

**International Joint Master of Research in Work
and Organizational Psychology**

**Maastricht University,
Leuphana Universität Lüneburg (Germany) and
Universitat de València (Spain)**

20 December 2018

NVAO initial accreditation according to the European Approach for
Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes

Panel report

Table of Contents

1	Executive summary	3
2	Introduction	6
	2.1 The procedure	6
	2.2 Panel report	7
3	Description of the programme	8
	3.1 General	8
	3.2 Profile of the consortium	8
	3.3 Profile of the programme	9
4	Assessment per standard	10
	4.1 Standard 1: Eligibility	10
	4.2 Standard 2: Learning Outcomes	12
	4.3 Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2]	14
	4.4 Standard 4: Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4]	17
	4.5 Standard 5: Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3]	18
	4.6 Standard 6: Student Support [ESG 1.6]	21
	4.7 Standard 7: Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6]	22
	4.8 Standard 8: Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]	23
	4.9 Standard 9: Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1 & part 1]	24
	4.10 Conclusion	25
5	Overview of the assessments	27
	Annex 1: Extension of duration	28
	Annex 2: Composition of the panel	29
	Annex 3: Schedule of the site visit	31
	Annex 4: Documents reviewed	32
	Annex 5: List of abbreviations	33

1 Executive summary

This report is issued by the panel appointed by the Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO) and assesses the conditions for initial accreditation of the academic master programme International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology (IJMRWOP) as submitted by Maastricht University on behalf of the IJMRWOP consortium which also features Leuphana Universität Lüneburg (Germany) and Universitat de València (Spain).

The application concerns a joint English-language master's degree of 120 European Credits which is offered as a full-time two-year programme in the Netherlands, Germany and Spain. Given these specific features, the panel based its assessment on the standards of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the European Higher Education Area of October 2014, approved by the EHEA ministers in May 2015, which in turn are based on the European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance.

The application documentation, programme materials on site and discussions with delegations from all three universities, some of whom participated in the discussions via skype have provided the panel with a comprehensive view of the programme. It became clear to the panel that the programme is founded by a group of highly motivated scholars with a longstanding collaboration in research and teaching and a visible ambition to turn this joint master into a success. Based on the presented documentation, the site visit and the additional information provided on 26 October 2018, the panel concluded that the IJMRWOP programme meets each standard of the assessment framework. Consequently, the panel assesses the overall quality of the entire IJMRWOP programme as positive.

IJMRWOP is a programme featuring intensive cooperation between three higher education institutions in three countries, whose national frameworks enable the institutions to participate in the programme. The panel considers the IJMRWOP programme to be a truly cooperative endeavour whereby the three consortium partners have indeed jointly developed the programme and have adequate provisions in place to roll-out and implement the programme together. The consortium agreement covers all the required components, but the panel did find some aspects could be elaborated on further, in particular the financial arrangements, examination regulations and the mobility support of students.

The IJMRWOP programme aims to deliver graduates with academic knowledge and skills pertaining to (research in) Work and Organizational Psychology in an international context. It has a cognitive profile and prepares students to become academic professionals with an orientation towards fundamental and applied research. The panel has established that the intended learning outcomes comply with the Dublin descriptors for the master's level, are in line with the EuroPsy criteria set out by the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA) and have a clear academic orientation. The intended learning outcomes contain an adequate mixture of knowledge, skills and competencies that are clearly grounded in the field of work and organizational psychology. However, in the opinion of the panel there is a bit of a gap between the expectations of the professional field and what the programme will actually offer. It recommends the programme pays good attention to involving the professional field in the further development of the programme and keeping the intended learning outcomes up-to-date.

Concerning the teaching-learning environment, the panel considers the curriculum structure to be adequate for a master's programme in work and organizational psychology. The IJMRWOP programme is carried out in such a way that each of the three consortium partners will consecutively offer an equal part of the programme (i.e. one semester), followed by a final semester during which students will conduct their research project and write their master's thesis at one of the consortium partners. The programme design follows the European

Network of Organizational and Work Psychologists (ENOP) reference curriculum model for academic education and training in Work and Organizational Psychology and adopts various active learning methods. The panel is curious how students will experience the different teaching formats at each of the partner universities, but believes that the problem-based learning approach of Maastricht University may support students throughout the whole programme. However, the panel did have some difficulties in understanding the general underlying framework of the programme and strongly advises the programme management to further clarify the general structure and interrelatedness of the various modules in the curriculum. Additionally, the panel recommends the programme to make research ethics and moral dilemmas explicit in its course descriptions. Although it became clear during on-site discussions that these issues will sufficiently be addressed in the curriculum, this should be made transparent to students. Similarly, the panel found that the innovation and vitality of the programme was not adequately reflected in the content of the curriculum. It therefore advises the programme to further integrate innovative elements such as artificial intelligence (AI), big data and digitalisation into its curriculum.

