

**MASTER'S PROGRAMME EUROPEAN
STUDIES**

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0722

© 2020 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME EUROPEAN STUDIES OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
APPENDICES	21
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	23
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	25
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	26
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	27

This report was finalised on 14 April 2020

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME EUROPEAN STUDIES OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Master's programme European Studies

Name of the programme:	European Studies
CROHO number:	69303
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	(1) public policy and administration, (2) international relations, (3) global challenges
Location(s):	Maastricht
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

The site visit of the assessment panel History and International Relations to the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Maastricht University took place from the 11th of December until the 13th of December 2019.

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 the 4th of February 2019. The panel that assessed the master's programme European Studies consisted of:

- Dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig [chairman] is senior lecturer in War Studies, Department of War Studies, King's College London (United Kingdom) and visiting professor of Military Strategy at the Swedish Defence University in Stockholm (Sweden);
- Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Bursens is full professor of Political Sciences at the University of Antwerp (Belgium);
- V. (Vicky) Marissen LLM is partner at consultancy firm EPPA, a company specialised in connecting government and business, and visiting professor at the College of Europe;
- Prof. dr. C.A. (Claire) Dunlop is full professor of Politics and Public Policy and head of research at the Department of Politics at Exeter University (United Kingdom);
- Prof. dr. E.B.A. (Erik) van der Vleuten is professor and Chair of History of Technology and chair of the M.Sc. program Innovation Sciences at the Eindhoven University of Technology;
- R. (Rikst) van der Schoor BA, has started the master's programme Intellectual History at the University of St. Andrews (United Kingdom) in 2018 [student member].

The panel was supported by drs. M. (Mariette) Huisjes, who acted as secretary.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The site visit to the master's programme European Studies at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences of Maastricht University was part of the cluster assessment History and International Relations. Between April 2019 and December 2019 the panel assessed 24 programmes at 8 universities. The following universities participated in this cluster assessment: Erasmus University Rotterdam, Maastricht University, Radboud University Nijmegen, University of Groningen, Leiden University, Utrecht University, University of Amsterdam and VU Amsterdam.

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

During the site visit at Maastricht University the panel was supported by Mariette Huisjes, a certified NVAO secretary.

Panel members

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

- Dr. J.W. (Jan Willem) Honig [chairman] is senior lecturer in War Studies, Department of War Studies, King's College London and visiting professor of Military Strategy at the Swedish Defence University in Stockholm;
- Prof. dr. I.B. (Inger) Leemans is professor Cultural History and director of the Graduate School of Humanities at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam;
- Prof. dr. J.F.J. (Jeroen) Duindam is full professor of Early Modern History and programme director at Leiden University;
- Prof. dr. W.J.H. (Jan Hein) Furnée is full professor of European Cultural History at Radboud University;
- Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Bursens is full professor of Political Sciences at the University of Antwerp;
- Prof. dr. W.P. (Wim) van Meurs is full professor of European Political History and chairman of the department Political History at the Humanities Faculty of Radboud University;
- Prof. dr. E. (Eric) Vanhaute is full Professor of Economic and Social History and World History, as well as head of UGent Research Group Communities, Comparisons, Connections at Ghent University;
- V. (Vicky) Marissen LLM, is partner at consultancy firm EPPA, a company specialised in connecting government and business and Visiting Professor at the College of Europe;
- Dr. N. (Nico) Randerad is Associate Professor at Maastricht University and Interim Director of the Social History Centre for Limburg History;
- Prof. dr. N. (Nanci) Adler is full professor Memory, History, and Transitional Justice at the University of Amsterdam (UvA) en research director Holocaust and Genocide studies at the Nederlands Instituut voor Oorlogsdocumentatie (NIOD);
- Prof. dr. K. (Koenraad) Verboven is professor of Ancient History and programme director for History at the University of Ghent;
- Prof. dr. V. (Violet) Soen is an Associate Professor in Early Modern History and chair of the research group Early Modern History at the University of Leuven;
- Prof. dr. C.A. (Claire) Dunlop is full professor of Politics and Public Policy and head of research at the Department of Politics at Exeter University;
- Prof. dr. E.B.A. (Erik) van der Vleuten is professor and chair of History of Technology and chair of the M.Sc. program innovation sciences at the Eindhoven University of Technology;
- R. (Rikst) van der Schoor BA, has started the master's programme Intellectual History at the University of St. Andrews in 2018 [student member];

- M. (Mel) Schickel MA, completed the master's programme History of Society at the Erasmus University Rotterdam in 2018 and is working as external relations officer at the Faculty of Science and Engineering of Maastricht University [student member];
- R. (Rico) Tjepkema is a third year bachelor's student International Relations & International Organization at the University of Groningen [student member].

Preparation

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

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

Before the site visit to Maastricht University, QANU received the self-evaluation reports of the programmes and sent these to the panel. A thesis selection was made by the panel's chair and the project coordinator. The selection consisted of 15 theses and their assessment forms for the programmes, based on a provided list of graduates between 2017-2019. A variety of topics and tracks and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project coordinator and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

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

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

Site visit

The site visit to Maastricht University took place from the 11th until the 13th of December 2019. Before and during the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. For the master's programme, no requests for private consultation were received.

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

Consistency and calibration

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

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

Report

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to the project coordinator for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project coordinator sent the draft reports



to the Faculty in order to have these checked for factual irregularities. The project coordinator discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty and University Board.

Definition of judgements standards

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

Generic quality

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

Meets the standard

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

Partially meets the standard

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

Does not meet the standard

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

Positive

The programme meets all the standards.

