

Besluit **Besluit strekkende tot het verlenen van accreditatie (na herstel) aan de opleiding wo-master European Public Affairs van de Universiteit Maastricht**

Gegevens

datum	Naam instelling	: Universiteit Maastricht
29 april 2016	Naam opleiding	: wo-master European Public Affairs (60 EC)
onderwerp		
Besluit	Variant opleiding	: voltijd
accreditatie wo-master	Locaties opleiding	: Maastricht
European Public Affairs van de		
Universiteit Maastricht	Datum goedkeuren	
(004407)	Panel 1	: 23 oktober 2012
ons kenmerk	Datum eerste locatiebezoek	: 5 en 6 maart 2013
NVAO/20160938/LL	Datum eerste visitatierapport	: 15 januari 2014
bijlagen	Datum herstelplan	: 31 januari 2014, aangevuld in april 2014
2	Datum herstelbesluit NVAO	: 30 juni 2014
	Datum tweede locatiebezoek	: 14 oktober 2015
	Datum tweede visitatierapport	: 9 december 2015
	Datum aanvraag 2 (na herstel)	: 18 december 2015
	Instellingstoets kwaliteitszorg	: ja, positief besluit van 16 mei 2013

Voorgeschiedenis

Op 30 december 2013 ontving de NVAO van Universiteit Maastricht een accreditatieaanvraag voor de opleiding wo-master European Public Affairs vergezeld van een paneladvies waarin de standaard 3 (toetsing en gerealiseerde eindkwalificaties) en daarmee het eindoordeel als onvoldoende zijn beoordeeld. De NVAO nam vervolgens op 30 juni 2014 een besluit tot het verlengen van de accreditatietermijn (zogenoemd herstelbesluit) van de opleiding met een periode van twee jaar, derhalve tot en met 29 juni 2016, op basis van een door het panel positief geadviseerd herstelplan en addendum. Op 18 december 2015 ontving de NVAO een nieuwe accreditatieaanvraag vergezeld van een rapport van een tweede panel, waarin de betreffende standaard nu positief is beoordeeld. Twee leden uit het oorspronkelijke panel maakten deel uit van het tweede panel. De opleiding heeft naar het oordeel van het tweede panel binnen de herstelperiode van twee jaar de nodige verbeteringen doorgevoerd voor de standaard 3. Het is van mening dat de opleiding na het doorvoeren van de verbeteringen voor deze standaard thans het vereiste niveau heeft bereikt.

- Artikel 5a. 12a. van de Wet op het hoger onderwijs en wetenschappelijk onderzoek (Stb. 2010, 293);
- Accreditatiebesluit WHW (Stb. 2011, 536);
- Beoordelingskader voor de beperkte opleidingsbeoordeling van de NVAO (Stcrt. 2010, nr 21523)

Bevindingen

De NVAO stelt vast dat in beide visitatierapporten te samen deugdelijk en kenbaar is gemotiveerd op welke gronden de kwaliteit van de opleiding voldoende is bevonden.

Advies van het eerste visitatiepanel (eerste beoordeling)

Samenvatting bevindingen en overwegingen van het panel (hierna: the committee).

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The committee assesses Standard 1 as satisfactory.

The master's programme European Public Affairs is oriented towards the professional practice of public affairs in the European Union (EU). The programme defines public affairs as the process of developing and influencing public – European Union – policy and states that the field is closely related to public policy and public administration. The goal of the programme is to prepare students for a career in European or EU-related public affairs and public service. For a successful career in the EU public affairs domain graduates must be academics who know how to analyse, critically evaluate and research EU policy problems. The committee appreciates the niche the programme fills within the domain of European Studies. The learning outcomes of the programme are formulated at master's level and sufficiently reflect its research orientation and the domains and knowledge base the international field requires. They guarantee that students gain knowledge of the system of European governance, the way policy is made in the European Union in the main fields of its competences, and in each stage of the policy cycle. Students also learn about contemporary events, developments and debates related to the process of European integration.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

The committee assesses Standard 2 as satisfactory.

The one-year master's programme (60 EC) is organised in cooperation with the European Institute of Public Administration. It consists of four modules (one 4-week module and three 8-week modules) and an Integrated Skills Track that runs in parallel to these four modules. Students conclude the programme by following a 12-week internship (18 EC). The committee assessed that the work experience students gained during the internship is relevant for their future employment. It concludes that the internship guarantees the professional orientation of the programme.

The first three modules of the programme focus mainly on EU policy making. The fourth module analyses the impact of the EU at the Member State level. The committee concludes that the learning outcomes are sufficiently addressed in all four modules. However, it finds that the theoretical framework in module four is somewhat weak as it lacks solid theories that can be applied or used when implementing policy, for example. It also advises the

Pagina 3 van 7 programme to communicate to students more clearly what is expected of them in module four. The committee concludes that the level of the courses suffices. Communication, research and academic skills are trained in the Integrated Skills Track that runs parallel to the four modules.

