

MASTER
CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND
GOVERNANCE

FACULTY OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

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: Q0613.UvA

© 2017 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME CONFLICT RESOLUTION OF GOVERNANCE OF UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM	4
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	4
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION	4
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	4
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	7
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED PROGRAMME ASSESSMENTS.....	9
APPENDICES	21
APPENDIX 1: CURRICULA VITAE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	23
APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE	23
APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	27
APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	29
APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT	31
APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	34

This report was finalised on 15 June 2017.



REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME CONFLICT RESOLUTION AND GOVERNANCE OF UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessments as a starting point (19 December 2014).

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance

Name of the programme:	Conflict Resolution and Governance
CROHO number:	69314
Level of the programme:	Master
Orientation of the programme:	academic (WO)
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	none
Location(s):	Amsterdam
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Expiration of accreditation:	3 July 2018

The visit of the assessment panel Conflict Resolution and Governance to the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences of University of Amsterdam took place on 18-19 April 2017.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	University of Amsterdam
Status of the institution:	Publicly funded
Result institutional quality assurance assessment	Positive

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on Conflict Resolution and Governance. The panel that assessed the master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance consisted of:

- Prof. dr. Marijke Breuning, Professor of Political Sciences, Department of Political Science, University of North Texas in Denton, Texas, USA [chair];
- Dr. Renske Doorenspleet, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science and International Studies, University of Warwick, UK;
- Dr. Christien Van den Anker, Associate Professor of Politics and International Relations, Faculty of Health & Applied Sciences, University of the West of England in Bristol, UK;
- Prof. dr. Ferdi De Ville, co-director of the Centre for EU Studies, Ghent University, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Peter Vermeersch, Professor of Political Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences, KU Leuven, Belgium;
- Prof. dr. Dirk De Bièvre, Professor of International Politics, Department Political Sciences, Antwerp University, Belgium;
- Kaisa de Bel, third-year bachelor student Political sciences and second-year bachelor student Law, Leiden University, the Netherlands [student-member].



The panel was supported by dr. Marianne van der Weiden, who acted as secretary.

Appendix 1 contains the curricula vitae of the panel members.

WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

Preparation

QANU received the critical reflection of the master's programme Political Science on 2 March 2017 and forwarded copies by mail and e-mail to the panel members. They read the report and prepared questions, comments and remarks prior to the site visit. The secretary collected these questions and arranged them according to subject matter.

In addition, all panel members read recent theses from the master's programme. In consultation with the chair of the panel, fifteen theses were selected, covering the full range of marks given: five with grades in the range 6.0-6.9, five with an intermediate grade (7.0-8.4) and five with a high mark (8.5-9.9). Theses were selected from all specialisations and from the academic years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. The panel members also received the grades and the assessment forms filled out by the examiners and supervisors. An overview of all documents and theses reviewed by the panel is included in Appendix 6.

The secretary drafted a programme for the site visit. This was discussed with the chair of the panel and the coordinator of the programme. As requested by QANU, the coordinator of the programme carefully selected discussion partners. The panel agreed with the selection. A schedule of the programme with all partners is included in Appendix 5.

Site visit

The site visit took place on 18 and 19 April 2017 at the University of Amsterdam. In a preparatory meeting on 17 April 2017 the panel members discussed their findings based on the critical reflection. Furthermore, the panel discussed its findings with regard to the theses and the questions and issues to be raised in the interviews with representatives of the programme and other stakeholders.

During the site visit, the panel studied documents provided by the coordinator of the site visit. They included minutes of the Programme Committee and the Examination Board, course descriptions, course materials, written exams, assignments and other assessments.

Furthermore, the panel interviewed the programme management, students, alumni, staff members, members of the Programme Committee and members of the Examination Board. Prior to the site visit, both staff members and students were informed about the opportunity to speak to the panel confidentially during the 'consultation hour'. No requests were received for the consultation hour.

After the concluding meeting with the management, the panel members extensively discussed their assessment of the programme and prepared a preliminary presentation of the findings. The site visit was concluded with a presentation of the preliminary findings by the chair.

Report

After the visit, the secretary produced a draft version of the report. She submitted the report to the panel members for comments. The secretary processed corrections, remarks and suggestions for improvement provided by the panel members to produce the revised draft report. This was then sent to University of Amsterdam to check for factual errors. The comments and suggestions provided by the university were discussed with the chair of the assessment panel and, where necessary, with the other panel members. Based on the panel's decisions to incorporate or ignore comments and suggestions, the secretary compiled the final version of the programme report.



Decision rules

In accordance with the NVAO's Assessment framework for limited programme assessments, the panel used the following definitions for the assessment of both the standards and the programme as a whole.

Generic quality

The quality that can reasonably be expected in an international perspective from a higher education 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

Standard 1. Intended learning outcomes

Graduates from the master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance (CRG) of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) are equipped to work – as researchers or practitioners – in the sphere of action that exists at the intersection of conflict, conflict resolution, and governance. The intended learning outcomes are well in line with an academic master's programme. The exit qualifications clarify what is expected from graduates in terms of knowledge and skills. The panel advises a formulation in terms of perspectives and approaches instead of theories, in order to express even more clearly what is intended. A strong feature is the way in which the academic literature and practice are brought together and feed into each other. The focus is not only on violent conflicts, but includes the constructive elements of conflicts and conflict resolution as well, which broadens the career perspective for graduates. The panel considers this a creative approach. The programme thus presents a clear and distinctive profile, which is recognised by prospective students. The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be more than satisfactory. The panel assesses Standard 1 as 'good'.

Standard 2. Teaching-learning environment

The one-year master programme consists of two semesters. The first semester is composed of two required core classes and an elective, the second semester of a two-part thesis seminar.

The first course ('Capita Selecta') draws on theory and research from political science and other social sciences to analyse the way conflicts develop, how efforts to conflict resolutions are shaped and how this relates to governance. Students learn to draw on theory to identify and analyse the features and patterns of a case and its development. In the second course ('Seminar on Conflict and Governance Practice'), the relationship between theory and practice is reversed. Students are introduced to fields of professional work through interaction with experienced professionals. The seminar concludes with a six-day workshop on negotiation and conflict resolution. The panel considers the combination of the two courses a valuable approach, but observed that the theoretical notions of the students were not strong, despite the strict admission requirements. The panel thinks the courses can be improved if the theoretical base is given a stronger focus and more coherence. Parallel to the 'Seminar', students choose an elective. A range of courses is offered each year. In these electives, CRG students share the class with students from one or two tracks of the master's programme Political Science. The panel feels this works well.

In the second semester, students work on their thesis project, integrating the theoretical foundation they have developed with their topical interests in a project of empirical research. In the 'Thesis Seminar' students broaden and deepen their methodological knowledge and skills and work on a proposal for their research project. Case studies are the most common form of research and most students use qualitative research methods. Students must complete an acceptable thesis proposal in order to move on to the research project. For most students, the project begins with a period of fieldwork. The findings are communicated in a series of poster sessions, after which the students start writing the thesis. Students must present their findings in a document that frames the research question theoretically, critically reviews the methodology employed, and links the findings back to theory. The panel fully agrees with these requirements, although the generalisation from cases to theory was not always recognisable in the theses studied by the panel (see Standard 4).