Conditionally positive

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

Negative

In the following situations:

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

SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Standard 1

The panel appreciates the profile of the master's programme European Studies. It is convinced that this profile prepares students well for a Brussels-related career. The panel views the three specialisations as assets. They provide students with the opportunity to tailor the programme to their own liking and develop expertise in a specific field. The panel judges the intended learning outcomes comprehensive and of an appropriate level and orientation for a master's programme. It rates highly that the intended learning outcomes are regularly updated and aligned with the professional field. The panel recommends articulating a clear and realistic view on multi- and/or interdisciplinarity in the programme and incorporating this in the intended learning outcomes.

Standard 2

The panel is satisfied with the curriculum of the master's programme European Studies, which it finds clearly and cleverly construed. There are combined substantive and professional skills courses and there is on the one hand the solidity of mandatory courses for each of the specialisations and sufficient flexibility for students to follow their own interest on the other. The programme director and course coordinators are quick in responding to feedback from various key sources, and also in annually adapting the curriculum to new developments in the European Union. It is not surprising to the panel that the programme receives high ratings in the 'Keuzegids Universiteiten'. The curriculum could be made even more adventurous and inspiring if a larger part of the curriculum is research driven. To this end, the panel suggests that the introduction of additional premaster options to create a level playing field for all incoming students may be useful. Less foundational material needs then to be taught and assessed in the master's programme itself.

The master's programme has an intensive thesis course which according to the panel may be made lighter. In its view, even with a reduced number of intermediate assignments, the course would still give sufficient structure and support to the thesis trajectory. The panel supports the programme management in its aim to award more EC's to the thesis trajectory.

Even though the problem-based learning format can be challenging, students and staff are enthusiastic about it, as is the panel. The format fits the goals of this programme and creates its own niche, with unique learning opportunities for students and enriching the Dutch academic landscape. The panel recommends flexibility in applying problem-based learning and strengthening it where possible.

The panel finds the programme doable and in good hands with a responsive and effective programme management. The quality of staff and programme-specific services are satisfactory. The panel fully endorses the decision to teach this international programme in English. All in all, the panel is satisfied that the learning environment offered by the master's programme European Studies enables students to realise the intended learning outcomes.

Standard 3

The panel is unanimously impressed by the positive changes the programme has made in recent years. Assessment procedures have been redesigned and formalised, so that elements exhibit state-of-the-art practices that could serve as sources of inspiration and models of emulation for other programmes. Quality of assessment is soundly assured, the panel found. The programme's Education Plan explicitly connects forms of assessment to the courses and intended learning outcomes. The Board of Examiners assures that the intended learning outcomes are realised by performing regular checks, screenings and audits. At course level, the assessment methods are sufficiently varied and effective. They fit the goals of the courses and offer a good preparation for professional practice. Thesis assessment is satisfactory, in the panel's view. It found the grading accurate, the procedures well laid out and it appreciated the generous amount and high quality of feedback given to students. The panel suggests aligning the criteria on the thesis assessment forms more directly with the intended learning outcomes and recommends explicitly distinguishing the comments from the two



examiners. In general, the panel concludes that the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments meet the standard.

Standard 4

The panel states that the master's programme European Studies offers students a good preparation for a professional career dealing with European integration. It found the theses of varying quality, but even the weaker theses demonstrated that students had mastered the intended learning outcomes at the appropriate level. Data shows that students find relevant positions and alumni look back on their student days with satisfaction. The panel is impressed with the lively alumni network maintained by faculty and university. This is advantageous for all parties concerned and, according to the panel, can be seen as an example of good practice.

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

Master's programme European Studies

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	meets the standard
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	meets the standard
Standard 3: Student assessment	meets the standard
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	meets the standard
General conclusion	positive

The chair, Jan Willem Honig, and the secretary, Mariette Huisjes, 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: 14 April 2020

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

Profile

The master's programme European Studies prepares students for professions that relate to European integration in Brussels, national capitals and regional and local offices. Students start by studying the broader context of integration, and progressively narrow their focus by choosing thematic specialisations and a topic for their theses. It is the programme's ambition that in the course of this trajectory, students maintain an interdisciplinary view, drawing on different disciplines conceptually to understand and analyse problems. The master's programme provides students with sufficient knowledge, insight and competences to make original, research-based contributions to the field of European Studies. They are also well equipped critically to engage and formulate judgments on contemporary developments in European society and politics in a professional setting.

Students choose one of three specialisations:

- public policy and administration, which focusses on the EU policy process and its implications,
- international relations, which focusses on the EU as an international actor,
- global challenges, which focusses on the changing global environment and its impact on relations between Europe and the rest of the world.

The panel considers the profile of the master's programme European Studies well-attuned to a successful career in a highly competitive job market. It especially appreciates the three specialisations. They are a strength of the programme, allowing students to focus on one of the subfields of European Studies and in this way provide a critical step in them becoming real experts.

Intended learning outcomes

The programme's intended learning outcomes correspond to the master's level Dublin Descriptors. Students are required to demonstrate advanced level knowledge and understanding of the historical, political, societal and international context of the process of European integration and the multi-level system of actors, institutions, norms and practices that make up European governance. It is the programme's ambition that its graduates can apply their knowledge, understanding, and problem solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts, formulate judgments with limited information which include reflection on social and ethical responsibilities, and express ideas and communicate research findings on European integration to specialist European and international academic audiences.

To ensure that the intended learning outcomes are relevant to career prospects, the programme maintains close links with the professional field, primarily through its own alumni as represented in the External Advisory Board. This system works well. For instance, alumni stressed the need for graduates to learn hands-on professional skills, which has led to a strengthened professional skills trajectory. They also pointed at the importance of digital skills as part of the programme's learning trajectory, which has resulted in increased attention for social media and communication. In addition, many staff members have personal contacts with the professional field that feed into the courses and the intended learning outcomes. The programme regularly revises and updates the intended learning outcomes and records any changes in the Education Plan.

