

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

NIJMEGEN SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT

RADBOUD 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: Q0622

© 2018 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S AND THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION OF RADBOD UNIVERSITY	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMMES.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM NVAO-EAPAA ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK 2016 ...	13
APPENDICES	29
APPENDIX 1: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	31
APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE	33
APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	39
APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	41
APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	43
APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	44

This report was finalized on 16-03-2018





REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S AND THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION OF RADBOUD UNIVERSITY

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

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMMES

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

Name of the programme:	Public Administration (Bestuurskunde)
CROHO number:	56627
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Location:	Nijmegen
Mode of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	Dutch
Expiration of accreditation:	31/12/2018

Master's programme Public Administration

Name of the programme:	Public Administration (Bestuurskunde)
CROHO number:	66627
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specializations or tracks:	Policy and Consulting Organization and Management Public Safety Management Comparative Politics, Administration and Society (COMPASS)
Location(s):	Nijmegen
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	Dutch, English
Expiration of accreditation:	31/12/2018

The visit of the assessment panel Public Administration to the School of Management of the Radboud University took place on 2-3 november 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Radboud 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 bachelor's and master's programmes Public Administration consisted of:

- Prof. dr. T. (Tony) Bovaird, professor emeritus of Public Management and Policy at the University of Birmingham (United Kingdom) [chair];
- Prof. dr. H.M.C. (Harrie) Eijkelhof, professor emeritus of Physics Education at Utrecht University;
- J.C. (Jasper) Meijering, master's student Engineering and Policy Analysis at Delft University of Technology [student member];
- Prof. dr. Tiina Randma-Liiv, professor of Public Management and Policy and vice-dean for Research at Tallinn University of Technology (Estonia);
- Prof. dr. A. (Adrian) Ritz, professor for Public Management at the University of Bern (Switzerland) [vice-chair];
- Drs. B. (Bertine) Steenbergen, internal interim manager Public Sector, working for, amongst others, Inspection Health Care, the Dutch Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Security and Justice.

The panel was supported by Peter Hilderling MSc, who acted as secretary.

Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The assessment of the bachelor's and master's programmes Public Administration are 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 the 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 university 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 Radboud 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 ten 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 Radboud University on 2 and 3 November 2017 followed a visit to the University of Twente that took place from 30 October to 1 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. After this, the panel discussed its working method and its preliminary findings for the Twente 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

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The programme has a strong mission and identity, focusing on educating generalists with strong academic skills for the Dutch public sector. The aims are relevant and shared and recognized by relevant stakeholders inside and outside the programme. The panel is impressed by the explicit attention to ethics and values. The intended learning outcomes are strongly formulated and present the aims and objectives of the programmes in a clearly recognizable form.

The curriculum of the programme is solid. It has a strong internal structure, covering the basics of the field as well as the disciplines in which public administration is embedded. These are integrated in a coherent curriculum, with a strong emphasis on academic skills. The courses adequately cover the intended learning outcomes, although this could be made more apparent by applying a coherent style in the formulation of the course objectives. The panel also advises the programme to use more variation in teaching methods in order to enrich the learning experience of its students. The programme is feasible, and pays sufficient attention to practice, for instance through an elective internship, but the relation with the professional field itself could be improved. To this end, the panel recommends improving structural contact with the professional field, for instance through alumni and internship organizations. The staff teaching in the programme are highly qualified in both research and teaching skills.

The programme has succeeded in building an impressive assessment system with outstanding attention to quality assurance. The very active and influential Board of Examiners plays a pivotal role in taking the teaching staff and programme management along in co-production of various quality mechanisms. This includes an independent second reader, a rich and transparent assessment form for the thesis, an extensive evaluation system for assessments and a review aimed at improvement of the grading process. The panel recommends decoupling the role of process reviewer and second assessor. This will benefit both the independence of the thesis review and the variety in second assessors for years in which the thesis review is conducted. The test matrix used to map the intended learning outcomes to all assessments in the programme was very impressive and worthy of publication.

The graduates of the programme convincingly show that they achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses are of a good quality, and show in particular good research skills and the ability to approach research questions from various perspectives, using multiple theories. Alumni view their bachelor's programme as adequate preparation for their master's programmes.

The programme has a very good system of internal quality assurance in place. The Educational Committee is strong, and systematic student evaluations play a major role in curriculum development. The continuous attention to improvements on all levels of the programmes is impressive. The programme has generally responded very well to the recommendations of the previous external review.

The programme pays attention to diversity, although it is not a major aim. It has an adequate gender balance in both student population and staff, and it attracts students from ethnic minorities.

Master's programme Public Administration

The programme has a clear mission and identity, focusing on educating generalists with strong academic skills for the Dutch public sector. The aims are relevant and shared and recognized by relevant stakeholders inside and outside the programme. The panel is impressed by the explicit attention to ethics and values. The intended learning outcomes are strongly formulated and present the aims and objectives of the programmes in a clearly recognizable form.

The master's programme has a solid, coherent curriculum that convincingly covers the interrelatedness of themes in public administration. The curriculum is aimed at turning the students



into critical academics, and the interactive teaching methods are appropriate to reach this goal. The programme offers four adequate specializations, three Dutch-language and one English-language track. For the latter, the panel recommends the programme to reflect on the role of a strongly international track in a programme otherwise oriented towards the Dutch public sector. The courses adequately cover the intended learning outcomes, although this could be made more apparent by applying a coherent style in the formulation of the course objectives. The programme is feasible, and pays sufficient attention to practice, for instance through an internship taken by the majority of students, but the relation with the professional field itself could be improved. To this end, the panel recommends improving structural contact with the professional field, for instance through alumni and internship organizations. The admission criteria are sensible. The premaster remedies most deficiencies before the start of the programme, although an evaluation of the premaster programme would be advisable. The staff teaching in the programme are highly qualified in both research and teaching skills.

The programme has succeeded in building an impressive assessment system with outstanding attention to quality assurance. The very active and influential Board of Examiners plays a pivotal role in taking the teaching staff and programme management along in co-production of various quality mechanisms. This includes an independent second reader, a rich and transparent assessment form for the thesis, an extensive evaluation system for assessments and a review aimed at improvement of the grading process. The panel recommends decoupling the role of process reviewer and second assessor. This will benefit both the independence of the thesis review and the variety in second assessors for years in which the thesis review is conducted. The test matrix used to map the intended learning outcomes to all assessments in the programme was very impressive and worthy of publication.

The graduates of the programme convincingly show that they achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses are of a good quality, and show in particular good research skills and the ability to approach research questions from various perspectives, using multiple theories. They additionally show themselves to be critical, reflective academics. This is confirmed by alumni and employers, who praise the programme for its generalist approach and attention to research skills. The employability of the programme's alumni is impressive.

The programme has a very good system of internal quality assurance in place. The Educational Committee is strong, and systematic student evaluations play a major role in curriculum development. The continuous attention to improvements on all levels of the programmes is impressive. The programme has generally responded very well to the recommendations of the previous external review.

The programme pays attention to diversity, although it is not a major aim. It has an adequate gender balance in both student population and staff, and it attracts students from ethnic minorities. International students in the master's track 'Compass' feel included. The panel recommends the master's programme to explore possibilities to make better use of the international classroom in the Compass track.