The programme aims to involve students actively in a learning community. The programme's small size (maximum thirty students) allows for seminar-style teaching, involving critical discussion and a mix of individual and group work and assignments. The panel feels the programme structure and teaching methods are solid and well-considered.

The programme is selective. All applicants must have a relevant academic bachelor's degree, prior knowledge of conflict resolution and governance and prior knowledge of research methods. They must also have an adequate level of English language proficiency. The disciplinary and international



diversity in the student group is broad and is appreciated by the students. The panel suggests taking the example of the master's programme Political Science by providing a preparatory reading list to the students and assessing the students' knowledge in a test at the start of the programme. This would be an efficient way to bring all students to a comparable knowledge level in crucial areas and relieve the 'Capita Selecta' course. The programme contains no structural impediments to study progress.

The staff is well-qualified substantively, didactically and in research. The students and alumni are very enthusiastic about their teachers. They find them inspiring and approachable. The feedback they provide is not always on time, but very extensive and helpful. General and programme-specific student support services are in place. The panel concludes that the curriculum, staff and facilities constitute a coherent teaching-learning environment, enabling the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel especially appreciates the fact that students acquire practical research skills and learn to implement them through well-guided fieldwork, while basing their research on academic literature. The panel judged this to be a distinguishing feature of the programme. The panel assesses Standard 2 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 3. Assessment

Assessment is based on a sound assessment plan and fulfils the required quality criteria of validity, reliability and transparency. The Examinations Board is actively engaged in monitoring and guaranteeing the assessment quality. In 2015-2016 an evaluation was carried out of the quality of master theses. As a result, the assessment form was adapted, clarifying the crucial differences between a fail (5.0) and a pass (6.0) and between a pass and a pass with distinction. The shortcomings of the assessment forms used until 2015-2016 were also noted by the panel, when it assessed a sample of theses. The panel noticed inconsistencies in the grading procedure and provision of feedback. The new form and criteria will be an improvement. Further improvements are possible, for example by separating the grades for thesis seminar and master's thesis, and providing more guidance on the weight of sub-criteria per aspect. Two other points of improvement are the appointment procedure of the second thesis examiner (preferably not by the supervisor, but by the programme director or Examinations Board) and the issue of timely feedback, a matter on which students commented during the site visit. These points are not so serious, however, that they outweigh the positive aspects. The panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 4. Achieved learning outcomes

The sample of theses studied by the panel shows that students are able to conduct an independent research project in the field, based on sufficient theoretical grounding and using appropriate research methods. Many theses are original and impressive. The research question and fieldwork are based on theory, but the ambitions of the programme would be truly achieved if the outcomes refer back to theory in more detail in the analysis and conclusions. The panel advises emphasising this from the beginning of the research project, when a case is selected for the fieldwork. The panel also advises requiring students to report explicitly on the ethical aspects of their research in the methods section of their thesis. The grades are fair and reflect the differences in quality between theses. From the interview with alumni and a recent alumni survey the panel concludes that alumni are satisfied with the programme. They have found employment in a wide variety of relevant positions. Based on the sample of theses and the alumni information, the panel concludes that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel assesses Standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

Based on its international experience (Belgium, USA, UK), the panel notes with appreciation that the programmes in Political Science in the Netherlands are comparatively better structured and well-considered than elsewhere. For further improvement of the programme, the panel recommends a formulation of the exit qualifications in terms of perspectives and approaches instead of theories, in order to express even more clearly what is intended. The panel suggests two ways to strengthen the students' theoretical knowledge base: by providing a preparatory reading list and assessing the students' knowledge at the start of the programme, and by giving a stronger focus and more coherence to the theoretical base in the 'Capita Selecta' course. Feedback on assignments and exams

should be delivered within the designated limit of fifteen working days at the latest. To fully guarantee the independence of the second thesis examiner, the panel advises that he/she be appointed by the programme director or Examinations Board, rather than by the supervisor. The panel believes that the new standardised thesis assessment form is a major improvement, but advises developing it further. The panel advises emphasising from the beginning of the research project, the importance of commenting on the possibility of generalising the outcomes of the case and/or relating the research outcomes back to the theoretical framework. The panel also advises requiring students to report explicitly on the ethical aspects of their research in the methods section of their thesis.

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

Master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes	good
Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment	satisfactory
Standard 3: Assessment	satisfactory
Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes	satisfactory
General conclusion	satisfactory

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

Datum: 15 juni 2017



Prof. dr. Marijke Breuning



Marianne van der Weiden





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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes of the programme have been concretised with regard to content, level and orientation; they meet international requirements.

Explanation:

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.

Findings

The master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance (CRG) of the University of Amsterdam (UvA) seeks to equip students to work – as researchers or practitioners – in the sphere of action that exists at the intersection of conflict, conflict resolution, and governance. The programme emphasises the importance of an interdisciplinary foundation in the social sciences, the ability to engage in practical problems through research and applied forms of practice, and the ability to engage with colleagues as reflective partners in a shared and ongoing effort to learn and act effectively in the world. These intended learning outcomes are operationalised in exit qualifications (see Appendix 3). The exit qualifications are linked to the Dublin descriptors at master's level. They include academic knowledge and skills, such as the ability to understand relevant normative debates, to critically evaluate research and analysis, to independently frame and conduct research, and to communicate critiques, analyses and findings in a range of setting relevant to the field. The panel agrees that they properly reflect the intended learning outcomes of an academic master's programme.

The programme developed six years ago from its initial position as a track within the master's programme Political Science, pursuing the link between conflict resolution and governance in the context of interdisciplinary theory and the practical setting of action. The panel agrees that the exit qualifications remain compatible with the domain-specific reference framework shared by programmes in political science (see Appendix 2), as stated in the critical self-reflection, because the central focus is on 'identifying and analysing conflicts between ... groups and organisations, tangible and intangible interests, [and] institutions'. Also, 'collective decision-making processes' and 'processes of power' are dealt with, and students learn to analyse the political and social impacts of 'contemporary societal trends such as globalisation and regionalisation, technological developments ... and [the] challenges set by increasing diversity'. The theoretical core consists of political sciences, in particular public policy and governance and international relations. In addition, the programme draws selectively from other social sciences, such as social psychology and anthropology.

The programme aims to develop graduates' research skills and their abilities to draw on theory and research findings from across the social sciences, but also the ability to communicate and function effectively in settings that bring together experts and non-specialists. Graduates are prepared to critically reflect on conflicts and contentious public problems and to contribute to dialogue, debate and negotiation through which these controversies are addressed in public life. The panel considers this a strong combination of academic and professional skills, with clear relevance to the focus of the programme. The panel thinks the exit qualifications would even better express the intended learning outcomes if they speak of perspectives and approaches, rather than theories.