The panel finds the intended learning outcomes comprehensive, of the appropriate level and orientation for a master's programme, and in accordance with the international demands. It



appreciates that the programme is responsive to suggestions from the professional field and that the intended learning outcomes are regularly updated. The panel finds it striking, however, that the intended learning outcomes only speak of a multidisciplinary context in which knowledge should be applied, even though interdisciplinarity is officially at the heart of the programme. In itself, the panel finds a multidisciplinary focus acceptable and in line with MA expectations. Yet, it would not in principle object if the programme explicitly aims at the more ambitious aim of interdisciplinarity and so also develops a clearer distinction from its BA programme. It should however be clear whether it desires or demands (and so has to achieve) such a learning outcome. In its view, a middle road might be that talented students are encouraged to embark on interdisciplinarity, but that this challenging path is not demanded from all students. The panel recommends that the programme clearly and realistically formulates its ambition with regards to the use and purpose of learning different disciplinary approaches and methods.

Considerations

The panel appreciates the profile of the master's programme European Studies. It is convinced that this profile prepares students well for a Brussels-related career. The panel views the three specialisations as assets. They provide students with the opportunity to tailor the programme to their own liking and develop expertise in a specific field. The panel judges the intended learning outcomes comprehensive and of an appropriate level and orientation for a master's programme. It rates highly that the intended learning outcomes are regularly updated and aligned with the professional field. The panel recommends articulating a clear and realistic view on multi- and/or interdisciplinarity in the programme and incorporating this in the intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion

Master's programme European Studies: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings

Programme language and name

Given the objective of preparing specialists in European affairs for professions with an international orientation, the programme's courses are taught in English. Also, both staff and students in this programme form an international community. The panel fully endorses the decision to teach the programme in English.

Curriculum content and structure

The academic year at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University consists of three periods per semester, with an 8-8-4 week model per semester, where the last period in each academic year is used for independent study. Up until the fifth, each period contains a substantive module and a skills module geared towards providing students with professional competences. These two modules fit together and form one course. For instance, the substantive module 'The European policy process' forms a course with the skills module 'Policy analysis', and the substantive module 'Europe and international migration' twins with the skills module 'Policy evaluation'. In the first period, all students (approximately seventy each year) share the same course: the substantive module 'Post-war Europe, political and societal transformations' and the integrated skills module 'Source criticism and the politics of history'. From the second period onwards, the three specialisations start to diverge. However, all students take the skills modules 'Communication, press and social media' and 'Policy evaluation'. The thesis course runs parallel to the substantive and professional skills modules (see below). The final twelve weeks of the curriculum (the latter half of period 5 and period 6) are reserved for doing research and writing the thesis. Thus, the curriculum has three learning trajectories, partly shared by and partly divided across the specialisations: a substantive learning trajectory, a professional skills trajectory and an academic skills/thesis writing

trajectory. The curriculum is annually evaluated and updated in the Education Plan. This planning cycle is informed by data from the course evaluation forms, informal feedback sessions with students, and feedback from the Programme Committee, student representatives and the External Advisory Board.

The panel finds the curriculum cleverly construed, with a clear and simple structure. Although all modules in the three specialisations are mandatory, students find that they still have sufficient space to follow their own interests, on top of choosing a specialisation. This additional flexibility is provided by the didactic method used, problem-based learning. The method entails that students may add their own focus in assignments, and partly choose their own literature. The panel noticed that the master's programme European Studies receives a very high rating in the 'Keuzegids Universiteiten', which measures student satisfaction. This is worthy of a compliment. The panel has the impression that the programme is very agile and listens carefully to feedback from students and the professional field while keeping up with the ever-changing nature of European policy. It studied a sample of the course materials and found these elaborate and of the appropriate academic level. The panel has one suggestion to further strengthen the programme by offering, in addition to the full year premaster's programme, a summer school for students who lack preparedness only in certain desirable fields. This could be an extra springboard to get all students at more or less the same level prior to their studies. The master's programme itself will then need to cover less foundational material and, for instance, can then start out with courses based on the lecturers' research projects half-way through the curriculum. This could make the curriculum even more ambitious, adventurous and inspiring.

Thesis course

The thesis course consists of weekly lectures and tutorial meetings. In this course, students are systematically taken through the subsequent steps of writing a master's thesis. They choose a research question and develop a research design, which they then implement. During the research and writing process, students are supported through methods clinics (in which they receive advice from methodological experts), writing workshops (with a writing coach) and a thesis conference (where they present their work-in-progress and receive feedback). On top of this, students meet with their thesis supervisor five to seven times. To keep them on track, students have to hand in five compulsory intermediate assignments throughout the year, before delivering their final thesis in June.

The thesis course is a response to recommendations made by the previous re-accreditation panel. The present panel appreciates that the programme has taken these very seriously and now invests substantially in the thesis trajectory. Students now spend so much time on their theses throughout their master year, that the panel suggests that 12 EC seems an insufficient 'reward' for so much work. When discussing this, the programme management said it shared this opinion and was considering increasing the number of EC's for the thesis trajectory. That seems a good idea. The programme management asked the panel's views on the length of the thesis (12,000 to 15,000 words). The panel judged this a defensible length for MA level, but underlined that the key consideration is clarity on what the programme wants students to achieve with the thesis. Finally, although the response to the previous panel's recommendation to improve the quality of the theses is impressive, in the present panel's view, the programme should not be overly demanding. A reduction in the number of intermediate assignments in the thesis course to just a couple of carefully chosen milestones seems permissible and would also serve to decrease student and staff workload.