The panel assesses the standards from the combined NVAO-EAPAA framework 2016 in the following way:

Bachelor's programme Public Administration


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

Master's programme Public Administration

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

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



Peter Hilderling MSc



DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM NVAO-EAPAA ACCREDITATION FRAMEWORK 2016

Organisational context

The Public Administration programmes are part of the Nijmegen School of Management, which is one of the faculties of Radboud University. Research and education at the School focuses on structural issues of complex organizations in public and private sector. It unites the fields of Business Administration, Public Administration, Economics and Business, Social and Political Sciences of the Environment, Spatial Planning, Political Science and Human Geography.

The School is headed by the Dean, who is assisted by Associate Deans for Education and Research. The School consists of four departments, including Public Administration and Political Science. The departments are subdivided into chairs, which are managed by chair holders. One of these is the department chair. The educational programmes are organized by programme coordinators, who are the point of contact for that programme to the Associate Dean for Education. When it comes to education itself, the chair holders are ultimately responsible.

Within the university, Boards of Examiners and Educational Committees are organized at programme level, and supported by central faculty services. The bachelor's and master's programme Public Administration share their Board of Examiners and Educational Committee.

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

Mission and vision

The Public Administration programmes at Radboud University view themselves as programmes with a classic, generalist public administration core. They aim for their students to analyse problems and issues concerning government and governance, public policy and public sector management in an academically responsible manner. The choice for the bachelor's and master's programme to be generalist is deliberate. The programmes recognize the need in the Dutch public sectors for generalists with a thorough training in academic skills, and aim to address this by training multidisciplinary, academic professionals. This mission is translated into specific aims for both programmes.

In the *bachelor's programme*, students learn to draw on theory and knowledge from economics, political science, sociology, philosophy and law, and apply this to problem-solving in the public interest. This multidisciplinary expertise is integrated with a focus on ethics and values in order to be able to act in the general interest in an increasingly complex world. Students are also extensively trained in research skills in order to be able to describe and explain developments in the field of public administration. Theories are offered in a comparative perspective. By using various theoretical perspectives and research methodologies, students are taught to reflect critically on theories used in policy and organizational problems.



The master's programme aims to offer its students a more integrated, interdisciplinary approach. Students learn to apply insights from current research in multiple disciplines into the theory and practice of public administration. The students study and interpret situations from various perspectives. In doing this, they learn that these multiple perspectives add to their abilities to analyse problems and situations. Master's students can choose between one of three Dutch-language tracks (Policy & Consulting, Organization & Management and Public Safety Management) and the English language specialization Comparative Politics, Administration and Society (COMPASS) offered jointly with the political science master's programme.

The panel praises the strong identity of both programmes. They make a clear, recognizable choice to be generalist programmes with a research focus, oriented towards the Dutch public sector. The mission of the programmes is well-translated into aims and objectives, and is used as a starting point for the design of the programmes. The identity is recognized and shared by students, staff, alumni of the programme, as well as employers of alumni of the programme. Additionally, the panel was impressed by the attention to values and moral compass in the programmes. The drive to act in the public interest is an essential characteristic of good public servants, and the panel was very pleased to see this explicitly addressed in the mission of the programmes.

The focus on the Dutch market attracts students interested in the local and regional public sector, and the generalist approach is attractive to students who want to keep their future career options open. According to the panel, these are unique selling points of the programme, and the programme could make this more explicit in its marketing. The student body is currently predominantly regional, but the panel thinks the unique profile of the programme could be attractive to potential students throughout the Netherlands.

Intended learning outcomes

The panel has studied the intended learning outcomes of both programmes (see Appendix 3). It concludes that they are well formulated and present the core aims of the programmes in condensed form. The panel was impressed by their compact and strong formulation and their relation to the mission and aims of the programmes as formulated in the previous section. The academic orientation of the programmes is clearly recognizable in the intended learning outcomes, most prominently in the attention to research skills, reflection and ethics. For the master's programme, each of the four specializations has its own additional intended learning outcomes. The learning outcomes are properly formulated for the intended level, being based on the wording in the Dublin descriptors for bachelor's and master's programmes. As a result of the generalist nature of the programmes, they cover the broad range of topics formulated in the domain-specific framework of reference for Public Administration programmes in the Netherlands.

Considerations

Both programmes have a strong mission and identity, focusing on educating generalists with strong academic skills for the Dutch public sector. The aims are relevant and shared and recognized by relevant stakeholders inside and outside the programme. The panel is impressed by the explicit attention to ethics and values. The intended learning outcomes are strongly formulated and present the aims and objectives of the programmes in a clearly recognizable form.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 1:
for the bachelor's programme Public Administration as 'good'.
for the master's programme Public Administration as 'good'.

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 is essential to that end. Curriculum, staff, services and facilities constitute a coherent teaching-learning environment for the students.

Findings**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).

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The bachelor's programme is structured along five pillars of public administration: the public sector, organization & management, public policy, research methods and multidisciplinary. All pillars are covered in each of the three years, with the difficulty of the content increasing over the years. In the first year, students acquire basic knowledge and skills in each of the pillars through introduction courses and two projects. The second year is largely dedicated to courses on the disciplines upon which public administration draws, such as political science, economics, sociology, philosophy and law, and the application of these in research. In the third year, the students combine the knowledge and skills from the previous two years into more complex courses that combine the pillars and disciplines. They can also follow electives and/or pursue an internship to further expand their skills. The curriculum culminates in the bachelor's thesis in which students combine core, methodological and supplementary courses in an individual research project.

The panel is impressed by the strong core components of the programme and the clear structure and logic in which these are offered. The pillars cover many components of the field as well as the disciplines upon which public administration draws. Together they form a very strong generalist training in public administration, which is in line with the mission and goals of the programme. The panel was especially enthusiastic about the research methods pillar, which spans roughly one third of the programme and gives students a very thorough training in research skills. Students, alumni and employers name research skills and the generalist approach as the defining characteristics of the programme.

Master's programme Public Administration

Where in the bachelor's programme students learn to understand and use theories and skills, master's students are expected to compare theories. Both the core and specialist courses explore the interrelatedness of themes in public administration and are aimed at turning the students into critical academics. They learn to make a substantiated choice between theories and approaches in composing a research design. The four core courses cover research approaches, administrative ethics, evaluation monitoring and public governance. After this, the students choose one of the four specializations to further deepen their knowledge (see Standard 2.2). The programme is completed by two capstones: an internship and the master's thesis. In these two projects, students work on a problem relevant to their internship organization and a research question, using the knowledge and skills they have obtained in the programme.

The panel is satisfied with the core components in the master's programme. They adequately cover the basics of policy and management at a master's level. Compared to the bachelor's, the master's programme focuses less on the pillars of public administration, and more on research skills and attitudes. Considering the one-year length this is a reasonable choice. The specializations allow students to deepen their knowledge in one of the components, and the research skills and attitudes prepare students well for the internship and the thesis.



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).

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

Bachelor's students can choose electives (24 EC) in their third year from a selection of elective courses or a minor programme inside or outside the university. Students can also choose to do an internship or go abroad for electives. The programme would like more students to use this opportunity to provide international experience in an otherwise Dutch-oriented programme. Therefore, it will change the curriculum to clear an entire semester in the third year from compulsory courses, so students can go abroad without any study delay.