An international comparative study was conducted to mark the similarities and differences with comparable programmes in the Netherlands and abroad. The interdisciplinary approach and practice component are common to all, but the programmes have different disciplinary roots and most other



programmes focus exclusively on violent conflict. In this respect, CRG – with the programme at the London School of Economics and Political Science- differs from the other programmes, since it includes both violent and non-violent conflicts. Students and alumni told the panel that they preferred the UvA programme for its political science and activist approach and the attention to both violent and non-violent conflicts. They feel that the latter gives them a broader and better preparation for the labour market. The panel concludes that the programme’s profile is clearly distinctive and is as such recognised by prospective students who consider the programme an attractive option.

Considerations

The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are well in line with an academic master’s programme CRG, rooted in political science. They properly reflect the requirements of the domain-specific reference framework and the Dublin descriptors at master’s level. The general exit qualifications clarify what is expected from the programme’s graduates in terms of knowledge and skills. The panel advises a formulation in terms of perspectives and approaches instead of theories, in order to express even more clearly what is intended. A strong feature is the way in which theory and practice are brought together and feed into each other. The focus is not only on violent conflicts, but includes the constructive elements of conflicts as well, which broadens the career perspective for graduates. The panel considers this a creative approach. The programme thus presents a clear and distinctive profile, which is recognised by prospective students. The panel considers the intended learning outcomes to be more than satisfactory.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 1 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.

Explanation:

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

Programme: content and design

The one-year master programme consists of two semesters. The first semester is composed of two required core classes and an elective, the second semester of a two-part thesis seminar. For a schematic overview see Appendix 4.

The first block (September-October) is devoted to the ‘Capita Selecta’ course. This course draws on theory and research from political science and other social sciences (sociology, social psychology, anthropology, organisational development and international development and peace studies) to analyse the way conflicts develop, how efforts to conflict resolutions are shaped and how this relates to governance. Exercises and examples are used to help students learn to employ theory to develop tailored analyses of particular conflicts and their development and to assess the practical relationship between conflict resolution and governance from a theoretically-informed perspective. Case studies are discussed in a tutorial format, parallel to the regular class meetings, to deepen students’ competence in desk research and to require them to critically assess the virtues and limitations of this common form of research. Both the group and individual assignments push students to draw on theory to identify and analyse the features and patterns that make a case unique and shape its development.

In the second block (November-January), students attend the 'Seminar on Conflict and Governance Practice' and an elective. In the 'Seminar' the relationship between theory and practice is reversed. Students are introduced to fields of professional work through interaction with experienced professionals. In class meetings, concrete cases are reconstructed, focusing on practices that bridge local and transnational work (activism, peacekeeping and peace building, and mediation). Students are asked to reflect together on what they have heard, how they can make sense of it and what their role is in the development of these case narratives. In the practice study, students reconstruct cases through interviews. This helps them to learn about a field and about the complexity of on-the-ground-experience, and to develop interviewing skills, central to both research and practice. Readings provide conceptual resources from various disciplines. The seminar concludes with a six-day workshop on negotiation and conflict resolution. Cases take the form of simulations and help students to develop their practical capacity to negotiate and resolve conflicts and their ability to theorise their experience and extend their insights to designing institutionally-based approaches for managing interdependence. The workshop starts with simple cases and builds up during the week.

During the site visit, the panel studied the two course guides and discussed both courses with students, alumni and staff members. It is evident that students appreciate the broad and interdisciplinary approach of the 'Capita Selecta' course. They consider it sufficiently explicit which disciplines are brought in in the required readings. If students are not familiar with a particular discipline, they can refer to the additional literature suggested in the course guide or turn to a staff member. They feel that the lecturers organically relate the disciplines to each other and value that they are not 'caught up in always the same theories', as one of them put it. Both staff and students agree that in order for this approach to be fruitful, there must already be a foundation from earlier coursework at bachelor's level. The students also appreciate the 'Seminar' course and are enthusiastic about the Negotiation workshop.

The link between the 'Seminar' and 'Capita Selecta' courses is evident to the alumni. The staff members explained that some of the literature discussed in the first course, comes back in the second course, along with the guest lectures or linked to a case. The 'Capita Selecta' course is meant to lay the base and to make sure that everybody has the same basic knowledge. The panel considers the combination of the two courses a valuable approach, but observed that the theoretical notions of the students were not strong, despite the strict admission requirements. The panel thinks the courses can be improved if the theoretical base is given a stronger focus and more coherence. Both courses now take their input from a wide variety of disciplines, theories and perspectives. The panel thinks this is acceptable for the more practice oriented 'Seminar', provided it can build on a more coherent theoretical course. The panel appreciates the programme's interdisciplinary character, but this requires more efforts to clarify for students what this means in practice: not only a well-balanced set of theoretical knowledge from relevant disciplines, but also an insight in the various debates and perspectives both between and within these disciplines. The panel also advises more attention to governance and institutional aspects in this first course. Finally, the panel feels that assigning the 'Capita Selecta' and the 'Seminar' courses to different teaching staff could possibly contribute to a clearer distinction between the two courses.

Parallel to the 'Seminar', students choose an elective. A range of courses is offered each year, together with the master's programme Political Science. This offering always includes topics varying from policy conflicts to violence and civil war in fragile states and cross-cutting themes such as migration. The assignments in the electives develop students' analytic capacities and their ability to formulate and present an argument in a well-structured report. In 2016-2017, students could make a choice out of seven electives. In these electives, CRG students share the class with students from one or two tracks of the master's programme Political Science. The panel feels this works well.

In the second semester, students work on their thesis project, integrating the theoretical foundation they have developed with their topical interests in a project of empirical research. In the 'Thesis Seminar' (February-March) students broaden and deepen their methodological knowledge and skills and work on a proposal for their research project. Case studies are the most common form of



research and most students use qualitative research methods (narrative interview, structured interview, discourse analysis, desk research, policy analysis). Support is also available for students who want to take a quantitative approach. Based on the interviews, the panel wonders if students are sufficiently aware of their methodological choice and its consequences, and if they are allowed to use a certain research method (e.g. content analysis) without having the necessary skills (e.g. by having followed a preparatory course). Students select their cases for research in consultation with staff. Their personal interest is usually leading. In their application to the programme, students already must indicate the potential topics they are interested in. They develop their ideas further from the guest lecturers (practitioners) and in interaction with the other students. The staff members emphasise the importance of framing the research and reviewing the relevant literature. The panel notes that ethical guidelines and research transparency are increasingly demanded in the profession (esp. in academic journals in political science/international studies). The panel was, therefore, reassured to hear that the research design, including e.g. interview questions, must adhere to ethical guidelines and that supervisors are actively monitoring and guiding the students, bearing in mind the safety of both the students and their subjects. This was, however, not always recognisable in the methods section of the theses. The panel advises requiring students to report on this aspect explicitly in the methods section of their thesis.