Teaching methods

All modules in the master's programme follow the problem-based learning method, which encourages students to take charge of their own learning process. Addressing and analysing concrete problems are central to this approach. Key questions that are considered include 'does the EU have a democratic deficit', 'why is it difficult to establish an EU army', or 'what explains variation in migration policies across the member states'. By seeking answers to these questions – usually one every week – students effectively investigate many small-scale research puzzles. Three kinds of learning



activities are organised to support this process: tutorial group meetings, lectures and skills training meetings. For the tutorial group meetings, twelve to fifteen students go through four steps: 1. examine the case through active brainstorming, 2. cluster the available information and identify missing pieces, 3. individually find additional information, 4. present this to the group and reach consensus about the solution to the problem. One of the students leads group discussions and a tutor is present in the background to monitor the process, share his or her knowledge, ask critical questions and intervene in group dynamics if necessary. Lectures complement the tutorial meetings and take a more traditional form, where a staff member explains concepts or theories, or occasionally a policy practitioner provides a practical perspective. Finally, skills training meetings also take the form of small-scale seminars. Some of these meetings address practical problems, others are used for feedback on papers and/or group work.

The idea behind problem-based learning is that students acquire new knowledge and skills, such as working towards a solution, doing research, collaborating in groups, presenting results and receiving feedback. Moreover, students remain active throughout the whole learning process. Research has shown that knowledge acquired in this way is more rooted. Although both staff and students sometimes struggle to make the format work optimally, as they told the panel, they do appreciate it. Students said that the tutorial groups motivate them to dig deep into topics and engage with the course material, and staff said that the method helps to activate their students.

The panel is extremely positive about the problem-based learning format. Even though it may be challenging at times, the panel finds it fits well with the subject matter of European Studies, where problems are mostly complex and can be approached from different angles. Moreover, the panel sees it as a great asset for the Dutch academic landscape that problem-based learning is an option for students. It nonetheless urges flexibility in applying the format while maintaining the overarching principle of keeping students in the lead. Furthermore, the panel is impressed that in a master's programme which welcomes around 70 new students each year, these students can still receive small-scale education in groups of at most fifteen students. Even though the student population is already international, it would be worth trying to attract more students from Eastern European countries or from countries that seek access to the European Union. They are now a minority within the student population, and their experiences would enrich the learning environment.

Feasibility and student guidance

The panel found that the master's programme European Studies is seen by students and alumni as fairly demanding but inspiring, and manageable for students who work with discipline. An exception seems to be the third period, which lasts four weeks instead of eight. In the self-evaluation, both students and programme management raise concerns about the work pressure in this period. The programme management promised students to address this concern. Since the management is in general very responsive and effective in solving issues that students put forward, the panel is confident that this issue can and will be resolved.

Since the programme is intensive and small-scale, students have close relations with their tutors and the panel found that they receive sufficient academic guidance from them. In addition, the programme director closely monitors study progress in periods 1 and 2, and proactively invites students who are in danger of falling behind for a meeting. With regards to personal problems affecting study progress, students may consult a study advisor. The panel has the strong impression that students are in competent hands with the present study advisor. Since a large majority (85 per cent) of students in this master's programme hails from abroad, this means that there is a higher chance of students struggling with a greater variety of personal issues than may be the case in a less international programme. A dedicated study advisor may well be the 'secret ingredient' that keeps students on track. The study advisor should be easily accessible, and if at any point in the future the study advisor becomes overburdened, the panel urges the programme management not hesitate in investing in extra capacity.

Staff

The team of lecturers and tutors in the master's programme European Studies represents a broad range of expertise (political science, social studies, literature and art, history, philosophy). In addition to the academic staff, guest lecturers, writing experts and career experts are involved in the programme. All teaching staff possess a PhD and are active researchers. All course coordinators possess a university teaching qualification (UTQ) and tutors either have a UTQ or are enrolled in the one-year UTQ trajectory. New staff have to demonstrate proficiency in the English language at an advanced level (C1) and receive a mandatory introductory course to problem-based learning. Staff members have the opportunity continually to update their skills through the university-wide educational and innovation centre EDLAB.

All course coordinators in the master's programme European Studies meet at least once a year. Further exchanges take place during two annual 'education days', one at faculty level and one organised by the bachelor's programme. A digital space provides information about rules and regulations and practical documents such as draft e-mail texts, exam schedules etc. Staff workload is an issue, but the panel was assured that programme management takes this to heart.

The panel found that staff is of the appropriate professional level. It was struck by the candour with which they discussed issues during the site visit, and the amount of thought and creativity that had already been given to most of these issues. This has convinced the panel that critical points in the programme are in general quickly identified, openly debated and worked out. The panel finds this attitude admirable. Students are also positive about the performance and quality of lecturers and tutors, whom they characterise as knowledgeable, easily approachable and eager to help. So, on the whole, the staff makes a very favourable impression.

Programme-specific services

The Maastricht University library has extensive academic resources and databases useful for the study of European integration. The library facilitates group work by offering dedicated spaces. In the student chapter of the self-evaluation, students in the master's programme European Studies ask for more of these spaces. To the panel, this seems a reasonable request, since group work is such a vital element in the programme.

The geographical situation of Maastricht University close to Brussels, the presence of a Brussels campus, the traditionally strong links between Maastricht and the European Union and the university's status as a centre of expertise about European matters, not only facilitate the organisation of frequent events such as lectures and debates starring protagonists from the EU, but together also offer a uniquely inspiring environment for master's students European Studies. The panel suggests that this should be maximally underscored in marketing efforts.

Considerations

The panel is satisfied with the curriculum of the master's programme European Studies, which it finds clearly and cleverly construed. There are combined substantive and professional skills courses and there is on the one hand the solidity of mandatory courses for each of the specialisations and sufficient flexibility for students to follow their own interest on the other. The programme director and course coordinators are quick in responding to feedback from various key sources, and also in annually adapting the curriculum to new developments in the European Union. It is not surprising to the panel that the programme receives high ratings in the 'Keuzegids Universiteiten'. The curriculum could be made even more adventurous and inspiring if a larger part of the curriculum is research driven. To this end, the panel suggests that the introduction of additional premaster options to create a level playing field for all incoming students may be useful. Less foundational material needs then taught and assessed in the master's programme itself.