In the panel's view, the choice of the bachelor's programme not to have specializations makes sense in the light of the generalist approach of the programme. The opportunity to choose electives or an internship in the third year is adequate, and allows students to specialize or broaden their expertise as they see fit.

Master's programme Public Administration

Master's students choose one of four specialization tracks. These are the Dutch-language tracks Policy & Consulting, Organization and Management, and Public Safety Management, and the English-language track Comparative Politics, Administration and Society (Compass) offered jointly with the Political Science master's programme at the same faculty. Additionally, students can choose to pursue the research master's in Public Administration and Organizational Science, which is formally offered by Utrecht University but co-organized by this programme. The Dutch-language tracks consist of two specialized courses (12 EC), followed by a free slot (6 EC) for either an internship, an elective, an extra research project or an international exchange programme. The English-language Compass track has an international character, both in content and student population. The track focuses on analysing complex systems of government and governance from an international comparative perspective.

The panel is satisfied with the opportunities for specialization in the master's programme. A substantive portion of the curriculum is reserved for the specializations, giving students the opportunity to shape their curriculum to their own preference. The Dutch-language tracks make sense in light of the mission and goals of the programme. They aim to deepen student knowledge in specific aspects of public administration while maintaining the overall goal of studying public administration challenges from an interdisciplinary, comparative perspective.

The English-language Compass programme has a very high level of student satisfaction and offers a strong curriculum on international comparative government and governance. However, the panel was somewhat surprised to find such a strongly international focused track here. In light of the programme's mission and goals, the panel would rather expect a specialization on, for instance, local or regional government. The Public Administration programmes in Nijmegen focus on core public administration, and are oriented at the Dutch market. The Compass specialization is neither, nor does it clearly aim towards either Dutch or international students. While the track in itself works very well, the panel nevertheless recommends the programme to consider its role in the light of the programme's own mission and goals.

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.

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

In the bachelor's programme, students get acquainted with the various disciplines on which public administration draws: political science, economics, sociology, philosophy and law. In advanced courses in the third year and in projects throughout the years, students combine insights from these disciplines to study public administration topics. Most of the disciplinary courses in the second year are taught jointly with other programmes in the Faculty. They are adapted to the programme by adding small-scale seminars with public administration-focused content, and by grouping the programme's students in separate working groups.

In the panel's view, the bachelor's programme does a very good job in teaching public administration as a multidisciplinary subject. The various disciplines are clearly visible and firmly integrated in the bachelor's curriculum. Students get a thorough understanding that public administration is a multidisciplinary field, and learn how these disciplines relate to each other. The programme does not claim to be interdisciplinary. However, if the programme would want to develop in this direction, the panel sees an opportunity for this in the joint courses with other programmes. Students follow courses together with students from other disciplines, and could work on related projects in interdisciplinary work groups to develop their interdisciplinary skills.

Master's programme Public Administration

The master's programme aims to be interdisciplinary rather than multidisciplinary. This takes the form of theories and research methods being taught in a comparative way. Students follow courses on comparative research methods, and are themselves required to use multiple research methods in their thesis.

The panel thinks the programme is successful in achieving its ambitious interdisciplinary goals. Through the obligatory courses and thesis requirements, students study public administration themes from a variety of perspectives, and learn to reflect on this. The degree of multi- and interdisciplinarity a student experiences in the programme depends on his or her choice of specialization and thesis topic. For instance, the Compass specialization draws mainly from political science, whereas Public Safety Management has elements from economics, law, psychology and sociology. However, all specializations draw upon and integrate the varied disciplines from the core courses and other elements of the programme to qualify as interdisciplinary.

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.

Both the bachelor's (180 EC) and the master's programme (60 EC) fulfil the length criteria for academic bachelor's and master's programmes in the Netherlands.

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 main link between the programmes and the practice of public administration is the internship. Both the bachelor's and the master's programme have the opportunity for students to pursue an internship. Although not compulsory, students are encouraged to complete an internship either in



the bachelor's or master's phase of their studies in Nijmegen. Most students (80%) take this opportunity in their master's. During the internship, students work on answering a research question based on a problem faced by the internship organization. Although the internship is formally only 6 EC, many students choose to voluntarily do an internship for a longer period. To have better opportunities for a longer internship (or an international internship/exchange programme), the bachelor's programme has recently changed its curriculum to free up an entire semester in the third year for such activities.

Other activities related to practice are the attention to professional skills and career preparation. The analytical and reflective skills which the programmes aim to teach their students are useful in the professional field. Both programmes regularly draw on real-life policy issues in their courses. Both the bachelor's and the master's programme have a seminar series in which practitioners are invited for guest lectures. The students can use career services at faculty or university level, although these are not tailored to specific programmes.

The panel is generally satisfied with the relationship to practice of the programmes. The panel is impressed that so many students do an internship. Although not compulsory, by far the largest part of students takes this opportunity, giving them first-hand experience of the professional field. With regard to the orientation towards practice in the courses, the programmes clearly have an academic focus, and are less focused towards the development of practical skills. This is in line with the mission of the programme to educate critical, reflective academics in the field of public administration.

The panel noted that direct involvement of practitioners in the programmes is limited, and has the feeling that the programmes could benefit from more structural contact with the field. For instance, some of the employers that regularly take interns from the programmes indicated that they have limited contact with the internship supervisors within the university. They would be open to more structural contact with the programmes to discuss needs of the field and possible directions in which the programme could develop. The panel recommends that the programme improve contacts with stakeholders in the professional field, for instance through an advisory board of practitioners. In the panel's view, contacts with the professional field through internships would be a sensible starting point for this.

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 corresponds to the didactic philosophy of the programme. The programme is 'doable' in the formal time foreseen for the programme in the respective years.

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The structure of the programme, as discussed under Standard 2.1, is based on five pillars to which all courses are related: the public sector, organization & management, public policy, research methods and multidisciplinary. Except for the fifth pillar, all pillars build up progressively, starting with basic courses in the first year up to more advanced courses later in the curriculum. This culminates in the bachelor's thesis, in which all pillars are combined in a research project. The first year gives students knowledge in what public administration entails, the second year makes students familiar with the various disciplines upon which public administration draws, and the third year integrates the knowledge and skills from the previous years. In terms of structure, each year is divided into two semesters with five 6 EC courses, including an integrative research project at the end of each semester in the first two years. As discussed under Standard 2.2, the first semester of third year is dedicated to either electives, an internship or international exchange programmes. The third year is concluded by the bachelor's thesis in the second semester.

The panel is positive about the clear structure and coherence of the curriculum. The programme has a strong internal logic that is insightful for both staff and students. Having studied the course

objectives for several courses, the panel concludes that they are clearly formulated. Programme management and staff discuss them regularly and check whether all intended learning outcomes are properly covered throughout the courses. The panel approves of this, but thinks this process could be reflected more in the wording of the course objectives. For instance, some course objectives are formulated much more informally than others, or use different wording. This makes it harder to recognize the interrelatedness of the courses and their relation to the intended learning outcomes. The panel recommends the programme to apply a coherent style to the course objectives to remedy this.