Students must complete an acceptable thesis proposal in order to move on to the research project (April-June). The project begins with a period of fieldwork, for most students in a practice context, but possibly also a document research or quantitative analysis of a data set. Fieldwork has to be funded by the students themselves. Staff provides help by pointing out potential sources of funding, e.g. by cooperation with projects, and using their network to keep costs low. The panel suggests looking into possibilities to create a small fund to help students from disadvantaged backgrounds. Following their fieldwork, students present their findings in a series of poster sessions to their lecturers and colleagues. Writing the thesis is conducted in a tutorial format, with a faculty advisor and a small group of five to eight students. Students must present their findings in a document that frames the research question and discusses its theoretical underpinnings, critically reviews the methodology employed, and links the findings back to theory. The panel fully agrees with these requirements, although the generalisation from cases to theory was not always recognisable in the theses studied by the panel (see Standard 4).

The panel concludes that the format of the curriculum, both the modules of the first semester and the research phase in the second semester, is well-considered.

Didactical approach

The programme aims to involve students actively in a learning community. The programme's small size (maximum thirty students) allows for seminar style teaching, involving critical discussion and a mix of individual and group work and assignments. A key role for the faculty is to organise and model settings in which exchange and reflection are possible and in which students feel secure enough to explore the boundaries of their understanding and competence. It appears from the interview with the students that this approach is successful.

An important teaching method is case-based teaching, including the simulations in the negotiation workshop. The cases push students to link concepts to details of practice settings and vice versa. Assignments supplement this and expect students to develop their own perspective and to reflect on their capacities as learners and colleagues. Social activities provide opportunities for offline conversations and contribute to the development of a context for reflection and learning. The goal is to prepare students for a career where they will continually move between academic and applied research and professional action. The panel considers the didactical approach well-suited for the CRG-programme.

Admission and study progress

The CRG programme is selective. The admissions board, mandated by the Examinations Board, evaluates the 120-140 applications and admits sixty students on average per year. Not all students

accept this offer, often for financial reasons. Each year a class of 25-30 students start the programme. Approximately half of the student body is international.

All applicants are expected to have an academic bachelor's degree in the field of social sciences, humanities or economics, including 30 EC relevant subjects in the field of conflict resolution and/or governance, prior knowledge in the social sciences or related to the field of conflict resolution and/or governance (30 EC), prior training of social research methods and techniques (20 EC), a satisfactory grade point average and an adequate level of English language proficiency, as evidenced by a writing sample. They must submit two (academic) references and a motivation letter, and describe five or six subjects they are interested in studying. A preparatory methods course is organised in August to bring students up to speed who don't have the necessary background in social science research methods. The panel considers the admission criteria and procedure suitable for the programme. They evidently lead to the disciplinary and international diversity in the student group that the programme aims for and that is much appreciated by the students. The panel suggests taking the example of the master's programme Political Science by providing a preparatory reading list to the students and assessing the students' knowledge in a test at the start of the programme. This would be an efficient way to bring all students to a comparable knowledge level in crucial areas and relieve the 'Capita Selecta' course.

The students confirmed in the interview that the programme can be completed within the one-year duration. The tutorial format of the research project groups and the frequent interim deadlines help them to finish on time.

Staff

The Department of Political Science has more than 130 staff members. Eighteen of them are involved in the master's programme CRG. A few of them, and especially the programme coordinator, play a key role. For the sustainability of the CRG programme, the panel advises making sure that the programme is not too dependent on one core staff member. The number of staff was extended and stabilised this academic year. The staff-student ratio is now 1:28 (October 2016). The staff is well-qualified: all have a PhD degree and are active researchers. The quality of research in the Amsterdam Institute for Social Science Research, in which most staff members conduct their research, was rated 4.5 out of 5 in the most recent research assessment (2014).

Almost all staff members either have achieved a university teaching qualification (UTQ) (78 per cent) or have started the procedure to get it (17 per cent). The remaining five per cent concerns staff from abroad and/or the field, who have different credentials than a UTQ. The panel considers this acceptable. To introduce new staff members to the master's programme and the university system in the Netherlands (including the grading system), special events are organised per semester and experienced staff members are assigned as coaches and buddies to the new arrivals.

The intellectual and cultural diversity among staff helps the diverse student body to find compatible perspectives for their development and pushes them to confront differences and reflect critically on their background.

The students and alumni are very enthusiastic about their teachers. They find them inspiring and approachable. The feedback they provide is not always in time, but very extensive and helpful. The panel concludes that the staff is well-qualified in all respects.

Facilities

The information and guidance for students are well-organised. General facilities include the information desk and the study advisor. Most written information is provided through websites and e-mail. All courses use Blackboard as a digital learning environment. Career events take place twice a year. Students can join the faculty-wide student association SBS International. Panel talks and course evaluations are organised by the programme committee for students to give feedback on the programme.



The programme starts with a kick-off meeting and each student has a designated academic advisor from the core faculty. Specifically in the 'Seminar on Conflict and Governance Practices' and the 'Workshop on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution' students have first-hand engagement with experienced professionals in the field. These regularly turn into useful contacts that the students can draw on, e.g. for internships or employment opportunities. As mentioned above, extracurricular social events are provided. These contribute to the development of a strong learning community.

Considerations

The panel feels the programme structure is solid and well-considered. The programme offers an intensive combination of theory and practice and helps students develop into theoretically grounded professionals. The panel feels that, at the moment, the theoretical level that can be attained by the students is partially dependent on their prior knowledge. They need this background to make sufficient sense of the wide array of theoretical approaches in the 'Capita Selecta' course. The panel suggests two ways to address this issue: in the first place, by providing a preparatory reading list and assessing the students' knowledge at the start of the programme, and in the second place by giving a stronger focus and more coherence to the theoretical base in the 'Capita Selecta' course. The range of electives is broad and stimulates interaction with other master's students. The panel is impressed that almost all students conduct fieldwork as the basis for their thesis. The staff is well-qualified substantively, didactically and in research. They are very committed to support and guide the students in their development. General and programme-specific student support services are in place, and stimulate the development of a genuine learning community. The panel concludes that the curriculum, staff and facilities constitute a coherent teaching-learning environment for the students and enable them to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 2 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 3: Assessment

The programme has an adequate assessment system in place.

Explanation:

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

The examination policy is described in the critical self-reflection as a combination of confidence in the lecturers' professional qualifications and periodic evaluation of the way in which students are assessed. The UvA Assessment Policy Framework is the basis for the assessment policy at faculty and programme level.

The panel has looked into the assessment methods and concludes that they are appropriate for the learning objectives. Students are assessed on the basis of a mix of assignments, papers, presentations and participation. Written papers are the main method in the first semester and the only method in the second semester.

All lecturers who are authorised by the Examinations Board as examiners, must be members of the permanent staff and have obtained the university teaching qualification. Lecturers without this qualification can be appointed as an examiner upon the motivated request of the programme director to the Examinations Board.

