, the concepts of human development and strategic developments goals could be highlighted more clearly in the programme. There is also room for demonstrating how students are exposed to the interdisciplinary character of MPPHD.

The panel has come across several indications that not every specialisation track is yet developed to similar quality standards. While it recognises that many efforts have already been made, the panel encourages the Programme Board and the track coordinators to continue monitoring - and where necessary adjusting - the content, workload and internship opportunities of the respective tracks.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 2, Teaching-learning environment, of the Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 3: Assessment
The programme has an adequate assessment system in place. The tests and assessments are valid, reliable and transparent to the students. The programme's examining board safeguards the quality of the interim and final tests administered.

Findings

To assess the quality, validity and transparency of assessment within the MPPHD programme, the panel considered the assessment policy of the programme, the thesis assessment and the functioning of the Board of Examiners.

Based on the information in the Self-Evaluation Report and the discussions during the site visit, the panel understands that the assessment of the programme is currently being adjusted. The changes are mainly triggered by developments at central university and faculty level. In the view of the panel, these adjustments will enhance the quality of the assessment system and the individual assessments. The panel observed, moreover, that the MPPHD programme involves several stakeholders in the assessment process who have complementary and well defined tasks and responsibilities.

The Board of Examiners governing the MPPHD programme covers three master's programmes within the faculty. The Board is newly composed since 2016-2017 and its members have attended courses

which the University organised to strengthen the competence of examination board members. The panel met with some of the Board members and found that they are well equipped for their tasks.

In the summer of 2017, the Board of Examiners tasked the Programme Board with drafting an assessment policy and assessment programme. This document formalises existing practices and assists course coordinators, examiners and the Board of Examiners in implementing the assessment procedures. Moreover, the Programme Board is currently implementing – with the support of all course coordinators - an assessment and grading plan for each course. During the site visit, the panel studied the latest version of these documents. It supports the measures of the Board of Examiners, as well as the work that is currently being undertaken to align the forms of assessment with the learning goals of the individual courses and the overall outcomes of the programme.

The programme can rely for its assessment work on the support of an assessment expert at faculty level. The panel met this expert, acknowledges her value added for the programme, and suggests that programme and course coordinators make more/good use of her expertise in developing and implementing the assessment system, programme and plan.

Students indicated both in the Self-Evaluation Report and during the visit that assessment is organised in a transparent way. After each exam, they are invited to an assessment consultation hour and can discuss the assessment and their grades. In case they have concerns regarding the validity or reliability of a specific exam, they are aware that they can – and they effectively do - address these to the course coordinator, the education committee or the Board of Examiners.

The thesis is evaluated and marked by two independent graders: the thesis supervisor and a second reader assigned by the institute. The second readers are explicitly tasked to serve as in-house quality control and may not be involved in the thesis supervision or in a direct work relationship with the supervisor. The thesis coordinator monitors the grading of theses and performs individual quality controls to ensure that grades adequately represent the envisaged quality standards. The review panel in the previous accreditation round suggested that the thesis assessment should be improved. The current panel observed that such improvements have indeed been made, both in the set-up of the assessment and in grading the theses.

The panel was informed during the visit that an external thesis supervisor can be appointed, for instance when students perform their research in an organisation. While the panel thinks that such supervisors are useful to support students on the spot, they should not be involved directly in the grading of the thesis. This task should remain with both internal graders who are of course at liberty to seek the opinion of the external supervisor.

The panel has reviewed a sample of 15 theses submitted and accepted in the academic years 2013-2014, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. The panel observed that each thesis is assessed using an evaluation form. Although the panel agrees with the scores given by the assessors, it was not always possible to establish how the graders arrived at the final scores, because they did not always substantiate their scores. While assessors provided systematic 'tick-box' feedback in the evaluation forms, the level of text comments varied considerably. Nonetheless, the majority of evaluation forms was completed in an insightful way with detailed, precise and critical comments that justified the score. During the site visit, the panel encouraged the lecturers to step up their efforts to provide insightful evaluations for all theses.