The master's programme has an intensive thesis course which according to the panel may be made lighter. In its view, even with a reduced number of intermediate assignments, the course would still



give sufficient structure and support to the thesis trajectory. The panel supports the programme management in its aim to award more EC's to the thesis trajectory.

Even though the problem-based learning format can be challenging, students and staff are enthusiastic about it, as is the panel. The format fits the goals of this programme and creates its own niche, with unique learning opportunities for students and enriching the Dutch academic landscape. The panel recommends flexibility in applying problem-based learning and strengthening it where possible.

The panel finds the programme doable and in good hands with a responsive and effective programme management. The quality of staff and programme-specific services are satisfactory. The panel fully endorses the decision to teach this international programme in English. All in all, the panel is satisfied that the learning environment offered by the master's programme European Studies enables students to realise the intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion

Master's programme European Studies: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

Assessment system and Board of Examiners

Guided by the findings of the previous re-accreditation panel, the programme adjusted and formalised its assessment practices, in particular the assessment regulations regarding theses. Also, over the past four years the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University has redefined and enhanced its assessment policy. This policy currently specifies all roles and responsibilities related to assessment within its programmes, and sets the standards for the organisation of exams, the procedures to counter fraud etc. At the programme level, the Education Plan specifies the relationship between the intended learning outcomes, the teaching and the assessment methods. The programme also has an assessment model which guarantees a logical progression in assessment throughout the year and coherence across the specialisations. The management and teaching staff ensure the overall quality of assessment based on the Education Plan, the assessment model, the faculty regulations, and guidelines given by the Board of Examiners. Throughout the year, the programme director monitors the implementation of the Education Plan by checking the exam results and student evaluations, discussing courses and assessment during meetings of the teaching staff, and annually meeting with course coordinators to discuss past performance and identify possibilities for improvement.

The Board of Examiners consists of representatives from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and assures assessment quality in the whole faculty. It does so by organising checks, audits and screenings to verify that the intended learning outcomes are realised, and by providing advice to the management. As an example of the first, the Board of Examiners provided scenarios for three different types of calibration sessions and provided guidelines on how to protect academic integrity and counteract fraud. As an example of the second, the Board of Examiners systematically screens and evaluates the distribution of grades in all courses, screens the assessment forms for the theses, participates in thesis grading calibration workshops and re-assesses a sample of theses, on the basis of which it provides an audit report to the programme management. With its thesis assessment audit, the Board of Examiners rotates among the programmes. Each programme gets audited at least once every three years. The audit report is shared with the programme director, and the Board of Examiners subsequently checks whether required actions have been taken. In addition to these regular activities, the Board of Examiners chooses a special focus point each year for screening and advice. This could for instance be the Educational Plans, or the application of the plus/minus grades for participation in tutor groups (see below).

The panel finds the assessment system of the master's programme European Studies solid. It is impressed by the improvements that have been made in the past six years. The assessment methods are linked to the courses and the intended learning outcomes, and all the formal procedures are in place. The panel considers the efficacy and efficiency of the Board of Examiners as exemplifying good practice. With its combination of regular audits and focal points, it could serve as a source of inspiration for other programmes. The panel congratulates the board members and its supporting staff and encourages them wholeheartedly to follow the chosen course.

Assessment at course level

Each of the five courses in the master's programme is concluded with a final examination. This consists of two elements: assessment of the substantive element (70 per cent of the grade) and assessment of the skills element (30 per cent of the grade). Students have to pass both exams to obtain the course credits. A range of assessment methods is used throughout the programme: a closed-book exam (which assesses knowledge), take-home exams (which assess application), individual papers (which assess integration of knowledge, theory and methods and autonomous learning). Skills are assessed by presentations, group portfolios, a policy paper, an evaluation report and a negotiation strategy. The course coordinator develops each examination assignment and shares it with the programme director. In this way, the four eyes principle is applied to strengthen quality of assessment. To serve the same aim, all written work is checked against plagiarism via Safe Assign software. Wherever possible and feasible, a first round of feedback is given on drafts, prior to the summative assessment. Students receive the results of their summative assessment within fifteen workdays, accompanied by feedback and an explanation of the grade.

The panel is satisfied with the assessment in the courses. The assessment modes are varied and well thought-out, they fit the goals of the courses and are a good preparation for professional practice. The panel noticed that in exams, papers and in theses, few high grades are given. Given the size of the cohort one would expect more. When discussing this with the programme management, it suggested that lecturers are concerned about grading too high, particularly lecturers from abroad who are not familiar with the Dutch grading system. The panel however notes that a fair, clear and consistent differentiation in marks is important: excellent work deserves excellent grades, while mediocre work merits only mediocre grades. In the panel's view differentiation is moreover stimulating for students and should not be withheld from them. The calibration workshops (see below) could very well serve to enhance clarity on fairness and consistency in marking and help lecturers to gain confidence.

Thesis assessment

Contrary to the procedure six years ago, the current procedure demands that it is not the first examiner or supervisor, but the second – or 'responsible' – examiner who takes primary responsibility for the assessment of the thesis. He or she is matched with the supervisor by the programme director. The Board of Examiners checks that the grading pairs should be diverse and vary as much as possible. The responsible examiner is not involved in the thesis trajectory before the final assessment. He or she independently fills out a designated thesis assessment form that explicitly specifies the grading criteria. There are seven of these: structure, research question, contribution, analytical framework, analysis, conclusion, language and rhetorical skills. On the basis of these categories, the responsible examiner proposes a grade. The first examiner or supervisor can then add feedback or propose revisions to the feedback and grade. If the two examiners disagree, the programme director appoints a third examiner.