Tests and the associated answer or assessment keys are prepared by the authorised examiners and peer reviewed by a colleague with examiner status. The tests, answer/assessment keys and information on the peer review make up part of the course file maintained by the examiner and may be consulted by the Examinations Board at any time. The assessments are transparent: the format, weighting and content of all tests are described in the course guide and, where possible, students

are granted insight into the form and content of the tests by means of examples from previous tests and practice tests. In their meeting with the panel, students indicated their satisfaction with the feedback they receive, but they do not always receive it within the fifteen days laid out in the Teaching and Examination Regulations. The panel concludes that the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments are sufficiently guaranteed.

A separate guide is available for the final thesis, along with an assessment form laid down by the Examinations Board. The programme director submits these documents, as well as a lecturer's guide, to supervisors. The programme director also oversees the process of thesis assessment, which is done by two lecturers: the supervisor and a colleague who has not been directly involved in the writing process. The second reader is invited by the supervisor and becomes involved when the supervisor judges the thesis to be passable. Due to the small number of CRG staff, second readers are sometimes drawn from another programme or from outside the UvA. They assess the thesis independently of each other, and then decide on a common judgement through deliberation. In case they cannot reach an agreement, the Examinations Board appoints a third reader, whose independent judgement provides additional input in a second round of deliberation. The panel finds that this does work in an acceptable manner in practice, yet feels that the independence of the second reader can be better guaranteed if he/she is appointed by the programme director or Examinations Board, rather than by the supervisor.

In 2015-2016 the Examinations Board conducted a study on the assessment of (the quality of) the theses. As a result, the assessment form was adapted, clarifying the crucial differences between a fail (5.0) and a pass (6.0) and between a pass and a pass with distinction. Marks between 5.1 and 5.9 cannot be awarded. The panel strongly supports this step, because it noted a serious lack of consistency in the level of feedback among examiners: some just gave a grade, or only used words as 'excellent' and 'very good', while others provided extensive feedback to explain the proposed grade. Some gave a grade for the thesis as a whole, while others also assessed the sub-criteria. Different forms were used, which caused further confusion when the panel members read the sample of theses (see Standard 4). During the site visit, the panel studied the new assessment form and concludes that it is definitely an improvement. The assessment is now on a larger number of distinct aspects, for each of which a score must be provided, ranging from insufficient to excellent. An annex explains what is expected per aspect for a score of insufficient, sufficient, satisfactory, good, very good and excellent. Written comments must be added to substantiate the score, and an extra box needs to be filled in to motivate a distinction, if proposed. The panel advises a few further improvements, e.g. in clarifying the relative weight of items per category. It also seems strange that an assessment of the student's participation during the thesis seminar is included in the assessment of the thesis process. The panel agrees that a grade for the independence of work is a suitable criterion for a thesis, but believes that the seminar should be assessed and graded separately. In any case, participation should be operationalised clearly. A suggestion could be to assess the quality of peer feedback on the basis of short written texts.

The Examinations Board is a joint board for all three programmes in the political science domain at the UvA: the bachelor's and master's programmes Political Science and the master's programme CRG. The members are independent of the management. The board includes an external member, working at another university, who joins the meeting once a year and advises on the work of the Examinations Board. The panel appreciates this open attitude. The board is supported by a professional secretariat. Hours are allotted to the members so that they can carry out their tasks properly. As mentioned above, the Examinations Board appoints authorised examiners and third readers for a thesis. It is also the board's duty to prevent and, if necessary, verify and sanction cases of fraud and plagiarism. The panel finds these procedures to be adequate. In addition, the Examinations Board organises periodic evaluations of tests and assignments. The evaluation of the thesis assessments in 2015-2016 was mentioned above. In 2018, tests and assignments for all master's courses will be evaluated. Reports of these evaluations are submitted to the programme director and the conclusions are discussed with all lecturers during education meetings that are organised twice a year. The Examinations Board also provides feedback and recommendations to



individual lecturers whose tests have been evaluated. The panel concludes that the Examinations Board fulfils its legal tasks systematically and actively.

Considerations

Based on the written documentation and additional information provided during the site visit, the panel concludes that the assessment is based on a sound assessment plan and fulfils the required quality criteria. The Examinations Board is actively engaged in monitoring and guaranteeing the assessment quality. The new standardised thesis assessment form is a good example of its effects. Further improvements are possible through separating the grades for thesis seminar and master's thesis, and providing more guidance on the weight of sub-criteria per aspect. Two other points of improvement are the appointment procedure of the second thesis examiner and the issue of timely feedback. These points are not so serious, however, that they outweigh the positive aspects. The quality of assessment is satisfactory.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Explanation:

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

The panel read a sample of fifteen theses and their assessment forms and had an interview with a number of alumni during the site visit, to determine if the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

In the master thesis the student can demonstrate his/her ability to undertake independent academic research. The learning outcomes of the master thesis reflect all the exit qualifications of the programme. All theses were of the appropriate master level and the panel was impressed by the originality and quality of some of them. In CRG, the research is almost always based on fieldwork and the study of a particular case. These cases are generally grounded on a theoretical framework in the beginning of the thesis, sometimes more from sociology than political science. However, in the analysis and conclusions the panel often missed the second part of the feedback loop, i.e. a theoretical reflection on and/or generalisation of the findings. Nevertheless, such theses sometimes were awarded a high grade. The staff members agreed with the panel that this should not be the case. They expect that the new thesis assessment form and its annex (see Standard 3) will help to avoid this in future. They added that students are often rushed at the end of the thesis project and, as a consequence, spend less time on a final reflection. The panel also advises requiring students to report on ethical aspects in their methods section, as mentioned above (see Standard 2).

The grades are generally in line with the panel's judgements. In a few cases the panel would have given a slightly lower grade, but in other cases it would have been a little higher. As mentioned above, the panel was not very satisfied with the set-up and use of the assessment forms, because it led to inconsistency in the grading procedure and provision of feedback. The new form and criteria will be an improvement. Further development of this form is recommended (see Standard 3).

From the interview with four alumni the panel concludes that they look back on the programme with appreciation. They feel adequately prepared for their current positions, at a ministry and the university. The student counsellor, alumni events and individual staff members are all helpful sources of information in career guidance. An alumni survey was held in December 2015. The responses show that the alumni have found employment in a wide variety of relevant positions. The panel agrees with the suggestion in the critical self-reflection that the strong link in the programme

between theory and practice helps students to acquire competences that are relevant for a variation of employments.

Considerations

Based on the sample of theses and the information from alumni, the panel concludes that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. The theses show that students are able to conduct an independent research project in the field, based on sufficient theoretical grounding and using appropriate research methods. Many of them are original and impressive. The fieldwork is based on theory, but the ambitions of the programme would be truly achieved if the outcomes are referred back to theory in the analysis and conclusions. For an academic master's thesis, this is a requirement. The panel advises emphasising this from the beginning of the research project, when a case is selected for the fieldwork. The grades are fair and reflect the differences in quality between theses. The alumni are satisfied with the programme as a preparation for their further career. The panel, therefore, assesses this standard as 'satisfactory'.