The Board of Examiners informed the panel that the thesis evaluation form will change in the near future. The panel had a look at the new format and suggested that it be adjusted in such a way that the form triggers insightful comments from the assessors and demonstrates the independent character of the grading by both assessors.

Considerations

The panel considers that the assessment of both courses and theses was done adequately in the past and is currently being adjusted in line with central university and faculty policies. These adjustments will increase the quality of both the assessment system and the individual assessments. The panel applauds in particular the recent efforts of the Programme Board, the course coordinators and the Board of Examiners regarding the new assessment system, programme and plan. It considers that the persons concerned with assessment at both programme and faculty level have the necessary expertise to implement the changes.

Based on its review of a thesis sample, the panel is quite satisfied with the way thesis evaluation was performed in the recent past. The evaluation form was adequate as it could – and very often did - generate insightful comments to justify the scores given. The panel suggests that the envisaged new format should be adjusted to guarantee an independent assessment by both graders and to generate adequate written feedback in addition to mere tick-box scoring. Moreover, it strongly advises the programme to have theses graded only by internal staff, not by external supervisors.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 3, Assessment, of the Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes
The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved. The level achieved is demonstrated by interim and final tests, final projects and the performance of graduates in actual practice or in post-graduate programmes.

Findings

To assess the achieved learning outcomes of the programme, the panel studied a sample of 15 theses (Appendix 6) and interviewed alumni and representatives from the work field who employ graduates of the programme.

The thesis counts for 16 EC and is an independent work in which students do an analytical study on a topic of policy relevance. Students first develop a thesis proposal before they collect relevant literature, critically assess theories, apply a suitable methodology, analyse results and present concluding remarks.

In order to establish whether students had effectively achieved the MPPHD learning outcomes, the panel reviewed a sample of 15 theses covering the whole range of scores given. In each case, the panel found that the thesis fulfilled at least the minimum requirements one would expect of a final product of academic orientation at master's level. The quality of individual theses varied considerably, but these differences were also appropriately reflected in the scores.

The programme not only provides students with substantive and methodological knowledge, but also pays considerable attention to developing professional skills in order for graduates to work as policy designers and policy analysts. The panel observed in both the Self-Evaluation Report and the discussions with alumni and employers that the programme is quite successful in preparing students for these particular positions on the labour market. Given the combination of core courses and specialisation electives, alumni felt well prepared to find a job in the area of their specialisation. Employers from their side emphasised that the programme delivers graduates with an adequate combination of (specialist) knowledge and (professional) skills to join their organisations.

Because alumni surveys are aggregated at university and faculty level, the MPPHD programme has been conducting an internal census of its alumni through their LinkedIn profiles. According to this census, roughly 80% of graduates serve in either an analytical (researcher, consultant) or operational (manager, desk officer) capacity. A quarter of the graduates work directly for the public sector (be it in international, national or sub-national organisations), 22% are engaged at research-based institutions (universities), while civil society organisations and consultancies are each attracting 20% of the MPPHD graduates.

Considerations

Theses indicate to what extent students have achieved the intended learning outcomes. Having established that each thesis studied by the panel fulfils at least the minimum criteria required, the panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes of the MPPHD programmes are achieved by the end of the curriculum.

Given the evidence provided in both report and discussion, the panel thinks highly of the effective way in which the programme prepares students for a professional position. It applauds the efforts of the programme to follow-up its graduates and suggests that this action is repeated when alumni have moved further on in their career.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 4, Achieved learning outcomes, of the Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 5: External input
The content of a curriculum and the means of communication and teaching change over time. Flexibility, and the ability to innovate on the basis of adequate information on governance and teaching skills are important features of any educational programme, in order to meet the need of the students and the teaching staff. The programme provides evidence of an adequate process of curriculum development in which all relevant stakeholders are involved.