The panel was particularly impressed by the high level of motivation and enthusiasm shared amongst the staff members. The teaching staff in particular is a highly committed team of very experienced and skilled researchers. The panel considers the student support services to be sufficient. The panel learned that the programme will provide students with pre-departure guides and will organise various social events that will support community building amongst the students. The University of Valencia and Maastricht University are planning to devote one common room exclusively to the students of the master's programme. Although the panel values these initiatives, it did notice that some practicalities concerning the mobility support still need to be developed. The panel therefore recommends the programme to further invest in student support mechanisms that are geared towards the specific challenges of mobile students. It also recommends to implement a shared (e-learning) platform where students can find all the materials required for the programme from all the partner universities. The panel considers that the size of the programme is in line with the legal requirements for a master's programme and that the study load is spread equally over the two years. All in all, the panel is convinced that the curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff will enable incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

With regards to assessment, the panel has established that the programme employs a great variety of assessments in accordance with its intended learning outcomes. However, the panel found insufficient evidence that the programme has all the necessary elements in place to guarantee the consistency of grading. Translating grades to the existing scales in the three respective countries is not just a mathematical exercise. There are differences in grading cultures between countries that need to be taken into account. Although it is clear to the panel that the programme is aware of this complexity, formalized procedures to guarantee the consistency of grading still needed to be established. In addition, certain procedures, such as the thesis trajectory or what happens when a student fails both the regular exam and re-sit of a course, could not be extrapolated from the application documentation and still needed to be clarified and formalized in writing. The panel had initially formulated four conditions related to standard 5.2: Assessment of Students and standard 8: Transparency and Documentation. After the site visit, the programme provided the panel with additional information on how it plans to meet said conditions. The panel unanimously agreed that with the additional information the programme has adequately addressed all conditions. Lastly, the panel has established that the programme has an adequate quality assurance system in place, which foresees the involvement of various stakeholders.

In addition to the assessment of the programme according to the standards of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, the IJMRWOP consortium proposes that the master's programme has a duration of two years (120 EC). The programme management's arguments in favour of this regard the attainability of the intended learning outcomes and intended research competence level as laid out by the ENOP reference curriculum model for Advanced European Certificate in Work and Organizational Psychology,

as well as the requirements of the EuroPsy quality standard for education in psychology. In addition, the panel took into account the fact that a consortium agreement and the intensive mobility scheme would not have been possible without the extended duration of the programme. Following the criteria put forward in the Protocol for programme extension (NVAO, 2003), the panel concludes that a two-year master's programme is necessary for students to attain an international comparable level. The panel advises to grant the programme the right to offer a two-year master's programme (120 EC).

The panel concludes that it is convinced of the quality of this joint master's programme in Work and Organizational Psychology, taking into account the comments as described above. Given these considerations, the panel advises NVAO to take a positive decision regarding the quality of the proposed academic master programme International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology at Maastricht University, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg and Universitat de València.

The Hague, 20 December 2018

On behalf of the Initial Accreditation panel convened to assess the wo-master programme International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology at Maastricht University,

Prof. dr. J. Bensing
(chair)

A. van 't Slot MA
(secretary)

2 Introduction

2.1 The procedure

On 26 April 2018, the NVAO received a request for an initial accreditation procedure regarding the master programme of academic orientation (wo-master) International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology (IJMRWOP). As this concerns a joint programme issued by three higher education institutions in Germany, Spain and The Netherlands, this request was submitted on behalf of the IJMRWOP Consortium by Maastricht University.

Given the particular features of this application, the NVAO convened an international panel of experts consisting of:

- Prof. dr. Jozien Bensing, emeritus Professor of Health Psychology, Utrecht University;
- Prof. dr. Guido Hertel, Professor of Organizational and Business Psychology, University of Munster;
- dr. José Navarro, Associate Professor of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour, University of Barcelona;
- Paul Kop, Msc, Executive Psychologist, consultant and co-owner at Lagerweij;
- Mary Hayrapetyan, Student Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree in International Development Studies.

The composition of the panel reflects the expertise deemed necessary by NVAO for this initial accreditation exercise. The panel composition is also in line with the procedural requirements in the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes (C.2. Review Panel), Short CV's of the panel members are provided in annex 1. On behalf of NVAO, ir. Lineke van Bruggen was responsible for the coordination of the assessment process. The secretary, Aurelie van 't Slot, drafted the panel report in close cooperation with all panel members and in agreement with the chair. All panel members signed a statement of independence and confidentiality.

The panel based its assessment on the Standards for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA), issued in October 2014 and approved by the EHEA ministers in May 2015. This European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes should be applied for quality assurance of international joint programmes if some of the cooperating higher education institutions require external quality assurance at programme level. The standards to be assessed are based on the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the EHEA (ESG). With this procedure there is the possibility that only one procedure can lead to accreditation in several countries.

The panel members studied the application documentation of the proposed programme and reported their preliminary findings before the site visit to the secretary. The secretary collected them and processed them for the preparatory meeting in Maastricht on 2 October 2018. At this meeting, the panel discussed the preliminary findings, identified the most important issues for discussion on site and prepared the sessions with the delegations.

The site visit took place on 3 October 2018 at Maastricht University. The panel discussed with the management of the institution, the consortium and the programme, as well as with lecturers, (prospective) members of the examining board and the professional field. The schedule of the site visit is presented in annex 2. Annex 3 lists the materials made available by the programme either before or during the site visit.