Each year, the programme organises a calibration workshop, during which the thesis assessment forms and the ways of providing comments are discussed and calibrated through the use of the previous year's anonymised versions of a thesis and assessment forms from the previous year as a starting point. The calibration workshops are intended for reflection on the weighting of criteria, and for creating awareness of the required standards.



The panel noticed that compared to the situation of 2013, the thesis assessment procedure has shown great improvement, primarily in that the second examiner is in the driving seat. The panel finds this an excellent idea, worthy of emulation, since it guarantees an independent and fresh look at the thesis. Equally impressive are the calibration workshops which stimulate a shared grading practice.

The panel studied a sample of the master's theses and the accompanying assessment forms. It is generally satisfied, but noted a few formal points that could add to the otherwise good quality of the assessments. Firstly, the criteria on the assessment forms could, in the panel's view, be more directly linked to the intended learning outcomes, so as to make the relationship more explicit. Secondly, the panel strongly recommends making the independent roles of both examiners more transparent. As it is, their respective input cannot be distinguished on the form. The panel discussed this with the Board of Examiners. Its members say that the one 'unanimous' form is used in order to give students consistent feedback. However, the panel is of the opinion that students have a right to know on what points both examiners differed. If the programme chooses not to communicate these differences in judgement with students, then at least they should be recorded and archived in some appropriate form. The Board of Examiners conceded this point and told the panel that in practice the exchange of views between both examiners is already documented in e-mail correspondence, but this custom could be formalised. The panel agrees that this would be the right way to move forward. Nevertheless, in their assessment of these theses, the panel members were for the most part in complete agreement with the examiners. The panel unanimously praised the generous amount and high quality of feedback given on the thesis assessment forms. The feedback makes it very insightful to students what were the achievements and shortcomings of their theses.

Considerations

The panel is unanimously impressed by the positive changes the programme has made in recent years. Assessment procedures have been redesigned and formalised, so that elements exhibit state-of-the-art practices that could serve as sources of inspiration and models of emulation for other programmes. Quality of assessment is soundly assured, the panel found. The programme's Education Plan explicitly connects forms of assessment to the courses and intended learning outcomes. The Board of Examiners assures that the intended learning outcomes are realised by performing regular checks, screenings and audits. At course level, the assessment methods are sufficiently varied and effective. They fit the goals of the courses and offer a good preparation for professional practice. Thesis assessment is satisfactory, in the panel's view. It found the grading accurate, the procedures well laid out and it appreciated the generous amount and high quality of feedback given to students. The panel suggests aligning the criteria on the thesis assessment forms more directly with the intended learning outcomes and recommends explicitly distinguishing the comments from the two examiners. In general, the panel concludes that the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments meet the standard.

Conclusion

Master's programme European Studies: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'meets the standard'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

Master's theses

The explicit alignment between intended learning outcomes, teaching activities and assessment assures that graduates of the master's programme European Studies have met the programme's goals. On top of that, the master's theses are an indirect measure of what students are capable of. The panel studied a sample of the theses and found them of varying quality, as was to be expected. In general, the research questions are clear, interesting and societally relevant. Some theses however remained too descriptive in the panel's view, and not all were sufficiently explicit on what

methodology was chosen and why. This is a not uncommon challenge to students, but nonetheless one on which the programme needs to keep a close eye. On the other hand, the panel saw some fine theses, with original empirical research, relevant literature and a sophisticated analytical framework, where all steps of the research cycle were taken impeccably. The panel unanimously found that even the weaker theses demonstrated a sufficient, passable mastery of the learning outcomes.

Alumni success

The programme surveyed where its alumni end up. In general, it found that they work in a professional environment dealing with European or international topics. These may be national, regional or local administration and organisations, consultancy, communication or journalism. The large majority of students (71 per cent) reported that they were working outside of the Netherlands. No less than 39 per cent of recent graduates reported working in Brussels. This is a sign of the programme's success, for finding a job in in the EU institutions or Brussels is an ambition of many students. The programme is deservedly proud that some of its graduates have achieved such positions as European Commissioner, cabinet minister and member of the European Parliament. The panel talked to alumni and found them satisfied with the skills they developed in the programme. In particular, they were satisfied with the problem based learning format, saying that this had been a good preparation for life outside of academia.

The programme maintains close ties with its alumni through various channels. These include the External Advisory Board and alumni events in Maastricht or in local alumni circles organised by the university's alumni office. There are nine alumni circles in the Netherlands (e.g., in Amsterdam, The Hague, Southern Limburg) and 19 international alumni circles (e.g., in Brussels, Berlin, Paris, New York and China). Every year, a number of the university's professors tours all these circles to give lectures on the latest academic developments. In addition, the Brussels alumni circle – which counts over 1,200 active members amongst whom many European Studies graduates – can use the university's campus for professional and social activities. In the panel's view, this is an impressive, well-organised network and a credit to the programme. It considers it an example of good practice and hopes that it may inspire other programmes.

Considerations

The panel states that the master's programme European Studies offers students a good preparation for a professional career dealing with European integration. It found the theses of varying quality, but even the weaker theses demonstrated that students had mastered the intended learning outcomes at the appropriate level. Data shows that students find relevant positions and alumni look back on their student days with satisfaction. The panel is impressed with the lively alumni network maintained by faculty and university. This is advantageous for all parties concerned and, according to the panel, can be seen as an example of good practice.

Conclusion

Master's programme European Studies: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'Meets the standard'.



GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assessed standards 1, 2 3, and 4 of the master's programme European Studies at Maastricht University as 'meets the standard'. Based on the NVAO decision rules regarding limited programme assessments, the panel therefore assesses the programme as 'positive'.