Based on the interviews with students and staff during the site visit, the programme appears feasible in the time foreseen, and appears to have no major stumbling blocks. The workload seems to be adequate and not overly demanding for the students. If students overrun, it is usually because of their ambition to follow extra courses or pursue a longer internship. The recent change in the curriculum to free up an entire semester to improve opportunities for internships or going abroad makes sense, and makes the programme more flexible for students.

In terms of teaching methods, the programme mostly relies on lectures combined with small-scale working groups, seminars and assignments. Having studied the contents of several courses and discussing didactics with students and staff, the panel concludes that these are adequate, but not very innovative or varied. Some teachers use teaching methods such as flipping the classroom or simulation games, but these rely on individual initiatives rather than a distinct didactic philosophy. The large majority of courses use the traditional lecture - work group format. Students indicate that they would prefer modernized, more engaged teaching methods, such as a bigger role for ICT and 21st century skills. The educational committee has picked up on this and discussed it with the teaching staff, which has resulted in a pilot to provide web lectures in the first year. The panel encourages the programme to continue such initiatives and to investigate a modernization of the teaching methods. Providing more variation could result in an enriched learning experience for students. The panel also recommends the programme to monitor the use of teaching methods over the courses in order to increase variation of approaches used by lecturers.

Master's programme Public Administration

The structure of the programme as described under Standard 2.1 and 2.2 is aimed at equipping students to become critical, reflective academics. In the Dutch-language master's tracks, students follow four compulsory courses together, and two specialized courses in their tracks. The Compass track follows a similar structure, but has six track-specific courses instead of two. The programme is completed with two capstone projects: the internship (not compulsory, but completed by around 80% of the students) and the master's thesis. In these projects, students show that they are able to make use of various theories and research methods related to public administration in a comparative way. The panel thinks the curriculum fits the goals of the programme. The capstone project(s) at the end bind the programme together and provide a clear goal for students to work towards. The programme is demanding, but feasible for students in all of the tracks. Some students do overrun, but this is often related to other extracurricular ambitions such as extended internships or extra electives.

Just as in the bachelor's programme, the staff monitor whether all intended learning outcomes are properly covered throughout the courses. The panel approves of this, but thinks this process could be reflected more in the wording of the course objectives. For instance, some course objectives are formulated much more informally than others or use different wording. This makes it harder to recognize the interrelatedness of the courses and their relation to the intended learning outcomes. The panel recommends the programme to apply a coherent style to the course objectives to remedy this.

The master's programme mainly uses interactive teaching methods. Students are expected to study selected literature before the start of the seminar. During the seminars, students debate questions relevant to the course materials with the tutor and amongst themselves. These debates are often



prepared and introduced by students through for instance a presentation, video or speech. After the seminars, students usually do an assignment in which students write a paper, advice note or research proposal based on the materials studied and discussed. The panel has studied the contents of several courses and is satisfied with the teaching methods used. Students have an active role in preparing and participating in seminar discussions, which fits the goals of the programme to make students critical and reflective. The topics, projects and assignments throughout the courses are varied and offer students a rich learning environment.

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 bachelor's programme admits all students with pre-university education (vwo) degrees, as is common for Public Administration programmes in the Netherlands. According to the panel, these admission criteria are adequate for this programme.

The master's programme directly admits students with an academic bachelor's degree in Public Administration or Political Sciences, obtained at a Dutch university. Students with a bachelor's degree from another university programme or university of applied sciences (hbo) are admitted after successfully completing a premaster programme of 60 EC. This amounts to roughly 50% of the students. In the case of hbo-students, they also need to have obtained good grades (average 7.5 or higher) in their undergraduate programme. The premaster consists of selected courses from the bachelor's degree, and mainly focuses on research methods, public sector and public administration theory and a number of courses on the various disciplines in which public administration is embedded. In addition, for the Compass track, students need to prove their proficiency in English to qualify for entry to the programme. Depending on the background of students, it is possible to get waivers for a number of courses in the premaster. For instance, students with a university bachelor's degree might be exempt from certain research methods courses already covered in their undergraduate programme. The Board of Examiners decides on these exceptions.

According to the panel, the admission criteria make sense. The master's programme builds on the bachelor's programme, so a substantial premaster with bachelor's courses if students come from a different background seems necessary. Also, a high grade average for hbo-students is in line with the high academic ambitions of the programme. The panel notes that the student comment section in the programme's self-evaluation recommends an evaluation of the premaster. Student experience of the premaster is not monitored, although students from a wide variety of background participate. Experiences might differ for various groups. The panel thinks the request for an evaluation is appropriate, and advises the programme to follow up on this.

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.

The structure, contents and didactics of both programmes are generally in line with the qualifications of the students entering the programme. The bachelor's students form a largely homogenous group of Dutch students. There are no discernible patterns in drop-out rates or study success related to specific qualifications of groups of students.

In the master's programme, the premaster is intended to remedy deficiencies of students before entering the programme. In the experience of the teaching staff, the premaster is generally successful in this. Some hbo-students and international students in the Compass programme had difficulties with the expected level of independent learning. The premaster was recently changed to

include learning and reading skills. According to students and alumni, some master's students from an applied science or international background have initial difficulties in the master's programme. However, the teaching methods, in which students are required to actively participate and interact, quickly help them to obtain the required level.

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.

Both programmes are taught by experienced, established researchers in public administration or related fields. All teachers hold a PhD degree and have a University Teaching Qualification, and some also hold a Senior Teaching Qualification. All staff teaching courses in English are required to obtain a certificate to guarantee an appropriate language level. Specific attention is paid to a fit between the courses taught and the research focus of the teacher, with the aim to have all courses taught by a specialized teacher. This way, students can benefit from up-to-date, state-of-the-art knowledge in their courses. Courses in specific disciplines are taught by specialists outside the departments within the faculty.

The panel is impressed with the quality of the teaching staff in both programmes. The department employs a high level teaching staff with a solid research track record. The staff have a broad range of expertises, covering all key public administration disciplines. As such, the team practices what it preaches: public administration from a multidisciplinary, comparative perspective. Students are satisfied with the quality of the staff, and report that they receive personal attention from their teachers. The panel is impressed by the fact that all staff have a teaching qualification, and the widespread holding of a Senior Teaching Qualification, showing the attention to improving teaching throughout the programmes.

Considerations

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

The bachelor's programme Public Administration has a solid curriculum. It has a strong internal structure, covering the basics of the field as well as the disciplines in which public administration is embedded. These are integrated in a coherent curriculum, with a strong emphasis on academic skills. The courses adequately cover the intended learning outcomes, although this could be made more apparent by applying a coherent style in the formulation of the course objectives. The panel also advises the programme to use more variation in teaching methods in order to enrich the learning experience of its students. The programme is feasible, and pays sufficient attention to practice, for instance through an elective internship, but the relation with the professional field itself could be improved. The staff teaching in the programme is highly qualified in both research and teaching skills.