In the near future, students will undergo an assessment to establish their starting level. The committee is positive about the programme's focus on skills and is positive about the programme's plans to develop the track further because its primary focus currently mainly lies on professional skills relevant to the public affairs profession. Academic skills are not yet sufficiently trained. In contrast to all other programmes the university offers, the master's programme European Public Affairs does not use Problem-Based Learning (PBL) as its didactical concept. The learning methods support students in becoming independent critical thinkers. The programme offers knowledge on an advanced level, and requires students to use the literature as a basis for developing new and original insights into the subject matter, for instance in the form of research assignments and projects. The committee concludes that the didactical approach of the programme matches the intended learning outcomes. The committee concluded that the international profile of the programme is sufficiently reflected in the composition of the staff. Lecturers come from a wide variety of countries, and represent different departments, such as History, Politics, and Philosophy. They participate in national or international research schools and networks. The programme aims to involve practitioners who actively bridge the academic and practical world in their professional lives in order to pass on the link between academia and practice. The programme also regularly invites guest speakers with relevant and interesting backgrounds. The committee appreciates that the areas of expertise of the staff are closely related to the intended learning outcomes of the programme. Furthermore, the committee finds that the didactic quality of the staff is sufficiently guaranteed. The committee concluded that the programme specific quality assurance is guaranteed by the active approach of the Programme Committee (PC).

Standard 3: Assessment and achieved learning outcomes

The committee assesses Standard 3 as unsatisfactory.

The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences has one Board of Examiners that monitors the quality of the achieved learning outcomes by checking the examination dossier of individual students. At the time of the site visit this check has a procedural character, focussing – for example - on plagiarism and a filled-out assessment form. The Board has concrete plans to start monitoring the content of the examinations and theses. During the site visit the Board explained that it is also working on an internship assessment policy. The committee concludes that the Board plays a pro-active role in the quality assurance of the assessments in the master's programme.

The committee concludes that the system of assessment is valid and transparent. It studied exams from the core modules of the master's programme and concluded that the exams thoroughly assess academic knowledge and its application. The committee also found that the methods of assessment are varied and suitable for the assessment of the learning outcomes. In order to assess the achieved learning outcomes, the committee studied internship reports before the site visit. It also examined evaluation papers that students had written for module four, as the programme management had stated that these papers reflect the academically oriented learning outcomes. The committee encountered several problems in determining whether the learning outcomes had been achieved.

Firstly, the committee found it difficult to assess the achieved learning outcomes without a thesis as a final project. The committee stresses that the achieved learning outcomes, as far

Pagina 4 van 7 as academic research and writing skills are concerned, ideally culminate in a thesis. Secondly, the committee concludes that the evaluation papers of module four do not consistently comprise substantial academic research. The committee observed that the character of the evaluation papers had a more descriptive rather than academic nature. Finally, the internship report does not have a substantial academic component. The requirements that the programme has set for the internship report do not contain explicit academic criteria that one would expect in a final project. Students can pass module four with a grade lower than a 6 for the evaluation paper. Therefore, the evaluation paper cannot serve as a final project with which the achieved learning outcomes can be assessed. The committee concludes that if the evaluation paper can be compensated and the internship report does not contain a research component, students can graduate without having demonstrated academic research skills. The committee therefore strongly advises the programme to develop the evaluation paper of module four further into a significant research project that can serve as a master's thesis. As students do not conclude their studies with a substantial written account of academic research, and neither the evaluation paper nor the internship report contain a substantial amount of research, the committee concludes that the programme cannot guarantee that students achieve the expected academic research and writing skills. As academic research is essential to an academic master's degree, the committee concludes that the most important learning outcomes cannot be achieved in the programme.

Advies van het tweede visitatiepanel (beoordeling gerealiseerd herstel)

On 5 and 6 March 2013, a second assessment panel (hereafter panel) assessed the master's programme European Public Affairs. The panel assessed Standard 1 (Intended learning outcomes) and Standard 2 (Teaching-learning environment) as 'satisfactory'. Standard 3 (Assessment and achieved learning outcomes), however, was assessed as 'unsatisfactory'. Consequently, in line with the framework's decision rules, the programme as a whole was assessed as 'unsatisfactory'. The most important reason for this outcome was that the panel was not convinced that all graduates in the programme had achieved the intended learning outcomes, since none of the final papers sufficiently tested the achievement of academic research skills. In response to these findings, the programme developed an improvement plan, and later an addendum to this plan. On 30 June 2014, the NVAO approved of the improvement plan plus addendum and decided to extend the accreditation of the programme and to grant the programme an improvement period of two years (until 29 June 2016) to implement improvement measures.

On 14 October 2015, an assessment panel again assessed Standard 3 of the programme in order to establish whether the improvement measures had been implemented successfully and had been effective.

The panel found that the programme management took the advice of the previous assessment panel seriously and carried out the required improvement measures in a professional manner. It not only implemented measures from the improvement plan plus addendum, but also took measures based on evaluation and progressive insight and paid attention to the sustainability of the improvements.