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *Master's programme European Studies* as 'positive'.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

What does the programme aim for?

The Degree of Master of Arts (MA) of European Studies is awarded to students who have demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the field of European Studies that is founded upon and extends and enhances their BA level, and that provides a basis or opportunity for originality in developing and/or applying ideas, often within a research context.

A. Knowledge and insight (Dublin Descriptor I)

demonstrate advanced knowledge and understanding of:

A1. the historical, political, societal, and international context of the process of European integration since 1945

A2. the multi-level system of actors, institutions, norms and practices that make up European governance, and the relations between the EU, its Member States and other international bodies

A3. the policy process from agenda-setting to implementation and evaluation, various EU public policies, and the implications of the integration process for European politics and society (specialisation 1)

A4. the establishment of the EU as an international actor as a result of its various external relations policies (specialisation 2)

A5. the changing global environment and its impact on relations between Europe and the rest of the world, including the challenges resulting from an increasingly complex and interconnected world (specialisation 3)

A6. a broad range of academic concepts, frameworks and theories from history, political science, public administration, international relations, sociology and related academic disciplines aimed at understanding the process of European integration

A7. qualitative and quantitative research methods appropriate for answering advanced academic questions about the process of European integration

A8. how to design, plan and implement an independent research project in the field of European Studies

B. Applying knowledge and insight (Dublin Descriptor II)

can apply their knowledge and understanding, and problem solving abilities in new or unfamiliar environments within broader (or multidisciplinary) contexts related to European Studies. MA ES graduates have the ability to:

B1. apply knowledge and understanding of the process of European integration, within its historical, political, societal, and international contexts, to academic questions

B2. apply specialist knowledge and understanding of the EU policy process (specialisation 1), the establishment of the EU as an international actor (specialisation 2), and the changing global environment and the relations between Europe and the rest of the world (specialisation 3) to advanced academic questions and policy-relevant cases

B3. compare, select, and apply the appropriate academic concepts, frameworks and theories for answering advanced academic questions on the process of European integration

B4. compare, select, and apply the appropriate qualitative or quantitative research methods for answering advanced academic questions on the process of European integration

B5. critically appraise the quality of various source materials

B6. design, plan and implement an independent research project, which has the potential to make an original contribution to the state of the art research in the field of European Studies

B7. integrate and apply substantive knowledge, theories and methods in the field of European Studies to new research puzzles in order to facilitate substantive, theoretical or methodological innovation

B8. use ethical rules related to scholarly work, including styles of acknowledgement, use of other persons' sources, and referencing



C. Formation of a judgement (Dublin descriptor III)

have the ability to integrate knowledge and handle complexity, and formulate judgments with incomplete or limited information, but that include reflecting on social and ethical responsibilities linked to the application of their knowledge and judgments. MA ES graduates have the ability to:

- C1. appraise, contextualise and judge past and ongoing developments in the process of European integration, including its historical, political, societal, and international context
- C2. evaluate, compare and develop scholarly arguments in the field of European Studies in view of forming a judgement on the state of the art of research in the field and its original contribution
- C3. pinpoint the key issues and perspectives about the process of European integration in the context of informational complexity – information overload as well as incomplete or limited information
- C4. identify, retrieve, and evaluate sources and data to build evidence-based arguments to explain past and ongoing developments related to the process of European integration
- C5. reach well-reasoned conclusions about the process of European integration through integrating and combining substantive knowledge, theories and methods from the diverse field of European Studies;
- C6. evaluate and reflect on the societal and ethical implications of conclusions, with awareness to the inter-cultural context, drawn on the basis of academic and policy research related to the process of European integration

D. Communication (Dublin Descriptor IV)

can communicate their conclusions, and the knowledge and rationale underpinning these, to specialist and non-specialist European and international audiences clearly and unambiguously.

MA ES graduates have the ability to:

- D1. participate in scholarly and policy debates on European integration with an awareness to the sensitivities of inter-cultural communication
- D2. present ideas and research findings on European integration in spoken English to specialist and non-specialist European and international audiences using an appropriate register, vocabulary and tone
- D3. express ideas and research findings on European integration to specialist European and international academic audiences in written academic English through the medium of academic papers
- D4. express ideas and research findings on European integration tailored to European and international policy audiences and the general public in written English using different types of mediums, including policy papers, opinion articles, online communication and social media

E. Learning skills (Dublin Descriptor V)

have the learning skills to allow them to continue to study in a manner that may be largely selfdirected or autonomous. MA ES graduates have the ability to:

- E1. critically reflect upon one's own work and performance in an international professional environment, display an openness to feedback, and adapt their work accordingly
- E2. autonomously generate new ideas related to the process of European integration, identify new academic questions and policy problems, and stay up-to-date with the academic and policy literature
- E3. autonomously make substantive choices when analysing academic questions and policy problems related to the process of European integration
- E4. autonomously set and implement objectives, priorities and work plans, while managing time
- E5. function in a group setting and work in an international professional environment

APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Specialisation: Public Policy and Administration			Specialisation: International Relations			Specialisation: Global Challenges		
period 1	EUS4012 Post-War Europe: Political and Societal Transformations (12 EC)	EUS 4800 Thesis (12 EC)	period 1	EUS4012 Post-War Europe: Political and Societal Transformations (12 EC)	EUS 4800 Thesis (12 EC)	period 1	EUS4012 Post-War Europe: Political and Societal Transformations (12 EC)	EUS 4800 Thesis (12 EC)
<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Source criticism and the politics of history</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Source criticism and the politics of history</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Source criticism and the politics of history</i>	