Master's programme Public Administration

The master's programme Public Administration has a solid, coherent curriculum that convincingly covers the interrelatedness of themes in public administration. The curriculum is aimed at turning the students into critical academics, and the interactive teaching methods are appropriate to reach this goal. The programme offers four appropriate specializations, three Dutch-language and one English-language track. For the latter, the panel recommends the programme to reflect on the role



of a strongly international track in a programme otherwise oriented towards the Dutch public sector. The courses adequately cover the intended learning outcomes, although this could be made more apparent by applying a coherent style in the formulation of the course objectives. The programme is feasible, and pays sufficient attention to practice, for instance through an internship taken by the majority of students, but the relation with the professional field itself could be improved. The admission criteria are sensible. The premaster remedies most deficiencies before the start of the programme, although an evaluation of the premaster programme would be advisable. The staff teaching in the programme are highly qualified in both research and teaching skills.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 2:
for the bachelor's programme Public Administration as 'satisfactory'.
for the master's programme Public Administration as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 3: Student 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 both programmes, the panel considered the assessment policy of the programmes, the assessment of the thesis, and the functioning of the Board of Examiners of the programmes.

Assessment policy and evaluation

The assessment policy of both programmes is based on three principles: continuous testing throughout the courses, a continuous professional discussion of assessment by the staff and continuous monitoring of assessments in the programme to ensure their quality.

Continuous testing is achieved by a variety of assessments over the duration of the course. This includes papers, presentations, written exams with either open or multiple choice questions and short assignments. The bar of these assignments is slowly raised as the students progress throughout the programme. All written exam questions are peer reviewed by a colleague before the exam to make sure that they make sense and meet relevant requirements. A continuous professional discussion on assessment is initiated by the Board of Examiners and involves all teaching staff in each of the programmes. Assessment is regularly on the agenda of the monthly staff meetings, and in separate staff meetings several times per year. Also, assessment expertise plays a major role in the university's teaching qualification, that all teaching staff need to obtain. Therefore, internships are always assessed by an assessor within the programme, using criteria determined before the internship starts. The university assessor always consults the supervisor at the host institution of the student. In staff meetings, the teachers use an extensive test matrix in which the intended learning outcomes are related to assessment formats throughout the programmes. This test matrix is a co-production of the entire teaching staff, and is continuously updated in staff meetings to monitor the variety and completeness of assessment in the entire programme. After each assessment, students fill out an evaluation. This evaluation is made available for all students, accompanied by a reflection of the tutor on the results and points for improvement.

The panel was impressed by the assessment policy within the programmes. It has studied various assignments, assessment instructions and the test matrix, and was very impressed by these documents. The assessments were varied and very relevant with regard to the course objectives. The instructions for students were perfectly transparent on what was expected. In particular, the thesis preparation documents for both programmes were of high quality, and made perfectly clear

what would be assessed and by which criteria. The panel considers the test matrix which the programmes use to be of an innovative design and to constitute international best practice. It described in great detail the assessments within the programmes and their contribution to the overall assessment of the programme's learning outcomes. Even more impressive was that it was a living document, a co-production with all teaching staff as contributors, and being used in all discussions on assessment. Further, the panel praises the fact that all assessments are evaluated by students as part of the course evaluations, and that the results are made available to students. Such a level of transparency contributes to a culture of continuous quality improvement. The panel praises the programme for this excellent assessment policy. It thinks that the programme should seriously consider a publication based on its test matrix for the benefit of other programmes.

Thesis assessment

The thesis is assessed by two separate assessors based on clear criteria provided to the students at the start of the thesis trajectory. The first assessor is the student's daily supervisor, the second is an independent assessor unrelated to the trajectory. After running the thesis through anti-plagiarism software, they both grade the thesis on a standardized form. This form requires them to give detailed feedback on the separate thesis criteria. Afterwards the two assessors discuss a final mark and, if their individual marks differ more than one point, note down how they reached consensus on the final mark. If the two assessors cannot agree on a mark, a third assessor can be called upon to make the decision. This happens on average once every 1-2 years. To prevent pairing up the same first and second assessor too often, the programme management keeps track of all the pairings in a social network, and tries to achieve as much variation as possible. As an extra measure of quality assurance, once every few years a member of staff acts as second reader for all theses for an entire academic year to discover patterns in grading and the application of the criteria. This was recently done by the programme director for all master's theses.

The panel studied a number of theses and the accompanying assessment forms for both programmes, and was very impressed by the depth and transparency of the thesis grading process. The assessment forms are clear and are filled in extensively, and as a result provide great transparency on how the grades are reached. The second assessor is independent from both the thesis trajectory and the judgement of the first assessor, and is therefore in a very good position to make an independent judgement on the thesis quality. The programme even keeps track of the pairing of assessors, which the panel considers very good practice. The panel is also very positive about the process of thesis review by a single member of staff to discover patterns in grading. It is however less convinced that this can be combined with a role as second assessor. By playing a role in the grading process, the process reviewer cannot consider the entire grading process from an external viewpoint. Also, having the same second assessor for an entire year gives a single staff member too large a role in thesis grading. The panel recommends the decoupling of the grading and the process review by having the latter performed in a separate process by an independent reviewer.

Board of Examiners

It is the policy of the Nijmegen School of Management to have Boards of Examiners at programme level, and have them supported by faculty services. The two Public Administration programmes share a Board of Examiners between them. As a result, the board can direct all their attention to these programmes. The Board has a very good working relation with the programme management and has a visible influence on programme policy. It defines its role as jointly and actively monitoring assessment within the programme. It initiates various checks on assessments, such as reviewing a selection of exams each year, and lays down the frameworks for assessments in procedures and forms. However, it sees its most important role in achieving a culture of quality in relation to assessment. To this end, the board regularly addresses assessment issues in staff meetings and initiates discussions with management and teaching staff. The board aims for co-production of regulations and frameworks to ensure that all staff members understand why regulations are in place and what they entail. For instance, all teaching staff contribute to the test matrix discussed above, and are involved in evaluations of assessments in the programmes. Other, more procedural roles of



the Board of Examiners includes decisions on the admission of master's students and possible waivers in their premaster, approving electives and investigating suspicions of plagiarism.

In both the documentation and the interviews during the site visit, the panel saw a very active and influential Board of Examiners. An example of the influential role of the Board of Examiners was the inclusion of the Board of Examiners chair in the management meeting during the site visit. The panel was initially surprised by this, but according to the programme, it made perfect sense considering the role the board plays within the programme. The panel became convinced that the chair has an independent yet influential role in quality control of the programme. The board has succeeded in bringing assessment within the programme to a very high level, as discussed in previous sections, and has taken both teaching staff and programme management along in this. The panel compliments the board on this.

Considerations

The programmes have succeeded in building an impressive assessment system with an outstanding attention to quality assurance. The very active and influential Board of Examiners plays a pivotal role in taking the teaching staff and programme management along in co-production of various quality mechanisms. This includes an independent second reader, a rich and transparent assessment form for the thesis, an extensive evaluation system for assessments and a review aimed at improvement of the grading process. The panel recommends decoupling the role of process reviewer and second assessor. This will benefit both the independence of the thesis process review and the variety in second assessors for years in which the thesis process review is conducted. The test matrix used to map the intended learning outcomes to all assessments in the programme was extremely impressive and worthy of publication.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 3:
for the bachelor's programme Public Administration as 'good'.
for the master's programme Public Administration as 'good'.

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 programmes, the panel studied a sample of theses for both programmes, and interviewed several alumni, as well as employers who frequently hire alumni of the programme.