Immediately after the discussions with the delegations, the panel discussed the findings and formulated its considerations and preliminary conclusions per standard. These are based on the findings during the site visit and on the assessment of the programme documents.

The initial accreditation procedure was proposed under the name *International Joint Research Master Work and Organizational Psychology*. During the site visit, the panel questioned the programme's considerations that led to the initial name of the master's programme *International Joint Research Master Work and Organizational Psychology*. In the view of the panel, the name evokes the association with the Research Master as described in Dutch legislation, although the programme stressed in the application documentation that it seeks accreditation in line with the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, rather than the NVAO Guidelines for Assessment of Research Masters. The reference to 'research' in the programme title merely expresses the strong research orientation of this joint international programme. Therefore, the panel highly recommended to change the name of the programme since it might be mistaken for a Research Master programme in the formal sense of the word. On 29 October 2018, the programme sent a letter to the NVAO requesting to change its name to *International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology* (reference number 2018.10.2234-JD). The panel fully endorses the proposed name change and regards it as a subtle way to preserve the strong research orientation whilst also distancing itself from the Research Master as described in Dutch legislation.

Based on the findings, considerations and conclusions the secretary wrote a draft advisory report that was first presented to the panel members. After the panel members had commented on the draft report, the chair endorsed the report. On 4 December 2018 the advisory report was sent to the institution, which was given the opportunity to respond to any factual inaccuracies in the report. The institution replied on 17 December 2018. No factual inaccuracies were found. Subsequently the final report was endorsed by the panel chair. The panel composed its advice fully independently and offered it to NVAO.

2.2 Panel report

The first chapter of this report is the executive summary, while the current chapter is the introduction. The third chapter describes the programme and its position in the consortium between Maastricht University, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg and Universitat de València, as well as within the higher education system of the Netherlands, Germany and Spain. The panel presents its assessments in the fourth chapter. For each standard the panel describes its findings and considerations and issues a conclusion. Findings are the facts as found by the panel in the programme documents, in the complementary materials and during the site visit. Considerations are the panel's interpretation of these findings and their respective importance. Panel considerations logically lead to a concluding assessment per standard. The panel concludes the report with an overall judgement on the quality of the programme and a table containing an overview of its assessments

3 Description of the programme

3.1 General

Country	: The Netherlands, Germany and Spain
Institution	: Maastricht University (Netherlands) Leuphana Universität Lüneburg (Germany) Universitat de València (Spain)
Programme	: International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology
Level	: master
Orientation	: academic (wo)
Specialization	: N.A.
Degree	: Master of Science
Location	: Maastricht (+ Lüneburg and València)
Study Load	: 120 EC
Field of Study	: Behaviour & Society

3.2 Profile of the consortium

The application is filed by a consortium of three higher education institutions in three countries: Maastricht University in the Netherlands, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg in Germany and Universitat de València in Spain. The consortium partners signed a joint programme agreement in May 2017.

Maastricht University is a young university in the south of the Netherlands, with a distinct global perspective. It offers a variety of degree programmes in the areas of arts, social sciences, health and life sciences, law, engineering, and economics. The programmes are concentrated in six faculties, with IJMRWOP belonging to the Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience

Leuphana Universität Lüneburg is a relatively young university in the northwestern part of Germany. Originally founded as a Teacher Training College (*Pädagogische Hochschule*), it expanded its subject spectrum and was granted university status in 1989. In 2005, Leuphana University merged with the University of Applied Sciences North-East Lower Saxony, which strengthened its ties with the professional world. Involving practical experiences has become an important part of the university's academic culture. It offers both academically and professionally oriented degree programmes in English and German. The IJMRWOP programme belongs to the Faculty of Business Administration.

Universitat de València is one of the oldest higher education institutions in Spain. It is a public, modern and innovative university, focused on teaching and researching in a wide variety of academic disciplines. The university prides itself on being the second preferred destination in Europe for Erasmus students. It considers internationalization to be an important strategic priority, which is evident from the many research and teaching agreements signed between the university and institutions around the world. The IJMRWOP programme will be offered by the Research Institute of Personnel Psychology, Organizational Development and Quality of Working Life (IDOCAL).

3.3 Profile of the programme

According to the vision of IJMRWOP, the international labour market and work and organizational practices are changing rapidly. In order to understand these changes and adjust to new developments, organisations need academic professionals that can assist them in their sense making and interventions. IJMRWOP has been developed in recognition of this need.

The programme has a strong research orientation and aims to deliver graduates that not only have thorough knowledge of theories and methods used in Work and Organizational Psychology, but also have developed competences that are vital in creating organizational or societal value. As such, the programme has been designed following the 'scientist-innovator model'. The programme design facilitates two objectives. Students learn to produce research that is targeted towards the scientific community, but also engage in types of research that study and impact society, organisations and its members.

The programme consists of a two-year full-time study programme and amounts to 120 study points (EC). Throughout the programme, the language of instruction is English.

According to the application document, the IJMRWOP programme will provide a state-of-the-art overview of Work and Organizational Psychology, in combination with high quality research training focusing on both fundamental and applied research. Students must spend at least one semester at each of the three participating universities. This will provide them with the optimal environment to develop intercultural competences and an awareness of the importance of international contexts when partaking in research.