Specialisation: Public Policy and Administration			Specialisation: International Relations			Specialisation: Global Challenges		
period 2	EUS4002 The European Policy Process (12 EC)	EUS 4800 Thesis (12 EC)	period 2	EUS4001 International Relations and Global Governance (12 EC)	EUS 4800 Thesis (12 EC)	period 2	EUS4001 International Relations and Global Governance (12 EC)	EUS 4800 Thesis (12 EC)
<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Policy analysis</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Foreign policy analysis</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Foreign policy analysis</i>	
period 3	EUS4014 EU Budget and Economic Governance (6 EC)		period 3	EUS4003 EU Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy (6 EC)		period 3	EUS4016 Europe, Multilateralism and Multipolarity (6 EC)	
<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Communication, press and social media</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Communication, press and social media</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Communication, press and social media</i>	
period 4	EUS4005 Europeanisation and Domestic Change (12 EC)		period 4	EUS4006 EU Foreign and Security Policy (12 EC)		period 4	EUS4010 Europe and International Migration (12 EC)	
<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Policy evaluation</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Policy evaluation</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Policy evaluation</i>	
period 5a	EUS4007 Civil Society and European Integration (6 EC)		period 5a	EUS4004 EU External Economic Policy (6 EC)		period 5a	EUS4013 Europe and the Global South (6 EC)	
<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Policy brief</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Negotiations skills</i>		<i>Integrated skills</i>	<i>Discourse analysis</i>	
period 5b	Thesis		period 5b	Thesis		period 5b	Thesis	
period 6	Thesis		period 6	Thesis		period 6	Thesis	

APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Wednesday 11 December Dag 1

10.45 – 11.15	Aankomst en welkom, incl. korte presentatie FASoS
11.15 – 12.30	Intern overleg en inzage documentatie; incl. inloopspreekuur (12:15-12:30)
12.30 – 13.15	Lunch
13.15 – 13.45	Interview inhoudelijk verantwoordelijke BA ES
13.45 – 14.15	Interview inhoudelijk verantwoordelijke MA ES
14.15 – 14.45	Interview inhoudelijk verantwoordelijke MA EPA
14.45 – 15.30	Uitloop /intern overleg
15.30 – 16.00	Interview studenten bachelor (incl. OC-lid)
16.00 – 16.30	Interview docenten bachelor (incl. OC-lid)
16.30 – 17.00	Pauze / intern overleg
17.00 – 17.30	Interview studenten masters: MA ES/MA EPA (incl. OC-lid)
17.30 – 18.00	Uitloop/ intern overleg

Thursday 12 December Dag 2

08.45 – 10.30	Aankomst, voorbereiding, inzage documentatie
10.30 – 11.15	Interview docenten masters: MA ES/MA EPA (incl. OC-lid)
11.15 – 11.45	Interview alumni BA
11.45 – 12.15	Interview alumni MA ES/MA EPA
12.15 – 13.00	Lunch
13.00 – 13.30	Interview inhoudelijk verantwoordelijken ESST
13.30 – 14.00	Interview studenten ESST (incl. OC-lid)
14.00 – 14.15	Intern overleg
14.15– 14.45	Interview docenten ESST
14.45 – 15.15	Intern overleg
15.15 – 15.45	Interview examencommissie en studieadviseurs (totaal 7 personen)
15.45 – 16.45	Vorbereiding slotinterviews
16.45 – 17.30	Interview alumni ESST
17.30 – 18.00	Intern overleg

Friday 13 December Dag 3

08.45 – 09.30	Inzage documentatie
09.30 – 10.00	Slotinterview formeel verantwoordelijken BA ES
10.00 – 10.30	Slotinterview formeel verantwoordelijken MA ES
10.30 – 10.45	Pauze
10.45 – 11.15	Slotinterview formeel verantwoordelijken MA EPA
11.15 – 11.45	Slotinterview formeel verantwoordelijken ESST
11.45 – 14.00	Lunch en Opstellen oordelen
14.00 – 14.30	Mondelinge terugkoppeling BA ES/MA ES/MA EPA/MA ESST
14.30 – 14.45	Uitloop/pauze
14.45 – 15.15	Ontwikkelsprek BA ES
15.15 – 15.45	Ontwikkelsprek MA ES
15.45 – 16.00	Pauze
16.00 – 16.30	Ontwikkelsprek MA EPA
16.30 – 17.00	Ontwikkelsprek ESST
17.00 – 17.30	Afronding (Borrel)

APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the master's programme European Studies. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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

Ma OER 19-20
Rules & Regulations
UM Strategisch programma 2017-2021
FASoS Strategic Plan
UM Language Policy 2018-2021
Gedragscode Voertaal van de Universiteit Maastricht
UM taalbeleid 2018-2021
Assessment policy FASoS
Assessment Support Team
Annual Report BoE 2018-19
Annual Report BoE 2017-2018
Annual Report European Studies (ES) 2017-18
Annual Report PC MTI 2017-18
Annual Report PC MTI 2017-18 appendix 1
Annual Report PC MTI 2017-18 appendix 2
Annual Report 2018-2019 PC European Studies
Annual Report 2018-2019 PC MTI
Annual Report PC MTI 2018-19 appendix 1
Annual Report PC MTI 2018-19 appendix 2
Annual Report GPC Europe and a Globalising World 2019

Minutes Meeting External Advisory Board
Minutes Meeting EAB European Studies Programmes

Notes EAB ES GDS
Course Book ES Master Thesis
Mentor Programme
Data on dropouts (all programmes)
Keuzegids Ma (2019 and 2020)
Distribution of thesis grades (all programmes)
Plagiarism check report for one of the theses studies
Format Scripts for calibration workshops
Minutes MA ES calibration workshop 2018/19
Format BoE audit
Instruction for auditors BoE audit

Full portfolios (study material, assignments, exams, evaluation forms) of the following courses:

'Post-War Europe: Political and Societal Transformations'
'EU Budget and Economic Governance'
'EU and International Migration'
'Thesis Course'