Findings

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

The curriculum of the MPPHD programme has been adjusted continuously over the past few years by the Programme Board, acting on both formal and informal input from students, specialisation coordinators, course coordinators, Education Committee and Board of Examiners. Moreover, the range of specialisations on offer differs considerably from the tracks that were reviewed by the previous accreditation panel in 2010. The current panel observed that the introduction, retention, amendment and replacement of these tracks depended on appropriate consultations and decisions between the faculty, Maastricht University and the United Nations University.

The quality of individual courses is reviewed systematically through student evaluations, which are discussed in the Education Committee. Individual course coordinators are informed about the evaluations and discuss these every year with the specialisation coordinator and/or the Programme Board. Moreover, the student association DEMOS acts as a student union and presents concerns and complaints to the Programme Board and/or the Board of Examiners. Students indicated during the panel visit that they are aware of the opportunities they have to comment on the quality of the courses / curriculum. Very often they follow the informal path of addressing the lecturers directly.

Public Policy and Human Development, Maastricht University

Furthermore, they indicated that individual lecturers and the programme director are generally open to their suggestions and, where possible, accommodate their concerns.

The panel observed that, following a recommendation from the previous accreditation panel, the role of the Education Committee has been revised and now functions in line with the Dutch legal requirements. Similarly, the panel acknowledges that the programme has enhanced the contacts with the professional field through the alumni network, newly appointed lecturers and the cooperation with UNU. Nonetheless, the panel sees room for a more systematic involvement of alumni and employers, e.g. through a Professional Advisory Board, in the evaluation and development of courses and specialisation tracks. Furthermore, given the double-degree character of the programme, the cooperation with UNU could be strengthened also on issues of curriculum development. In this respect, the panel suggests that the programme organises a mid-term review of the curriculum and its tracks involving peers from UNU.

> *5.2 External reviews*
> *The programme provides evidence that the recommendations received during previous reviews (by NVAO, EAPAA or any other (inter)national review body) have led to changes in the content or the organisation of the programme.*

The programme reported extensively on the decisions of the previous accreditation visit in 2010 and the way it has addressed the recommendations of the NVAO. The panel observed that these recommendations are generally followed-up adequately, although some items received more attention than others.

Considerations

The panel considers that the programme has an adequate system in place to monitor and improve the quality of the individual courses, specialisations and overall curriculum. The MPPHD programme also takes into account the recommendations from external reviews. Nonetheless, the programme would benefit from a more systematic involvement of alumni and employers in discussing course and curriculum developments.

The bodies (and their representatives) in charge of quality assurance are competent. Given the student comments in the Critical Reflection on the varying study load in specialisation tracks, the panel suggests that the programme should organise a mid-term review. Such a review might also constitute a good opportunity for the programme to invite UNU representatives as peer reviewers.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 5, External input, of the Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development as 'satisfactory'.

> **Standard 6: Diversity**
> Diversity among staff and students is one of the aims of the programme. This reflects the broader appreciation of diversity as a relevant variable in the study and practice of public administration and governance. The programme at least takes steps to increase gender balance among the professional staff of the programme, if necessary.

Findings

The MPPHD programme is committed to values of diversity, and the approach to learning and the curriculum are designed in view of this commitment. It attracts students from around the world and makes use of this diversity in an international classroom setting and by stimulating intercultural knowledge transfers in problem-based learning tutorials. During the visit, the panel consulted the

list of students who enrolled on the programme over the past few years. While the programme is very international, the panel observed that there are only a relatively limited number of students from Developing Countries.

In terms of gender diversity, the panel learned that 70% of the staff on the programme is female and observed that several women take up senior positions (deputy director, chair of Board of Examiners, chair of Education Committee) in the programme, which is commendable. The programme employs international faculty with different cultural backgrounds. Nonetheless, the panel thinks that there is room for hiring more faculty from Developing Countries.