4 Assessment per standard

In this chapter the panel assesses the IJMRWOP programme according to the standards of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes in the EHEA. The criteria for each standard are mentioned. Per standard the panel presents a brief outline of its findings, as well as the considerations that led the panel to a concluding judgement on a three-point scale: the programme either meets, partially meets or does not meet the standard. At the end of this chapter and based on its judgements on the individual standards, the panel issues an overall conclusion on the quality of the entire programme. This conclusion can be either positive, conditionally positive or negative.

4.1 Standard 1: Eligibility

4.1.1 Status

The institutions that offer a joint programme should be recognised as higher education institutions by the relevant authorities of their countries. Their respective national legal frameworks should enable them to participate in the joint programme and, if applicable, to award a joint degree. The institutions awarding the degree(s) should ensure that the degree(s) belong to the higher education degree systems of the countries in which they are based.

Outline of findings

IJMRWOP is a programme featuring intensive cooperation between three higher education institutions in three countries. Each partner has been accredited at institutional level and is recognised as a higher education institution by the Ministry of Education in each country. The respective national frameworks enable the institutions to participate in the programme.

The IJMRWOP consortium aims to offer the programme as a joint degree. When the programme is accredited by NVAO, Maastricht University (the coordinating university) will be able to award IJMRWOP graduates one degree on behalf of the partner universities of the consortium that will be legally recognised in the Netherlands, Germany and Spain.

Considerations

The panel considers that the partners who offer the IJMRWOP programme are entitled to do so and that completing the programme will lead to a recognised and accredited master's degree of academic orientation. In the opinion of the panel, the involved partners are highly recognized public institutions that have experience with international programmes, in particular the University of Valencia who coordinates an Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree in Work, Organizational, and Personnel Psychology.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 1.1, status.

4.1.2 Joint design and delivery

The joint programme should be offered jointly, involving all cooperating institutions in the design and delivery of the programme.

Outline of findings

During the site visit, the panel learned that the IJMRWOP programme originated from three professors of the respective partner universities who were all members of the European Network of Organizational and Work Psychologists (ENOP). They generally felt the need for a new type of education and as members of ENOP, they developed a reference curriculum model which functions as the underlying philosophy of the IJMRWOP programme. The representatives of the Consortium Board with whom the panel met stressed that the development of the IJMRWOP programme has truly been a joint initiative, in which all partner universities have been involved from the start.

The IJMRWOP programme is carried out in such a way that each of the three consortium partners will consecutively offer an equal part of the programme (i.e. one semester), followed by a final semester during which students will conduct their research project and write their master's thesis at one of the consortium partners. Each semester in the programme has its own focus, and as became clear during the discussions on site, those involved in the curriculum design of the programme have ensured that the courses build upon and complement each other. To avoid possible redundancy amongst courses offered by the consortium partners, the lecturers involved in the programme explained that they will have regular (e-)meetings to ensure that they are up-to-date with what students have learned in the previous semester(s).

As is stated in the application document, the programme governance and management structure adheres to the principal notion that all participating universities take and bear equal responsibility for the content, quality and delivery of the programme. The governance and management is jointly structured. Maastricht University, however, functions as the coordinating university and handles the administrative and organizational processes of the programme.

Each partner has its own staff, services, systems, structures and facilities in place to ensure the delivery of 'regular' programmes and puts these at the disposition of the IJMRWOP programme and students. In addition, the programme created some specific services, such as the IJMRWOP internal quality assurance system featuring a Quality Assurance Committee and an Advisory Group.

Considerations

The panel considers that the IJMRWOP programme is a truly cooperative endeavour whereby the three consortium partners have indeed jointly developed the programme and have adequate provisions in place to roll-out and implement the programme together. The panel is of the opinion that the coordinating mechanisms are well established. All the universities involved show a strong commitment with regard to establishing this joint master's programme. The panel was impressed by the high level of motivation and enthusiasm shared amongst the staff members.

Given its small size and peripheral position within the large universities, the panel was concerned about the embeddedness of the programme within the partner universities. However, the discussions on site have convinced the panel that there are sufficient guarantees in place to ensure the programme will be executed according to plan if, for example, someone were to retire or fall ill. Considering the close personal relationships between the consortium partners, the panel is positive and optimistic that the programme will solve any upcoming problems in a constructive way.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 1.2, joint design and delivery.

4.1.3 Cooperation Agreement

The terms and conditions of the joint programme should be laid down in a cooperation agreement. The agreement should in particular cover the following issues:

- *Denomination of the degree(s) awarded in the programme*
- *Coordination and responsibilities of the partners involved regarding management and financial organisation (including funding, sharing of costs and income etc.)*
- *Admission and selection procedures for students*
- *Mobility of students and teachers*
- *Examination regulations, student assessment methods, recognition of credits and degree awarding procedures in the consortium.*

Outline of findings

In May 2017 the partner universities signed a consortium agreement. In the agreement it is stated that the consortium aims to execute the programme in the form of a joint degree. Upon accreditation by NVAO, graduates of the programme will be awarded a joint degree from the

three partner universities. A review of the consortium agreement showed that the agreement covers the necessary terms and conditions to set up and implement a joint programme. Some of the components, most notably the composition of the curriculum, the admission criteria and grade conversion tables, are elaborated on in annexes to the consortium agreement. These annexes form an integral part of the agreement.