Conclusion

The panel assesses Standard 4 as 'satisfactory'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The intended learning outcomes express clearly what is expected from graduates of the master's programme CRG and are in line with the domain-specific framework and the Dublin descriptors at master's level. A strong feature is the way in which theory and practice are brought together and feed into each other. The focus is not only on violent conflicts, but includes the constructive elements of conflicts and conflict resolution as well, which broadens the career perspective for graduates. The panel considers this a creative approach. The programme thus presents a clear and distinctive profile, which is recognised by prospective students. The one-year programme is well-structured and guides students to the required advanced knowledge level and research skills. The 'Capita Selecta' course is meant to lay the theoretical base, while the 'Seminar on conflict and Governance Practices' takes a more practice-oriented approach. The combination of the two courses is a valuable approach, but can be improved if the theoretical base is given a stronger focus and more coherence. The second semester focuses on the research project, almost always involving fieldwork. Students are guided in tutorial groups and individually. Admission to the programme is selective. Approximately half of the student body is international. The staff is well-qualified in research and teaching. They are easily accessible for students and always willing to answer questions. Students appreciate the extensive feedback, even though it is often late. The curriculum and staff provide a coherent teaching-learning environment. The panel especially appreciates the fact that students acquire practical research skills and learn to implement them through well-guided fieldwork, while basing their research on academic literature. The panel thinks this is a distinguishing feature of CRG. An assessment policy has been developed to guarantee the validity, reliability and transparency of assessments. The Examinations Board is actively monitoring and evaluating the quality of assessments. This led to a revised and standardised thesis assessment form in 2016-2017. The master theses and the alumni feedback prove that graduates achieve the intended learning outcomes. Summing up, the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'good' and Standards 2, 3 and 4 as 'satisfactory'. The final assessment is 'satisfactory'.

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance* as 'satisfactory'.



MEASURES FOR IMPROVEMENT

Based on its international experience (Belgium, USA, UK), the panel notes with appreciation that the programmes in Political Science in the Netherlands are comparatively better structured and well-considered than elsewhere. For further improvement of the programme, the panel recommends a formulation of the exit qualifications in terms of perspectives and approaches instead of theories, in order to express even more clearly what is intended. The panel advises to further strengthen the students' theoretical knowledge base and suggests two ways for doing so: in the first place, by providing a preparatory reading list and assessing the students' knowledge at the start of the programme, and in the second place by giving a stronger focus and more coherence to the theoretical base in the 'Capita Selecta' course. Feedback on assignments and exams should be delivered within the designated limit of fifteen working days at the latest. To fully guarantee the independence of the second thesis examiner, the panel advises that he/she be appointed by the programme director or Examinations Board, rather than by the supervisor. The panel believes that the new standardised thesis assessment form is a major improvement, but advises developing it further by clarifying the relative weight of items per category and separating the grades for the thesis seminar and the thesis itself. The panel advises emphasising from the beginning of the research project, when a case is selected for the fieldwork, the importance of generalising the outcomes of the case and/or relating the research outcomes back to the theoretical framework. The panel also advises requiring students to report explicitly on the ethical aspects of their research in the methods section of their thesis.

APPENDICES



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

Dr. C. (Christien) van den Anker is Associate Professor of Politics and International Relations at the Faculty of Health & Applied Sciences at the University of the West of England in Bristol (UK) since 2006. Between 2001-20016, she worked as a Lecturer in Global Ethics and as Deputy Director at the Centre for Global Ethics at the University of Birmingham, UK. Christien is an internationally established specialist in human rights and contemporary slavery. In her work, she refocused the narrow human trafficking debate to encompass all forms of slavery, clarified the migration-slavery nexus, and pioneered partnerships working for research-based advocacy.

Prof. dr. M. (Marijke) Breuning [chair] is Professor of Political Science at the University of North Texas, USA. She specialises in foreign policy decision making, with a specific interest in development cooperation and small states, as well as the politics of international children's rights (and especially intercountry adoption), women/gender and politics, and the sociology of the profession. Marijke has published numerous refereed journal articles and book chapters, as well as three books. She has served as an editor of the *American Political Science Review* (2012-2016), and previously served as a member of the inaugural editorial team of *Foreign Policy Analysis*, a journal of the *International Studies Association*, an editor of the *Journal of Political Science Education*, and book review editor of *International Politics*. She serves – or has served – on several editorial boards and in various leadership positions in the International Studies Association and American Political Science Association.

K.J.M. (Kaisa) de Bel started her studies in Political Science in 2013 at Leiden University, specialising in International Relations. In 2015, she decided to read Law next to her Political Science studies at the same university. Kaisa is an active member of various committees of study association SPIL, and was in 2014-2015 a member of the board. Currently, she is a member of the advisory board of SPIL. Between 2014-2016, she offered secondary school pupils advice on studying Political Science.

Prof. dr. D. (Dirk) De Bièvre is Associate Professor of International Politics and International Political Economy at the University of Antwerp, Belgium. He studied in Leuven (Belgium), Louvain-la-Neuve (Belgium), Konstanz (Germany), and Firenze (Italy), where he obtained his PhD at the European University Institute (EUI) in 2002. He specialises in European trade policy, the World Trade Organisation, and interest group mobilisation. Before joining the Antwerp Faculty in 2006, Dirk was a post-doctoral researcher at the Max Planck Institute for Research on Collective Goods in Bonn (Germany), and an EU and Volkswagen Foundation research fellow at the Mannheim Centre for European Social Research (MZES). He has taught at the universities of Brussels, Mannheim, Dresden, Leuven, and was a visiting fellow at the Department of Government of the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) during the academic year 2014-15.

Prof. dr. F. (Ferdinand) De Ville is Associate Professor at the Centre for EU Studies at Ghent University, Belgium. He received a master degree (2007) and a PhD (2011) in Political Science at Ghent University. In his dissertation he analysed the relationship between the international trade regime and European social, environmental and consumer protection. Ferdi has also done policy advisory research on European trade policy for the Flemish government.

Dr. R. (Renske) Doorenspleet is Associate Professor at the University of Warwick, UK. She is a graduate of the University of Leiden; after a postdoctoral fellowship at Harvard University (USA) in 2002/2003, she started a research project on democracy in divided countries, funded by NWO. She has taught courses on comparative politics, democratisation and development, statistics and research methods. During the academic year 2011-2012, she got an academic fellowship and grant of the Institute for Advanced Teaching and Learning, in order to innovate teaching in politics,



combining film and theatre projects with academic research and teaching around the theme of democracy. During 2012-2014, Renske was the political science coordinator of Warwick's interdisciplinary Q-step Centre, and developed new politics degrees offering quantitative social science training. Her research focuses on democratic transitions and consolidation in comparative perspective. Her articles have been published in academic journals such as *World Politics*, *Democratization*, *Acta Politica*, *the International Political Science Review*, *Ethnopolitics*, *Government and Opposition* and *the European Journal of Political Research*. She is also the author of *Democratic Transitions* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005), co-editor of *One-Party Dominance in African Democracies* (Lynne Rienner, 2013) and of *Political Parties, Party Systems and Democracy in Africa* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014). At the moment, she is working on a new book, which will explore the value of democracy in comparative perspective (Palgrave Macmillan, 2018).