Considerations

The panel considers that the MPPHD programme is not only committed to diversity, but also realises this goal in terms of staff, students and educational philosophy. The panel is impressed by the international composition of the student body and by the large presence of female staff and the senior positions they hold in the programme.

Given the focus on human development, which is a global concept, the panel recommends that the programme seeks to recruit students and staff from an even wider geographical range, notably from Developing Countries.

In the view of the panel, diversity definitely is a key aspect of this programme; and because MPPHD is delivering on this point, it deserves appreciation and a score of 'good'.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 6, Diversity, of the Master's programme Public Policy and Human Development as 'good'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assesses standards 1-5 as 'satisfactory' and standard 6 as 'good'. According to the decision rules of NVAO's Framework for limited programme assessments applied to standards 1 to 4, the panel assesses the master's programme Public Policy and Human Development as 'satisfactory'.

APPENDICES

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

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

Prof. dr. M. (Marleen) Brans (vice-chair) is professor at the KU Leuven Public Governance Institute. At KU Leuven she directs the Master's in European Politics and Policies programme. At KU Leuven she directs the Master's in European Politics and Policies programme, and the Master's in Public Management and Policy. She currently teaches courses at bachelor's, master's, and advanced master's level, such as Design and Strategy of Policy, Evaluation of Policy, Comparative Public Policies in Europe, and Policy Analysis. In the past she has taught other subjects such as Public Administration, Relations Government-Citizens, Governance and Steering, Research Seminar. Her research interests focus on the production and use of policy advice by academics, civil servants, personal advisors, and strategic advisory bodies. Her publications include the Routledge Handbook of Comparative Policy Analysis (edited with Iris Geva-May and Michael Howlett) and Policy Analysis Belgium (edited with David Aubin, Policy Press). She serves as Vice-President of the International Public Policy Association and as Chair of the Accreditation Committee of the European Association for Public Administration Accreditation. She serves on the board of the Journal of Comparative Policy Analysis, Policy and Society and Halduskultuur.

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

Prof. dr. Xue Lan is a Cheung Kong Chair professor and dean of School of Public Policy and Management at Tsinghua University (China). With a Ph. D in public policy from Carnegie Mellon University, he taught at the George Washington University before returning back to China in 1996. His teaching and research interests include public policy analysis, STI policy, crisis management, and global governance. He has published widely in these areas, including, Risk Governance on Climate Change and Globalization of Science and Technology and its Influence on China's Development. He

also serves as an adjunct professor at Carnegie Mellon University and a Non-Resident Senior Fellow of Brookings Institution. His many public service appointments include a member of the National Committee for Strategic Consultation and Comprehensive Review, a member of the Expert Committee on Emergency Management of the State Council of China, the Convener of the State Council Academic Assessment Committee for Public Administration, Vice President of China Association of Public Administration, a member of United Nations University Council, and a member of the academic advisory board of Blavatnick School of Government at Oxford University. Since 2012, he has been the Co-Chair of the Leadership Council of the Sustainable Development Solution Network (SDSN). He is a recipient of the Fudan Distinguished Contribution Award for Management Science.

Prof. dr. J.P. (Jan) Pronk studied Economics at the Erasmus University in Rotterdam, where he also worked as a lecturer and research fellow. Professor Pronk has combined politics and education in his career. In 1971 he became a Member of Parliament for the Labour Party (PvdA), which he was until 1973, and again from 1978 to 1980 and from 1986 to 1989. He was Minister for Development Co-operation in three cabinets (1973-1977, 1989-1994 and 1994-1998), Acting Minister of Defence (1992) and Minister of Environment, Spatial Planning and Housing (1998-2002). He was appointed professor in Theory and Practice of International Development at the Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague in 1978 and worked there until 1980, from 2002 to 2004 and again from 2007 to 2011. He was also professor in Theory and Practice of Policy Making at the University of Amsterdam (1988-1989). Over the years, professor Pronk has been involved in numerous organizations that focus on international and sustainable development, peace and refugees and climate change, as member and chairman. From 1980 to 1986 for instance, he was Deputy Secretary-General for the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and from 2004 to 2006 he acted as Special Representative of the Secretary General of the United Nations in Sudan (SRSG/USG) and Head of the United Nations Peace Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). Currently, professor Pronk is Associate Fellow at the Centre International Conflict Analysis and Management (CICAM) of the Radboud University in Nijmegen and lecturer at the Amsterdam University College. Since 2009 professor Pronk is visiting professor of the United Nations University for Peace (UPeace) in Costa Rica.