In response to the critique of the previous assessment panel, the programme introduced a thesis as part of the final work. The new "graduation package" consists of the Internship (8

Pagina 5 van 7 EC), the Internship report (2 EC), and the Thesis (8 EC). The programme management also enhanced and expanded the academic writing and research skills track: it implemented an Integrated Skills Track (IST, 4 EC) in 2013-2014, and introduced further improvement measures to this track in 2014-2015. Finally, the Faculty took measures to improve the faculty-wide final work procedure.

The panel studied the implementation and the effect of the above-mentioned improvement measures. It observed that the new "graduation package" and the adjusted academic skills training better match the profile of an academic master's programme with a strong professional focus. It studied 3 theses and 3 complete "graduation packages" and concluded that the new "graduation package" sufficiently assesses the acquisition of professional as well as academic research- and writing skills by the students. It was also positive about the adjustment of the faculty-wide final project procedure, especially the measures to strengthen the independence of the second reader and the introduction of thesis calibration workshops for thesis assessors. It applauds the development of a document outlining necessary and sufficient conditions for passing the MA thesis.

The panel read 3 internship theses and 3 complete "final work packages" that were produced since the previous assessment and concluded that they are of satisfactory academic quality. Although the effect of further measures to be implemented in the current academic year (2015-2016) is not yet noticeable, the 2015 panel concludes that the measures taken have already yielded positive results.

Besluit

Ingevolge het bepaalde in artikel 5a.10, derde lid, van de WHW heeft de NVAO het college van bestuur van de Universiteit Maastricht te Maastricht in de gelegenheid gesteld zijn zienswijze op het voornemen tot besluit van 21 maart 2016 naar voren te brengen. Van deze gelegenheid heeft het college van bestuur geen gebruik gemaakt.

De NVAO besluit accreditatie te verlenen aan de wo-master European Public Affairs (60 EC; variant: voltijd; locatie: Maastricht) van de Universiteit Maastricht te Maastricht. De NVAO beoordeelt de kwaliteit van de opleiding als voldoende.

Dit besluit treedt in werking op 30 juni 2014 en is van kracht tot en met 29 juni 2020.

Den Haag, 29 april 2016

De NVAO
Voor deze:


Dr. A.H. Eilerman
(voorzitter)

Tegen dit besluit kan op grond van het bepaalde in de Algemene wet bestuursrecht door een belanghebbende bezwaar worden gemaakt bij de NVAO. De termijn voor het indienen van bezwaar bedraagt zes weken.

Uit besluit van 30 juni 2014

Onderwerp	Standaard	Beoordeling door het panel
1. Beoogde eindkwalificaties	De beoogde eindkwalificaties van de opleiding zijn wat betreft inhoud, niveau en oriëntatie geconcretiseerd en voldoen aan internationale eisen	Voldoende
2. Onderwijsleeromgeving	Het programma, het personeel en de opleidingsspecifieke voorzieningen maken het voor de instromende studenten mogelijk de beoogde eindkwalificaties te realiseren	Voldoende
3. Toetsing en gerealiseerde eindkwalificaties	De opleiding beschikt over een adequaat systeem van toetsing en toont aan dat de beoogde eindkwalificaties worden gerealiseerd	Onvoldoende
Eindoordeel		Onvoldoende

Beoordeling na herstel

Standaard	Standaard	Beoordeling door het panel
3. Toetsing en gerealiseerde eindkwalificaties	De opleiding beschikt over een adequaat systeem van toetsing en toont aan dat de beoogde eindkwalificaties worden gerealiseerd	Voldoende
Eindoordeel		Voldoende

De standaarden krijgen het oordeel onvoldoende, voldoende, goed of excellent. Het eindoordeel over de opleiding als geheel wordt op dezelfde schaal gegeven.

Panel eerste beoordeling en beoordeling herstelplan

- Prof. Marjan Schwegman (chair), professor of Politics and Culture in the long twentieth century, University of Utrecht, and director of NIOD;
- Prof. Luc François, professor of Contemporary History and former director of Educational Matters, University of Ghent;
- Prof. Jan Orbie, university senior lecturer on EU External Relations, University of Ghent;
- Dr. Ulrich Tiedau, senior lecturer on Modern Low Countries History and Society, University College London;
- Prof. Ingeborg Tömmel, emeritus professor of International and European Politics, University of Osnabrück.
- Anne Stickers, bachelor student of International Relations, University of Groningen.

During the site visit, the committee was supported by M. Jansen (certified), who acted as secretary. M. Frederik (certified), overall project co-ordinator, took over as secretary after the site visit. In the final stages, L. te Marvelde (certified) acted as liaison for the committee and the institution.

Panel beoordeling gerealiseerd herstel

- Luc François (chair), professor emeritus of Contemporary History at Ghent University, Belgium;
- Jan Orbie, university senior lecturer on EU External Relations at the Department of Political Science and co-director of the Centre for EU Studies at Ghent University, Belgium;
- Sebastian Oberthür, professor for Environment and Sustainable Development at the Institute for European Studies (IES) at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel (VUB), Belgium.

Het panel werd ondersteund door Adrienne Wieldraaijer-Huijzer, secretaris (gecertificeerd).