Prof. dr. P. (Peter) Vermeersch is Professor of Politics at the KU Leuven, Belgium. He is currently director of the LINES Institute (Leuven International and European Studies) and affiliated as senior researcher with the Centre for Research on Peace and Development – both at KU Leuven. In 2007 and 2008, he was a visiting scholar at the Minda de Gunzburg Center for European Studies, Harvard University. Peter is a graduate of the University of Leuven, but he also studied, lived and conducted research in Central Europe and the Balkans. His research focuses on minorities and migration, democratisation, reconciliation and nationalism. His articles have appeared in academic journals such as *The European Journal of Sociology*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *Communist and Post-Communist Studies*, *The Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, and *East European Politics and Societies*. Peter is also the author and editor of several academic books. In addition, he is an associate editor of *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Ethnicity and Nationalism* and a board member of PEN Flanders, and he serves on the editorial board of *Karakter*, a Dutch-language journal that publishes essays about all aspects of science. In 2011 and 2012 Peter Vermeersch was part of the organising team of the G1000, a largescale deliberative citizens' initiative held in Belgium.

APPENDIX 2: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

Note: As formulated on 22-01-2016 by LOOP (Landelijk Overleg Opleidingen Politicologie) the political science cluster in the framework of re-accreditation of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, University of Amsterdam, Radboud University Nijmegen and Leiden University. This text is a translation.

The Political Science degree programme provides training in the independent practise of political science and the professional application of the scientific knowledge and skills acquired in the programme. The political scientist is specialised in identifying and analysing conflicts between and collective decision-making processes by groups and organisations, tangible and intangible interests, institutions and processes of power that influence these conflicts and decision-making, and the resulting societal effects. The political scientist is able, by virtue of their specialisation, to analyse the occurrence, causes and effects of contemporary societal trends such as globalisation and regionalisation, technological developments such as the ICT revolution and knowledge society, and the functions of diversity.

In line with agreements made at the European level with regard to political science (European Conference of National Political Science Associations, 1 September 2003) and with descriptions of the field of study worldwide, the following components of Political Science are regarded as fundamental to an effectual practise of the profession and should in any case be included in the course of study: political theory/history of political ideas/political philosophy, research methods (qualitative and quantitative), the national and EU political system, comparative political science, and international relations. These European agreements pertain to Bachelor's programmes. The emphasis placed on other components, as follows, may vary between institutions: management science and policy analysis, conflict studies, political decision-making, political economics, political conduct, political history, political sociology, and political psychology. Most Master's programmes do not cover the entire spectrum of political science, and instead focus on specific facets.

The Bachelor's programme trains students to practise a wide range of professions in the policy environment as well as to pursue advanced study that requires greater autonomy; the Master's in Political Science refines and deepens knowledge and skills, including research skills, in the field of political science and provides training for the independent practise of professions at the academic level. The programmes do not aim to train for any single specific professional profile apart from that of scientific researcher. Rather, the needs of the modern knowledge society call for broad professional expertise with sufficient mobility and flexibility to work in public, non-profit and hybrid organisations and the private sector alike. The current requirements on a sound academic degree programme that trains for work in the knowledge society furthermore entails that a Political Science programme educates students to be open to and possess an understanding of other disciplines, to be capable of communicating specialist political scientific knowledge to non-specialist audiences in a coherent manner, to be able to integrate a mass of information in a targeted and effective manner, to apply their knowledge to formulate decisions (also in collective contexts), to be active and critical participants in public debates on political scientific problems, and to keep up with the latest knowledge independently.

On the basis of the above description and the Dublin descriptors, the following distinctions can be made between the competences demonstrated by Bachelor's graduates of Political Science and Master's graduates of Political Science:



Dublin Descriptors	Bachelor's	Master's
Knowledge and understanding in the field of study	Sufficient knowledge of recent developments in the field of study to formulate scientifically founded judgements.	Capacity to integrate knowledge and handle complex subject matter.
		Insight into the specific position that political science occupies relative to other fields of scientific study.
Applying knowledge and understanding	Ability to incorporate knowledge and to apply knowledge to phenomena addressed during the Bachelor's study	Ability to incorporate knowledge from disciplines relevant to political science and apply it to the analysis of political scientific problems, as well as to apply knowledge to phenomena that were not explicitly addressed during the course of study.
	Ability to recognise and analyse societal problems based on an understanding of political science	Ability to recognise and analyse complex societal problems and to evaluate solutions based on an understanding of political science.
	Competences to devise and sustain arguments in general and solve problems within the field of study.	Ability to contribute original ideas to solve societal problems.
Research skills	Knowledge of the empirical cycle of research through supervised participation in all phases of scientific research.	Ability to independently formulate, carry out and report on scientific research.
Formulating judgements and reflecting on the field of study and societal phenomena	Ability to evaluate the structure and outcomes of empirical scientific research.	Ability to evaluate the structure and outcomes of empirical scientific research, including its methodological and methodical-technical aspects.
	Sufficient knowledge of normative theories to recognise the value loading of both scientific theories and policy intentions	In-depth knowledge of normative theories in order to take a substantiated position in debates on the value loading of both scientific theories and policy intentions.
Communication skills	Ability to communicate information, ideas and solutions.	Ability to communicate scientific knowledge, including the structure of research and the rationale and considerations underpinning it clearly and unambiguously. Participation in the scientific and public debate.

APPENDIX 3: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

Master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance

Exit Qualifications UvA Master Conflict Resolution and Governance as stated in the Teaching and Exam Regulations (OER) 2016-2017

Knowledge and understanding (DD1)

The graduate has acquired knowledge and understanding:

- of the principal theories, research, and areas of practice covered by the field of Conflict Resolution and Governance.
- of the literature covered by the field of Conflict Resolution and Governance.

Cognitive and/or professional abilities (DD2)

The acquired cognitive and/or professional abilities enable the graduate to:

- have developed the ability—in the context of teamwork—to contribute to developing political policy, and practice-based responses to these issues, in relation to the relevant socio-political context in which they are embedded.
- have developed the ability to draw on the foundation provided by the program to adjust in a critical and action-oriented manner to new problems and contexts and to conduct synthetic analyses that bridge gaps between disciplines, analytic constructs, and practice repertoires.

Formulating judgement (DD3)

Concerning the ability of formulating judgements, the graduate should be able to:

- assess cases, theories, policies, and practices critically, both verbally and in written form drawing on the principal theories and findings from disciplinary and applied research that are covered by the field of Conflict Resolution and Governance.
- analyse and interpret contemporary social and political issues drawing on his/her theoretical and practical knowledge and report on these phenomena, both verbally as well as in written form.
- adequately catalogue and assess literature and empirical data within a short amount of time and to assess this literature and data critically.