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

APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

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

Introduction

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

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

Developments

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

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

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

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

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

Resulting Fields of Study

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

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

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

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

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

Defining programme principles

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

Knowledge

Knowledge of society and changing contexts

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attitude

Critical stances

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

Moral stature and professionalism

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

Academic learning outcomes for PAGO studies

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

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

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

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

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

Knowledge and understanding

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

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

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

Applying knowledge and understanding

1 (Bachelor's) [through] devising and sustaining arguments

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

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

Making judgments

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

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

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

Communication

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

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

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

Learning skills

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

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

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

APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

In line with the programme's mission, concrete learning outcomes have been established.

These are:
• Gaining knowledge on how to design and assess public policies;
• Gaining analytical understanding of the multi-disciplinary characteristic of public policy and its political complexities;
• Enabling the understanding and assessment of leading theories in the field;
• Understanding, assessment and implementation of accurate methods (evidence-based policy making);
• Obtaining the ability to undertake analytical and independent research.

Learning outcomes are achieved with the alignment of three educational parts that compose the programme. The three parts that compose the programme are: (i) fall semester, with core courses that are the same for all students, (ii) spring semester, with specialised elective courses to be chosen by students based on their interests, and (iii) a summer period, with supervisory assistance for thesis writing.

APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Curriculum 2010/11 and 2011/12

Summer	September	October	November	December	January
Optional summer levelling courses	Public Policy	Public Economics	Risk & Uncertainty	Public Policy Analysis	Thesis proposal writing
	Quantitative Methods		Econometrics		

Curriculum 2012/13, 2013/14 and 2014/15

Summer	September	October	November	December	January
Optional summer levelling courses	Public Policy	Public Economics	Public Policy Analysis		Thesis proposal writing
	Statistics		Econometrics		

Curriculum 2015/16 and 2016/17

Summer	September	October	November	December	January
Optional summer levelling courses	Public Policy	Public Economics	Public Policy Analysis		Thesis proposal writing
	Research Design	Data Science	Econometrics		

Curriculum 2017/18

Summer	September	October	November	December	January
	Public Policy	Public Economics	Public Policy Analysis		Thesis proposal writing
	Statistics & Data Science	Regression Analysis I	Regression Analysis II	Research Design	

Fall Semester: 28 EC
Spring Semester: 16 EC
Master's Thesis (fall+ spring): 16 EC

Group	Name	Code	Category	ECTS	Provider	Initial pass rate[21]
Fall semester	Public Policy	MPP4301	substantive	4	UNU	99.1%
	Public Economics	MPP4302	substantive	4	UNU	99.2%
	Public Policy Analysis	MPP4504	substantive	8	UM	93.2%
	Statistics Levelling	SKL4401	methodol.	1	UM	98.4%
	Introduction to Data Science	SKL4402	methodol.	3	UM	98.4%
	Econometrics	SKL4303	methodol.	6	UNU	91.0%
	Research Design	SKL4403	methodol.	2	UM	99.2%
Social Protection Policy	The Global Social Challenge; beyond Poverty and Inequality	SPP4205	substantive	4	UM	100%
	Understanding Social Protection	SPP4206	substantive	4	UM	97.8%
	Quantitative Techniques for Social Protection Policy Design	SPP4408	substantive	4	UNU	100%
	Financing Social Protection	SPF4105	substantive	4	UM	100%
Foreign Policy & Development	International Trade; Theory, Policy, Environment and Development	FPD4105	substantive	4	UNU	94.7%
	The Law and Policy of the WTO	GTD4206	substantive	4	UM	94.7%
	International Intellectual Property Law and Policy	GTD4307	substantive	4	UM	93.8%
	FPD4408 - Development and Human Rights	FPD4408	substantive	4	UM	95.2%
Migration Studies	Introduction to Migration Studies	MGR4105	substantive	4	UM	80%
	Migration and Remittance Effects	MGR4206	substantive	4	UM	100%
	Data Collection and Analysis for Migration Studies	MGR4307	substantive	4	UM	100%
	Comparative Migration Policy	MGR4408	substantive	4	UM	100%