The panel was positive about the level of the theses in both programmes. In all cases, the students convincingly demonstrated that they had achieved the minimum level required by the programme. The topics are relevant and often derived from cases in the field, and generally well-embedded in theory. The use of research skills was quite strong in several cases in both programmes, showing the results of the training the students receive in this aspect. Students show that they can work with theoretical frameworks and research methods, combining and comparing theories and approaches when necessary. The latter is especially apparent in the master's thesis, which matches well with the programme's goal to turn students into critical, reflective academics. The panel generally agreed with the marks given by the supervisors. There were some exceptions in which the scoring might have been a bit more generous, but not systematically.

The vast majority of bachelor's students continue with a master's programme, either in Nijmegen or at other universities. As far as the programme can tell, they are doing well at other places. The programme can tell with certainty that the bachelor's programme properly prepares students for the master's programme in Nijmegen. The results of a recent survey show that 89% of students feel that the bachelor's prepared them adequately for their master's.

The employability of the master's students of the programme is exceptionally high, with 90% finding a relevant job within a year, with an average search time of 4 months. This is significantly higher than the national average. Most students are employed by local and regional governments. The employers and alumni interviewed by the panel during the site visit were very satisfied with the quality of the programme. Employers told the panel that graduates from the Nijmegen programme (either interns or alumni) distinguished themselves by the high research skills, independence and their broad perspective. They liked the fact that Nijmegen graduates were generalists who could adapt to the requirements of their job. This is confirmed in a survey of internship supervisors that the programme conducted, in which supervisors emphasize high scores for skills and attitudes of students. All would take interns from the programme again. The Compass track alumni have a more diffuse job profile and often end up abroad in their home country or in Brussels.

Considerations

The students of both programmes show that they achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses are of a good quality, and show in particular good research skills and the ability to approach research questions from various perspectives, using multiple theories. The master's students additionally show themselves to be critical, reflective academics. This is confirmed by alumni and employers, who praise the programme for its generalist approach and attention to research skills. The employability of the programme's alumni is high.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 4:
for the bachelor's programme Public Administration as 'good'.
for the master's programme Public Administration as 'good'.

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.

Curriculum development in both programmes is mainly demand-driven. The programmes collect input from student, staff and external sources on several occasions, and use this to improve the programme. The Educational Committee, and to a lesser extent the Board of Examiners, play an active role in this. The Educational Committee is, just like the Board of Examiners, shared between the programmes and consists of students and staff from both programmes.

Examples of evaluations used in curriculum development are course evaluations, a yearly brainstorm session and an exit questionnaire for all students. Each course is evaluated by the students using a



questionnaire and open questions. The Committee discusses the results of each course evaluation, and advises the course coordinator on possible improvements. The coordinator writes a response to this advice, which is made available to all students. The advice very often results in adaptations to the course. Additionally, the Educational Committee organizes a yearly brainstorm session in which programme management, staff and students exchange ideas on possible improvements and innovations in the programme. Furthermore, students are asked to complete an exit questionnaire upon leaving the programme about their experiences. Examples of recent changes in the programme as a result of these evaluations are a strengthening of career preparation activities in both the bachelor's and master's programmes, increasing and redistributing the workload in the bachelor's and a change in the scheduling of the bachelor's internship (see Standard 2.5).

The panel has studied reports from the Educational Committee and the results of several course evaluations, and discussed quality assurance in interviews throughout the site visit. It was impressed by the very good quality assurance within both programmes. The course evaluations were very thorough and led in a very transparent way to improvements in the courses. The students' voices were clearly heard, and all staff appeared open to recommendations, irrespective of their hierarchical position. The panel praises the programmes for this. By continuously having an open eye on improvements, the programmes have organically grown and improved.

Although the internal quality assurance is very good, the programme could make better use of external stakeholders in their curriculum development. As discussed under Standard 2.5, direct involvement of practitioners in the programmes is limited. The panel has the feeling that the programmes could benefit from staying more in contact with demands of the professional field. Quality assurance mainly driven by input from internal stakeholders has the associated risk of focusing too much on quality of education and less on relevant external developments that might affect the programme. The panel recommends the programmes to improve contacts with external stakeholders, for instance through an advisory board of practitioners. In the panel's view, contacts with the professional field through internships, and an improved contact with the professional field, would be a sensible starting point for this.

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 previous accreditation in 2011 resulted in a number of recommendations, which played an important role in improvements made in the past years. Recommendations included the improvement of the staff-student ratio in both programmes, greater diversity of assessment methods in the bachelor's, the inclusion of financial management in the bachelor's, more attention to professional skills in the master's, more generous grading of theses in the master's programme, and improvement of contacts with alumni.

The panel concludes that the programmes have in general responded very well to these recommendations. Most prominently, both programmes succeeded in improving the staff-student ratio: from 1:48 to 1:34 in the bachelor's and from 1:63 to 1:31 in the master's programme. This is a major achievement, especially for the master's programme which more than halved the number of students per staff member with a steady inflow of students. The other recommendations were also adequately addressed, except for the improved contacts with alumni, which is still an issue (see Standard 5.1). Some attempts were made, but with limited success. As for the thesis grades in the master's, the panel felt that the marks are now generally on par, still with a small tendency towards being on the lower side of the spectrum, but not problematic.

Considerations

Both programmes have a very good system of internal quality assurance in place. The Educational Committee is strong, and systematic student evaluations play a major role in curriculum development. The continuous attention to improvements on all levels of the programmes is impressive. The programmes could make more use of external input in curriculum development. To this end, the panel recommends improving structural contact with the professional field, for instance through alumni and internship organizations. The programmes have generally responded very well to the recommendations of the previous external review.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 5:
for the bachelor's programme Public Administration as 'good'.
for the master's programme Public Administration as 'good'.

Standard 6: Diversity

Diversity among staff and students is one of the aims of the programme.

Findings

Both programmes strive for diversity among students and staff, and equal opportunities for all groups of students. To reach these goals, the university has several central policies in place. This includes policies on gender diversity in staff and regulations for studying with disabilities.

The gender diversity of the student population has an appropriate balance, with a slightly larger proportion of male students: 62% in the bachelor's and 57% in the master's. The composition of the teaching staff is very balanced, with 54% female and 46% male. This also applies to the higher positions: two full professors are male, and two are female. Being Dutch-language programmes, the bachelor's and the Dutch-language tracks in the master's programme have no international students, and the staff is all Dutch above the postdoc level. The programmes do have a steady inflow of around 5% of Dutch students from ethnic minorities, which is in line with the composition of the regional population. The Compass track consists of both Dutch and international students. Based on the interviews during the site visit, the international students feel adequately included in the student community. Some have initial difficulties with subjects or the style of education, but the interactive educational methods and small group sizes seem to remedy this quickly.

The panel concludes that diversity within the programme is adequate. It is not a major aim of the programme, nor do there appear to be any issues. The programme does well in gender balance of both students and staff, and performs well in attracting students from ethnic minorities. The panel does have the impression that the programme could make better use of the international classroom in the Compass track. This track studies governance in an international comparative perspective, but does not appear to challenge students explicitly to use their own backgrounds in this. The panel recommends the master's programme to explore the possibilities of using international classroom methods in the Compass track.