The panel found the information on the financial arrangement to be rather limited in the consortium agreement. Upon request by the panel, the programme provided additional information on the estimated workload for delivering the IJMRWOP programme. The additional documentation clearly stipulates the estimated hours for teaching, supervision and assessment, extra-curricular activities and committee work. The budget is based on 30 students per cohort. The tuition fee is divided between the three partner universities: Leuphana University will receive € 350 per student for administrative costs and the remaining tuition fee is divided between Maastricht University and the University of Valencia (i.e. €855).

Considerations

Although the panel found the consortium agreement to cover all the required components and was satisfied with the information provided on site, it is of the opinion that the agreement could be more specific on certain aspects, in particular the financial arrangements, examination regulations and the mobility support of students. It therefore advises the Consortium Board to re-evaluate the information provided in the consortium agreement upon its renewal.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 1.3, cooperation agreement.

4.2 Standard 2: Learning Outcomes

4.2.1 Level [ESG 1.2]

The intended learning outcomes should align with the corresponding level in the Framework for Qualifications in the European Higher Education Area (FQ-EHEA), as well as the applicable national qualifications framework(s).

Outline of findings

The IJMRWOP programme aims to deliver graduates with academic knowledge and skills pertaining to the (research in) Work and Organizational Psychology in an international context. It has a strong cognitive profile and prepares students to become academic professionals with a strong orientation towards fundamental and applied research. The programme is designed in such a way that by the time of their graduation students will have demonstrated all 14 intended learning outcomes (ILO's) at master's level. In order to ensure that the ILO's are indeed of such level, the programme has formulated the ILO's taking into account the Dublin Descriptors and the EuroPsy criteria set out by the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA). The panel reviewed the matrix in the application materials indicating how each of the ILO's reflect the five Dublin Descriptors.

In addition to the 14 ILO's, the programme has also defined 7 core competences and 9 enabling competences. These competences have been integrated in the courses and are related to the ILO's.

Considerations

The German Society of Psychology recommends at least 10 ECTS in Psychological Assessment (in addition to 10 ECTS in Research Methods) for a master degree in psychology. Similarly, the new seal of quality for German master programmes in Business Psychology, which is in effect since October 2018, recommends at least 10 ECTS in Research Methods including Psychological Assessment, and at least 5 ECTS in Basics of Psychology. When questioning the representatives of the programme on whether they had considered this recent development, they explained that they were not aware of this. The panel therefore recommends the programme to consider the quality criteria of the German Society of Psychology and to take a deliberate decision whether they want to comply with these criteria

or not.

The panel considers the ILO's to be adequately formulated for a higher education programme at master's level. The panel has established that the ILO's IJMRWOP students have to demonstrate by the time of their graduation are aligned with the Dublin Descriptors, fulfil the requirements set by the European Higher Education Qualifications Framework as well as EuroPsy criteria set out by the European Federation of Psychologists' Association.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 2.1, level.

4.2.2 Disciplinary field

The intended learning outcomes should comprise knowledge, skills and competencies in the respective disciplinary field(s).

Outline of findings

When outlining the IJMRWOP profile, the consortium partners have taken into account several similar European master's programmes in the disciplinary field. Moreover, the programme has followed the EuroPsy criteria set out by the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFPA). As is listed in the application document, the purpose of the programme is as follows:

- a. to provide in-depth knowledge, skills and understanding of the field of Work and Organizational Psychology, and attainment of the intended learning outcomes;
- b. to enable the student to prepare for fundamental and applied research in Work and Organizational Psychology;
- c. to enable the student to acquire behavioural norms applicable during the study and within professional research environments.

The ILO's which IJMRWOP students should achieve at the end of the two-year programme form the basic principles for the programme and are integrated in the subjects and their respective modules. The panel reviewed a matrix in the application material indicating in which courses the ILO's are addressed.

During the site visit, the panel met with several representatives of the professional field. They unanimously expressed the need for a new generation of work and organizational psychologists who are equipped in working with big data and artificial intelligence (AI), who have developed sound knowledge of important research methods and current developments in the field and who are assertive and adaptive to new situations. The representatives particularly liked the international aspect of the programme, as an international outlook is much needed in times of migration and globalization. Through the mobility scheme, the representatives expect students to learn how to deal with change and arguably become more equipped and versatile to handle complicated situations.

Although the panel was pleased to hear that the representatives of the professional field are outspoken advocates for the master's programme, the panel did notice that there seems to be a bit of a gap between the expectations of the professional field and what the programme will actually offer, especially when looking at more innovative topics such as big data, AI and digitalisation in work contexts. When addressing this finding with the programme management, the representatives expressed that some of the topics that were discussed will definitely be addressed in the content of the programme, but that this is not clear from the descriptions of the courses. The programme management stressed that they will conduct a regular update of the courses, during which they take into account the most recent developments in the disciplinary field.