Group	Name	Code	Category	ECTS	Provider	Initial pass rate
Risk & Vulnerability	Risk and Vulnerability Assessment	RSK4105	substantive	4	UNU	100%
	Building Resilience and Adaptive Governance	RSK4206	substantive	4	UNU	93.8%
	Risk Management in Crisis Situations	RSK4307	substantive	4	UM	100%
	Risk Communication: the last Frontier	RSK4408	substantive	4	UM	100%
Innovation, Institutions & Development	Innovation and the Global Income Distribution	IID4105	substantive	4	UNU	90%
	Innovation and Development Patterns around the Globe	IID4206	substantive	4	UNU	100%
	Innovation Systems in the Global Economy	IID4307	substantive	4	UNU	93.3%
	Science, Technology and Innovation Policy	IID4408	substantive	4	UNU	100%
Regional Integration & Multi-level Governance	Introduction to Regions	RIG4105	substantive	4	UNU	100%
	Comparative Regionalism	RIG4206	substantive	4	UNU	93.3%
	Regionalism and Multi-Level Governance	RIG4307	substantive	4	UM	92.3%
	Research Seminar Topical Issues in Comparative Regionalism	RIG4408	substantive	4	UNU	100%

APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Wednesday 15 November

08.30 Open consultation hour
09.45 Arrival panel at UNU-Merit, welcome by programme management
10.00 Internal meeting panel
12.00 Meeting with Management
13.00 Lunch
13.45 Meeting with Students
14.30 Meeting with Lecturers
15.30 Meeting with Programme Committee
16.15 Meeting with Board of Examiners
17.15 Meeting with Alumni & Employers
18.00 Internal meeting panel
       + clarification session on programme admission and content of skills track

Thursday 16 November 2017

09.00 Internal meeting panel
10.00 Final meeting with Management
10.45 Internal meeting panel
12.00 Feedback on key panel findings
12.30 Lunch
13.00 Development dialogue
14.00 End of visit

APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 master's theses. The associated student numbers are available through QANU upon request.

In the framework of the site visit, the panel studied, among other things, the following documents (partly as hard copies, partly via the institute's electronic learning environment):
• Master's of Science in Public Policy and Human Development, Self-evaluation report for re-accreditation, September 2017

Course materials, evaluations and assessments Bachelor's Public Governance:
• Research Design 2015-2016
• Public Policy 2015-2016 and 2017-2018
• The Global Social Challenge: beyond Poverty and Inequality 2015-2016

Other materials:
• Assessment policy and programme 2017-2018
• Education & Examination Regulations 2015-2016 and 2017-2018
• Thesis Regulations 2015-2016 and 2017-2018
• Thesis grading guidelines for supervisors and second readers
• Sample appointment letter for course coordinators
• Sample appointment letter for thesis supervisor
• Sample appointment letter for examiners
• Sample learning agreement to be signed by supervisors and students
• Declaration of academic integrity to be signed by students when submitting the thesis
• List of students enrolled (per track) 2015-2016 and 2017-2018
• Draft assessment policy
• Overview of assessment forms per course
• Admission process
• Board of Examiners – handout for members
• Board of Examiners – annual report 2015-2016
• Overview of staff engaged with the programme