Considerations

Both programmes pay attention to diversity, although it is not a major aim. They have an adequate gender balance in both student population and staff, and they attract students from ethnic minorities. International students in the master's track Compass feel included. The panel recommends the master's programme to explore the possibilities of making better use of the international classroom in the Compass track.



Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 6:
for the bachelor's programme Public Administration as 'satisfactory'.
for the master's programme Public Administration as 'satisfactory'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

For both the bachelor's and the master's programme, the panel assesses Standard 1, 3, 4 and 5 as 'good' and Standard 2 and 6 as 'satisfactory'.

According to the decision rules of NVAO's Framework for limited programme assessments applied to Standard 1 to 4, the panel assesses:
the bachelor's programme Public Administration as 'good'.
the master's programme Public Administration as 'good'.

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 Brasila. 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*. Professor Bovaird is 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. 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 bachelor education 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 a.o. on concepts of ionizing radiation, curriculum development and PISA results.

J.C. (Jasper) Meijering (student member) is master's student in Engineering and Policy Analysis at Delft University of Technology. He obtained his bachelor's degree in Systems Engineering, Policy Analysis and Management also from Delft University of Technology. His research focuses on using quantitative modelling and simulation techniques to address grand global challenges and acting as strategic policy advisor. He was selected for a scholarship program from, and works as Student Ambassador for, the Dutch Energy sector. From January 2016 to January 2017 he was selected to join the outreach program Young Future Energy Leaders Program of the Masdar Institute in Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates). In this capacity, he was a member of United Arab Emirates' delegation to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP22) in Marrakech (Morocco) in 2016 and attended the World Future Energy Summit 2016.

Prof. dr. T. (Tiina) Randma-Liiv is professor of Public Management and Policy at Tallinn University of Technology (Estonia) where she currently also serves as vice dean for Research of the Faculty of Business and Governance. She holds a BA in Economics from the University of Tartu, Estonia, an MPA from New York University and a PhD from Loughborough University. Randma-Liiv previously served as professor and chair of Public Management at the University of Tartu, and as visiting professor at the KU Leuven, the University of Gdansk, Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration, and Florida International University. She has served on the Steering Committees of the European Group of Public Administration (EGPA), and of the Network of Institutes and Schools of Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe (NISPAcee). Professor Randma-Liiv is currently a member of the Advisory Board to the Estonian Minister of Public Administration, and has



been a member of the Academic Council of the President of Estonia and of the Prime Minister's Advisory Board on Administrative Reform. She has served in the academic advisory board of the European Public Service Award, the advisory board of the UNDP Regional Centre for Public Administration Reform, and the OECD Expert Group of the Partnership for Democratic Governance. She is a co-founder and a board member of the biggest Estonian think-tank – PRAXIS Centre for Policy Studies. Her research interests include the impact of fiscal crisis on public administration, public sector organization, civil service reforms, policy transfer and small states. She has won Alena Brunovska Award for Teaching Excellence in Central and Eastern Europe (2006) and the Estonian National Science Award (2016).

Prof. dr. A. (Adrian) Ritz (vice-chair) is professor for Public Management and a member of the executive board of the interdisciplinary centre for public management at the University of Bern in Switzerland where he teaches at the Faculty of Social Sciences and at the Faculty of Law. He is the delegate of the University Board of Directors for further education and the president of the university commission for further education. Furthermore, Ritz is the managing director of the Executive Master of Public Administration (MPA) and the Certificate of Advanced Studies in Public Management and Policy (CeMap) at the University of Bern. Adrian Ritz worked as research scholar at the University of Georgia, School of Public and International Affairs, Department of Public Administration and Policy, in Athens GA USA, and at Indiana University, School for Public and Environmental Affairs, in Bloomington IN USA. As lecturer Adrian Ritz taught classes for the Universities of Bern, Lausanne, St. Gallen, Munich/Germany and Krems/Austria. His activities in consulting and applied research for public institutions take place at all federal levels of Switzerland. He is a member of the Swiss Public Administration Network (SPAN) and a member of the Accreditation Committee of the European Association for Public Administration Accreditation (EAPAA). Currently, Ritz serves as President of the Scientific Commission for Public, Non-profit, and Health Management (WK ÖBWL) of the German Academic Association for Business Research (VHB). Adrian Ritz' research areas are in the field of public management, leadership, motivation and human resources management, administrative reforms, and performance management.

Drs. B. (Bertine) Steenbergen is acting director Security and Management at the Ministry of Security and Justice in the Netherlands. She has studied Public Administration at the University of Twente and, as a post-doctoral, at the NSOB (MPA). She has had various functions in the government since 1995. She started at the Ministry of Finance, via the interdepartmental Program Modernizing Government, the municipality of The Hague to the Ministry of the Interior. Her position has shifted from policy advisor, via project manager, head of section, program manager to director. Since January 2014, she has made various assignments as an internal interim manager within government. One of her secondary positions is board member of the Association for Public Administration. All her professional activities aim to connect people and organizations within and outside government in creating collaborative solutions.

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 businesslike 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 and Master 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 and master 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 level we also expect a well-developed level of autonomy regarding the direction and choices in a study.

In generic bachelor PAGO-programmes most of the learning outcomes will apply that are listed below. Master 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 level, apply for the master 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) [Is] supported by advanced text books [with] some aspects informed by knowledge at the forefront of their field of study

2 (Master) 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) [through] devising and sustaining arguments

2 (Master) [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) [involves] gathering and interpreting relevant data

2 (Master) [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) [of] information, ideas, problems and solutions

2 (Master) [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) have developed those skills needed to study further with a high level of autonomy

2 (Master) 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

Bachelor's programme Public Administration

At the end of the degree programme, students are capable of:

1. Theory: regarding the most important ideas, theories and concepts from public administration in the areas of policy (policy analysis, decision-making and development of policy) and administration and management (organisation and organisation processes, control, structure and operation of public administration for various levels and organisations): a) to explain, critically assess and relate to current developments and debates; b) to relate to basic knowledge of sociology, political science, economics (in particular public finance) and Dutch law (in particular constitutional and administrative law).
2. Research: (under supervision) to set up quantitative and qualitative social science research to describe, explain or test, and critically reflect on the possibilities and limitations of this research.
3. Application: to analyse, interpret and explain policy and/or organisation problems within their legal, economic and societal contexts, and on this basis to develop and implement recommendations about policy and organisation, and evaluate them by means of critical reflection.
4. Communication: to communicate and report, in a scientifically responsible fashion, on public administration research and policy by working systematically on the collection and processing of information, and reporting the results in writing and orally to specialists and non-specialists alike.

Master's programme Public Administration

The Master's programme in Business Administration with the specialisations listed below is based on the following key concepts: Managing for Stakeholders, Responsible Decision Making and Intervention and Change.