Considerations

The panel considers that the ILO's of the IJMRWOP programme contain an adequate mixture of knowledge, skills and competencies that are clearly grounded in the field of work and organizational psychology. During the discussions on site, the panel became acquainted with

a vital team of lecturers keen to develop a new type of programme in work and organizational psychology and who are definitely at the forefront of their field. However, this vitality and innovation was not reflected in the application documentation. Therefore, the panel recommends the programme management to further integrate these innovative elements in the ILO's, as well as making them explicit in the content of the curriculum. This in turn can help the master's programme in its future marketing.

Related to this consideration, it has become clear that there is a bit of a gap between the expectations of the professional field and what the programme will actually offer. The panel thinks that the programme can make use of this gap and the things that were brought up during the discussions on site. It recommends the programme to pay good attention to involving the professional field in the further development of the programme and keeping the ILO's up-to-date. The panel is confident that the future Advisory Group will play an important role in managing the expectations of the professional field and vice-versa.

As it stands, the intended learning outcomes are sufficiently in line with the disciplinary field. The above mentioned comments are meant to improve the programme further in this respect.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 2.2, disciplinary field.

4.2.3 Achievement [ESG 1.2]

The programme should be able to demonstrate that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Outline of findings

At the very end of the IJMRWOP programme, students have to demonstrate their mastery of all competencies. This 'master proof' consists of writing a research proposal, conducting a supervised research project and report on the research results by writing a master's thesis.

Considerations

Since the programme has not started yet, the panel is not in the position to establish whether the intended learning outcomes are effectively achieved upon graduation.

Conclusion

The panel issues no conclusion as standard 2.3, achievement, is **not applicable**.

4.2.4 Regulated Professions

If relevant for the specific joint programme, the minimum agreed training conditions specified in the European Union Directive 2005/36/EC, or relevant common trainings frameworks established under the Directive, should be taken into account

Outline of findings

This standard is not relevant for the assessment of this master's programme.

Conclusion

The panel issues no conclusion as standard 2.4, regulated professions, is **not applicable**.

4.3 Standard 3: Study Programme [ESG 1.2]

4.3.1 Curriculum

The structure and content of the curriculum should be fit to enable the students to achieve the intended learning outcomes.

Outline of findings

The IJMRWOP programme consists of a two-year curriculum (120 EC) with courses that cover relevant subjects in Occupational, Work and Organizational Psychology and courses that contribute to the field of research with a focus on advanced statistics and methodology,

critically reading and reflecting upon papers, writing grant proposals and communicating with different target groups.

The programme starts with a semester at Maastricht University, where students will follow a short introduction module (2 EC), learn to generate knowledge in the field of Work, Personnel and Organizational Psychology (20 EC) and will be educated in research methods (8 EC). The second semester takes place at Leuphana University, where students will experience the difference between acquiring and generating scientific knowledge in courses focusing on international and intercultural competences (10 EC), critically analysing research and writing a research proposal (10 EC), and on the methodology and execution of research in small groups (10 EC). In the second year, students continue their studies at the University of Valencia, where they will focus on developing interventions; scientific knowledge about programmes, instruments and methods; (quasi-) experimental designs for evaluating interventions in organisations; and on advanced research skills (26 EC). Here, they will also start preparing a proposal (4 EC) for a research project that they will carry out during the fourth and final semester. Students will execute their research project at one of the three consortium partners, where they will also write their master's thesis (26 EC). In addition, during the final semester, students will attend an online module on research ethics and advanced research methods (4 EC).

A schematic overview of the curriculum has been included in the application document. In appendix 5 to the application document, an overview with the description of all IJMRWOP courses was provided. Per course, information was provided on the study load, course coordinator, the teaching and assessment methods, intended learning outcomes etc.

As is stated in the application document, the programme design follows the reference curriculum model for academic education and training in Work and Organizational Psychology that was developed by the European Network of Organizational and Work Psychologists (ENOP). The programme aims to differentiate itself by having a stronger focus on research competences. Still, the panel got the impression that the current selection of the courses had mainly been driven by the research background and interests of the course coordinators. This led the panel to question how the courses in the different semesters relate to one another. During the site visit, the representatives of the Consortium Board shed light on the general framework for the selection of the content of the courses. In the first semester students will develop a solid basis in Work and Organizational Psychology, followed by a focus on research methods and entrepreneurship in the second semester. In the third semester, students will use their entrepreneurial mind-set and knowledge of Work and Organizational Psychology to develop interventions. In the final semester, when students conduct a research project, they will need to integrate their knowledge of theories and methodologies. As such, each semester in the programme has a different focus, but is structured in such a way that the content of the courses build upon and complement each other.

During the preparation for the site visit, the panel noticed that research ethics and moral dilemmas are not explicitly addressed throughout the curriculum, with the exception of the Advanced Research Skills and Research Ethics module in the final semester. In the discussion with the programme designers and lecturers, the representatives expressed that this is something that could have been stressed more in the application documentation. The representatives explained that research ethics and moral dilemmas are integrated in different courses, for example by asking students to assess how different academic journals address ethical guidelines or by taking ethical issues into account when designing an intervention. Moreover, students are expected to submit their research proposal for the thesis to the Ethical Research Committee of Maastricht University.