Communicative skills (DD4)

The graduate should be in possession of the following communicative skills:

- proficiency in English at an academic level.
- the ability to present synthetic analysis, theory, and research findings to specialist and non-specialist audiences in written and oral communication.
- the ability to draw on common designs for organizing different forms of communication in group settings.

Competencies/ learning skills (DD5)

The graduate has acquired the following competencies:

- a critical and practical capacity to analyse the principal issues raised in the literature covered by the programme, in particular the ability to apply the insights developed to new fields of inquiry and to synthesise concepts across scholarly disciplines and contrasting analytic traditions.
- the ability to employ at least one method of empirical research methodology in scientific research within a limited field of the chosen specialisation of the master's programme and the ability to produce a scientifically sound interpretation of the results of such research.
- the ability to conduct independent research, to work in the setting of a team, and to reflect on how structural and behavioral influences affect the development of cooperation.



APPENDIX 4: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Master's programme Conflict Resolution and Governance

Semester 1		
<i>Extending and deepening</i>	Block 1	Capita Selecta Conflict Resolution and Governance (12 EC)
<i>Deepening and contextualising</i>	Block 2	Seminar on Conflict and Governance Practices (9 EC) (includes Workshop on Negotiation and Conflict Resolution)
	Block 3	
		Elective (9 EC) <i>Students can choose one of the following electives (to be confirmed):</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Violence and order in civil wars - Dealing with policy conflicts - Gender Development and Human Rights - Human rights and conflict resolution: policy, practice and politics - International Security and Political Violence - Refugees, rights and realities - The European Union, state-building and conflict resolution
Semester 2		
<i>Research methods and design</i>	Block 4	Thesis Seminar (9 EC) Go / No Go
<i>Fieldwork analysis & presentation</i>	Block 5	Research Project Conflict Resolution and Governance (21 EC)
	Block 6	





APPENDIX 5: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

18 april		
8.30	8.45	Aankomst panel
8.45	9.15	Vorbereidend overleg en inzien documenten
9.15	10.15	Gesprek met management (NL, David Laws antwoordt mogelijk in het Engels): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hans Brug (decaan faculteit), - Floris Vermeulen (afdelingsvoorzitter Politicologie), - Annette Freyberg-Inan (directeur Graduate School), - Richard vd Wurff (directeur College), - Marcel Maussen (dir Bachelor Politicologie), - Otto Holman (directeur Master Political Science & Conflict Resolution and Governance), - David Laws (wetenschappelijk coördinator MSc)
10.15	10.30	Overleg panel
10.30	10.45	Pauze
10.45	11.30	Gesprek met studenten BSc Politicologie (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Boje Boogaardt, - Bob Hamelers, - Gustav Eggers, - Lisa van den Boogaard, - Dirk Ritter, - Julia de Weijer
11.30	11.45	Overleg panel
11.45	12.30	Gesprek met docenten BSc Politicologie (inclusief mentoren) (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wouter van der Brug, - Judith Huigens (ook mentor), - Larissa Versloot (ook mentor), - Luc Fransen, - Robin Pistorius
12.30	13.00	Lunch (=pauze)
13.00	13.30	Overleg panel
13.30	14.15	Gesprek met studenten MSc Politicologie (ENG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Barbara Koole (PPG), - Filip von Ubisch (EPER), - Jarno Hazekamp (PT), - Gustaaf van Oosterom (PE), - Annemiek Krans (IR) - Simon Graf (IR)
14.15	14.30	Overleg panel
14.30	14.45	Pauze
14.45	15.30	Gesprek met docenten MSc Politicologie (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joost Berkhout, - Marlies Glasius, - Eric Schliesser, - Imrat Verhoeven, - Ursula Daxecker, - Darshan Vigneswaran
15.30	15.45	Overleg panel
15.45	16.15	Gesprek met Opleidingscommissies (OLC) (en studieadviseur masters) (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anne Loeber (vz OC), - Conny Roggeband (docentlid),



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Isaya Wullings (Bpol studentlid), - Joeri vd Ende (Mpol studentlid), - Geertje Haverkamp (studieadviseur Mpol en CRG). NB: studentlid CRG is helaas met veldwerk.
16.15	17.00	Overleg panel
17.00	17.45	Alumni BSc en MSc Politicologie (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Charlotte Renckens (bPol), - Tessa van Houtrijve (bPol), - Isabella Schulz (bPol), - Mila de Graaf (bPol), - Esmé Bosma (Mpol), - Giel van der Heijden (Mpol), - Danna Harmsen (Mpol)
17.45	18.15	Korte nabespreking dag 1/benoemen aandachtspunten dag 2
19.15	21.30	Diner panel
19 april		
8.30	8.45	Aankomst panel
8.45	9.15	Inzien documenten, voorbereiding gesprekken, inloopsprekuren
9.15	9.45	Gesprek met studenten MSc Conflict Resolution and Governance (ENG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Natacha Vallette d'Ossia, - Josh Walmsley, - Vikki de Jong, - Ibrahim Hamad
9.45	10.00	Overleg panel
10.00	10.15	Pauze
10.15	10.45	Gesprek met docenten MSc Conflict Resolution and Governance (ENG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - David Laws, - Anja van Heelsom, - Polly Pallister-Wilkins, - Martijn Dekker,
10.45	11.00	Overleg panel
11.00	11.30	Alumni MSc Conflict Resolution and Governance (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hester de Gooijer, - Babet Vente, - Piet Vriend, - Swaan van Iterson
11.30	11.45	Overleg panel
11.45	12.00	Pauze
12.00	12.45	Gesprek met Examencommissie incl. studieadviseur bPol (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - John Grin (vz masters), - Sarah de Lange (vz bachelor), - Franca van Hooren, - Grace Coert (studieadviseur Bpol)
12.45	13.15	Lunch (= pauze)
13.15	14.00	Vorbereiden eindgesprek
14.00	14.45	Eindgesprek management (NL) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hans Brug (decaan faculteit), - Floris Vermeulen (afdelingsvoorzitter Politicologie), - Annette Freyberg-Inan (directeur Graduate School), - Richard vd Wurff (directeur College), - Marcel Maussen (dir Bachelor Politicologie),

		- Otto Holman (directeur Master Political Science & Conflict Resolution and Governance), - David Laws (wetenschappelijk coördinator MSc)
14.45	15.00	Pauze
15.00	16.45	Opstellen voorlopige bevindingen
16.45	17.00	Mondelinge rapportage voorlopige bevindingen





APPENDIX 6: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied the theses of the students with the following student numbers:

10650784	10004625	10743189
10972463	10866833	10154612
10024905	11093935	10763279
11124911	11109467	11124059
5808073	10461434	10624651

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 and exams of two courses:
 - o Capita Selecta Conflict Resolution and Governance
 - o Seminar on Conflict and Governance Practices
- Thesis assessment form 2017
- Ethical guidelines
- Minutes and annual reports programme committee 2014-2015 and 2015-2016
- Minutes and annual reports Examinations Board 2014-2015 and 2015-2016