At the end of the degree programme, students will be specialised in one of the following fields:

- Strategic Management: the development and implementation of strategies for organisations in dynamic and complex environments, as well as the development of essential skills to deal with the diversity and plurality of stakeholders and to create multiple values for organisations and their environment.
- Organisational Design & Development: shaping socially responsible business practice by means of change processes and the design of organisation structures.
- Marketing: in a from a perspective of relations management responsible way developing, implementing, and evaluating market strategies in dynamic and international markets.
- Strategic Human Resources Leadership: effective HRM strategies that focus on positively influencing the motivation and development of people in dynamic and complex business environments, with the aim of optimising the employee- and organisational outcomes.
- Gender Equality, Diversity and Inclusion in Management: emphasising how gender equality, diversity and inclusion are important parts of responsible organising, mastering state-of-the art insights in internal organisation processes, the relations between multiple stakeholders and the requirements for organisational change.
- International Management: giving shape to and managing multinationals, as well as communicating effectively with the internal and external (international) environment.
- Innovation and Entrepreneurship: mastering knowledge and skills to act as a successful innovator, innovation manager, or entrepreneur; as an agent of innovation within an existing firm, or else ready to start their own company.
- Business Analysis and Modelling: responsibly designing and supporting decision-making processes within and between organisations, by involving stakeholders in the analysis of the problem in order to access all relevant knowledge and enhance support for change and commitment to the decisions that are made.

At the end of the degree programme, students in one of these specialisations will be capable of:

1. Theory. autonomously explaining, critically assessing and adequately applying available theories and concepts, current developments and scientific debates to complex, multidisciplinary business administration issues.



2. Research. Using autonomously conducted research based on social science research methodology and intervention methodology to provide an innovative contribution to the development of scientific knowledge and to formulate the implications for management practice and society.
3. Application. Diagnosing and analysing complex, multidisciplinary business administration issues in organisations, relations with stakeholders and their environment and product-market combinations; designing effective, responsible, sustainable, solution-oriented and research-based interventions and implementing and evaluating these interventions
4. Reflection. Assessing the scientific value of business administration research and reflecting on the implications for management practice and society.
5. Communication. in a scientifically credible and persuasive manner, communicating and reporting on business administration research and interventions and adequately accounting for the research and interventions, in writing and orally, in academia and in a professional environment.

APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Bachelor's programme Public Administration:

Course name	EC	Type of teaching activity	Type of testing	Contact hours
Semester 1.1.				
Core Themes in Public Administration	6	Lectures, working groups	Written exam and assignments	48
Academic Skills (Public Administration)	6	Lectures, working groups	Assignments and paper	80
Research and Intervention Methodology A	6	Lectures, working groups	Assignments and written exam	48
Organization Theory	6	lectures, working groups	Written exam and assignments	48
Policy Project 1.1: Public Administration	6	Lectures, working groups, field trips	Written examination +paper	32
Semester 1.2				
Domestic Governance	6	Lectures, working groups	Written exam and assignments	44
Management in the Public Sector	6	lectures, working groups	Written exam open and multiple choice + assignment	48
Research and Intervention Methodology B	6	Lectures, working groups	Written examination	48
Introduction to law	6	Lectures and working groups	Written examination	48
Project 1.2: Domestic Governance	6	Lectures, working groups, feedback	Individual presentation + paper	42
Semester 2.1				
Political Science for Public Administration	6	Lectures, working groups	Written exam and assignment	38
Economics of the Management Sciences	6	Lectures, working groups	Written exam open and multiple choice	46
Comparative Public Administration	6	Lectures, working groups	Written exam + essay + presentation	44
Research Methods in PA I	6	Lectures, practicals	Written exam + 7 assignments	30
Project: comparative analysis	6	Lectures, working groups, practicals	Group paper and presentation	32
Semester 2.2.				
Policy Cycle	6	Lectures, working groups	Written examination	48
Costs and Benefits of Public Administration	6	Lectures, working groups practicals	Written examination assignment and take home exam	58
Philosophy of the Management Sciences	6	Lectures and working groups	Written examination and assignments	48
Research Methods in Public Administration II	6	Lectures, working groups, workshops	Written examination +paper	32
Project 2.2. Consulting and Organizational Behavior	6	Lectures, working groups, workshops	Written examination +paper	34
Semester 3.1.				
Good Governance	6	Lectures, working groups	Written examination +papers	32
Sociology for Public Administration	6	Lectures, working groups	Written exam + assignment	46
European Governance	6	Lectures, working groups	Written examination +paper	41
Policy implementation	6	Lectures, working groups	Written examination +paper	30
Elective	6			
Semester 3.2				
Electives	18			
Bachelor thesis	12			

(2015-2016)



Master's programme Public Administration:

Course name	EC	Type of teaching activity	Type of testing	Contact hours
Semester 1.				
Research Approaches in Public Administration	6	Interactive lectures	Exam and assignment	30
Evaluation, Regulation and Enforcement	6	lectures and working groups	Exam and assignments	34
New Public Governance	6	Lectures and working groups	Exam and assignment	28
Administrative Ethics	6	Lectures and working groups	Exam and assignment	28
Specialization: Policy and consulting I	6	Working groups	Exam and assignment	34
Specialization: Organization and Management I	6	Seminars, practicals, working groups	Exam and assignment	34
Specialization: Public Safety management I	6	Lectures, working groups	Group work, individual paper, exam	35
Policy Reform	6	Lectures	Presentations, paper and exam	32
Multi-Level Governance	6	Lectures	Paper and exam	32
Advanced Research Methods	6	Lectures	Paper and exam	24
Europeanization	6	lectures, seminars, feedback- and presentation sessions	Presentation, paper and exam	32
Challenges to 21st Century Representative Democracy	6	Lectures	Book review and exam	32
Semester 2.				
Specialization: Policy and consulting II	6	Working groups	Exam and assignment	28
Specialization: Organization and Management II	6	Lectures and working groups	Exam and Assignment	34
Specialization: Public Safety management II	6	Lectures and working group	Exam and take home exam	35
Politics of Reform	6	Lectures	Presentation, review essay, logbook	24
Internship	6			
Master's thesis	18			

(2015-2016)



APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Wednesday 1 Nov 2017

17.30 - 19.00	Preliminary panel discussion
---------------	-------------------------------------

Thursday 2 Nov 2017

09.00 - 09.30	Arrival and preparation
09.30 - 10.30	Programme management
10.30 - 10.45	Break
10.45 - 11.30	Faculty management
11.30 - 11.45	Break
11.45 - 12.45	Teachers
12.45 - 14.00	Lunch break
14.00 - 15.00	Students
15.00 - 15.30	Internal consultation
15.30 - 16.15	Board of Examiners
16.15 - 17.00	Alumni master and professional field

Friday 3 Nov 2017

09.00 - 10.00	Arrival and internal consultation
10.00 - 10.45	Concluding conversation programme management
10.45 - 12.30	Internal discussion panel
12.30 - 12.45	Oral presentation
12.45 - 13.00	Break
13.00 - 14.00	Development conversation



APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the bachelor's programme Public Administration, and 15 theses of the master's programme Public Administration. The associated student numbers are available through 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):

Course materials, evaluations and assessments Bachelor Public Administration

- Management van het Openbaar Bestuur
- Policy Cycle

Course materials, evaluations and assessments Master Public Administration

- Bestuurskundige Onderzoeksbenaderingen
- Project Vergelijkende Analyse

Other materials:

Summary Institutional Audit

Minutes examination board 2016-2017

Annual reports examination board 2015-2016

Assessment plan 2017

Assessment matrix

Minutes educational committee 2016-2017

Annual reports educational committee 2015-2016