In the final semester, students are required to conduct a research internship. The representatives of the programme explained that they are very much aware of the fact that potential language problems might arise when conducting such a research project in a foreign country. The programme will therefore assist students in the application process by providing them with a list of potential internship placements. The representatives of the professional field recognized that this could be a restriction, but that they were eager to find a solution

should a student want to conduct an internship at their organisation.

Considerations

The panel considers that the curriculum structure is adequate for a master's programme in work and organizational psychology and will allow students to achieve the ILO's. Nonetheless, the panel had some difficulties in understanding the general underlying framework of the programme. This was not elaborated on in the application documentation, but was sufficiently addressed during the discussions on site. The panel does think that the programme could benefit from clarifying the general structure and interrelatedness of the various modules in the curriculum and thus strongly advises the programme management to do so. This would be helpful in further developing a common idea of the programme which is shared amongst the three partner universities, as well as for its future marketing. In line with a previous recommendation concerning the innovative elements of the programme (see 2.2), the panel advises the programme designers to make these innovative elements explicit in the content of the curriculum.

As the programme designers and lecturers had already noted during the site visit, research ethics and moral dilemmas should not be restricted to the final semester, but should be integrated throughout the curriculum. It is clear to the panel that these issues will sufficiently be addressed in the curriculum, yet it strongly recommends the programme to make this explicit in the course descriptions. Here, the programme could also take into account "Open Science" as a new and very central concept (and movement) with respect to research ethics). The importance of research ethics and moral dilemmas was moreover substantiated by the professional field, who expressed that such issues should be at the heart of the programme.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 3.1, curriculum.

4.3.2 Credits

The European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) should be applied properly and the distribution of credits should be clear.

Outline of findings

The IJMRWOP curriculum consists of a limited number of courses with clear indications of the respective credits. Credits follow the EC system and are awarded following the fulfilment of all learning goals of the subject.

The programme only consists of compulsory courses that amount to 120 EC, spread equally over the two-year programme. According to the Education and Examination Regulations, the study load per credit is 28 hours, which is customary in the Netherlands.

Considerations

The panel considers that the IJMRWOP programme applies the ECTS properly with regard to the overall programme and the respective subjects that can be followed in each of the two years.

Nonetheless, the panel did notice some inconsistencies with regards to the description of the modules. The amount of contact hours per week is only included for the modules offered at Leuphana University. The panel therefore recommends the programme to further standardize the course descriptions, as this would enhance their transparency.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 3.2, credits.

4.3.3 Workload

A joint bachelor programme will typically amount to a total student workload of 180-240 ECTS-credits; a joint master programme will typically amount to 90-120 ECTS-credits and should not be less than 60 ECTS-credits at second cycle level (credit ranges according to the FQ-EHEA); for joint doctorates there is no credit range specified. The workload and the average time to complete the programme should be monitored.

Outline of findings

The IJMRWOP is a full-time masters' programme with a total workload of 120 EC, spread equally over two years of study.

The workload is based on the total number of learning activities that the student is expected to complete in order to achieve the learning outcomes. Students have an important role in monitoring and determining whether the estimated workload is realistic. The workload is controlled systematically through course evaluations and as part of the quality assurance system.

Considerations

The panel considers that the size of the programme is in line with the legal requirements for a master's programme and that the study load is spread equally over the two years. The programme has put in place sufficient mechanisms to monitor the study load and, where necessary, to adjust it accordingly.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 3.3, workload.

4.4 Standard 4: Admission and Recognition [ESG 1.4]

4.4.1 Admission

The admission requirements and selection procedures should be appropriate in light of the programme's level and discipline.

Outline of findings

According to the IJMRWOP consortium agreement, the Joint Board of Admissions - consisting of one staff member of each partner university - shall select the students who will gain admittance according to selection criteria that were described in both the application document and an appendix to the consortium agreement. An updated Admission Procedure manual was provided on site. The programme offers a limited number of places (30).

In order to be admitted, applicants are expected to hold a university bachelor's degree in Psychology or a university bachelor's degree from an equivalent programme that meets similar achievement levels as determined by the Joint Board of Admissions. The bachelor's programme should include at least 70 EC in psychology subjects and at least 30 EC in research methods and statistics. Next to a copy of the certified diploma, students will need to submit a written motivation using a standardized form, a curriculum vitae using a standardized form, and proof of English proficiency. The Joint Board of Admissions will make a first selection on the basis of the submitted documents.

If the admission requirements are met by the candidate, the candidate will be invited for the second part of the selection, which consists of an admission test in research methods and statistics, and a 20-minute individual interview conducted by the members of the Joint Board of Admissions. The selection procedure as a whole is very much focused on whether the candidates' profile fit within the scientist-innovator model that the programme embraces.

Considerations

The panel considers the admission and selection procedure to be well-thought out and doable. The admission requirements are appropriate in light of the programme's level and discipline. The panel was convinced by the two-step procedure: pre-screening based on documentation

provided by the candidate, and if admissible, an admission test and interview.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 4.1, admission.

4.4.2 Recognition

Recognition of qualifications and of periods of studies (including recognition of prior learning) should be applied in line with the Lisbon Recognition Convention and subsidiary documents.

Outline of findings

According to clause 16 of the IJMRWOP consortium agreement, students will be granted one diploma by the coordinating university (i.e. Maastricht University) on behalf of the IJMRWOP consortium partners that is legally recognized in the Netherlands, Germany and Spain. Upon graduation, the coordinating university shall provide students with a grade transcript and a Diploma Supplement. The diploma supplement is in compliance with the agreed European standard format and shall contain information on the international character, nature, regulations and the credits obtained in the programme.

Considerations

The panel considers that the recognition of qualifications of the IJMRWOP programme is provided for adequately.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 4.2, recognition.

4.5 Standard 5: Learning, Teaching and Assessment [ESG 1.3]

4.5.1 Learning and teaching

The programme should be designed to correspond with the intended learning outcomes, and the learning and teaching approaches applied should be adequate to achieve those. The diversity of students and their needs should be respected and attended to, especially in view of potential different cultural backgrounds of the students.

Outline of findings

Constructive learning, contextual learning and collaborative learning are the most important educational principles that underlie the curriculum design of the IJMRWOP programme. As is stated in the application document, *Constructive learning* consists of activating and expanding previously acquired knowledge, thereby enabling students to improve their ability to store and retain new knowledge. *Contextual learning* is based on cases relevant to the student's future profession and increases student's motivation to learn. Lastly, *collaborative learning* involves not only lecturers but also other students, by encouraging them to share knowledge and responsibilities and give peer feedback.

These educational principles are implemented through the active learning methods used in the programme (e.g. problem-based learning, research-based learning and project-based learning). As is explained in the application document, these methods not only stimulate collaboration in teachers and self-directed learning in students, they also offer an excellent environment for integrated learning of knowledge and skills in relation to authentic professional and scientific problems.

During the site visit, the representatives of the institutional management gave the panel members a short introduction into problem-based learning (PBL), the learning method used at Maastricht University. They explained that PBL requires students to work on problems in small groups, activate their prior knowledge and identify gaps in their knowledge which will then function as their learning goals. Students will start their studies at Maastricht University, where they will receive PBL-training. They will learn to engage in discussions and will be taught in critical thinking. The PBL-approach has not been exported to the other partner

universities, and the representatives explained that it is inherent to the programme that students will be exposed to different teaching formats.

The PBL-approach also functions well with the scientist-innovator model that the IJMRWOP programme embraces. This entails that students will not only be educated in producing research that is targeted towards the scientific community, but will also engage in types of research that study and impact society, organisations, and its members. As the representatives of the Consortium Board explained, students will be taught to recognize societal problems and develop innovative solutions to these problems.

The international diversity of the student population, not only in terms of nationalities, but also in age and former education, is a key element for the IJMRWOP programme. Within the setting of the international classroom, it will enhance their cultural and professional learning as stipulated in the ILO's of the programme. Through the extended mobility windows students will be able to experience diverse academic and professional climates.

Considerations

The teaching and learning environment supports students in achieving the subject learning goals and eventually the ILO's of the programme as a whole. The panel is convinced that the active learning methods used throughout programme will enable students to fully embrace the scientist-innovator model.

The panel is curious how students will experience the different teaching formats at each of the partner universities, but believes that the PBL-approach of Maastricht University may support students throughout the whole programme. Overall, the panel considers the didactical approach underpinning the delivery of the IJMRWOP curriculum to be well developed and adequate.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 5.1, learning and teaching.

4.5.2 Assessment of students

The examination regulations and the assessment of the achieved learning outcomes should correspond with the intended learning outcomes. They should be applied consistently among partner institutions.

Outline of findings

As is described in the Education and Examination Regulations, the Joint Board of Examiners consists of one representative from each of the three partner universities. Each representative in the Joint Board of Examiners closely collaborates with (a member of) the local Board of Examiners. These three representatives are responsible for the local grades according to local regulations and laws. They are also responsible for the grade conversion table, which has been included in the consortium agreement and the Education and Examination Regulations.

In the application document, it is substantiated that the assessment of achieved learning outcomes correspond with the intended learning outcomes. The programme has an assessment plan prescribing the form of assessment per course. The assessment form(s) are selected by the course coordinator in collaboration with and/or after consultation with members of the Course Planning Group.

During preparations for the site visit, the panel had several questions regarding the consistency of grading. The lecturers with whom the panel spoke expressed that they are very much aware that guaranteeing the consistency of grading remains a challenge, especially considering the differences in severity of the grading systems at the respective partner universities. Although the programme has constructed a conversion table, the lecturers said it is important to take the underlying strictness into account. The programme has not established shared grading criteria, but the representatives of the Examining Board believe that they have enough mechanisms in place to deal with this problem if it appears.

The representatives explained that they plan to select random theses and examinations to check the quality and grades for comparability. After the site visit, the programme provided additional information on how it plans to guarantee the consistency of grading. For regular exams that are taken in the first three semesters, examiners will use the grade conversion table listed in Article 4.1 of the Education and Examination Regulations. Grading tables showing distribution of grades for each partner institution will be shared with staff members and students. Possible differences in grading tables would be discussed in the Joint Board of Examiners and the Quality Assurance Committee and may result in adaptation of the grade conversion table. With regards to assignments and papers, examiners will jointly choose or develop rubrics that fit the type of assignment. All consortium members will share these rubrics with staff and students.

Based on the application documentation, the panel could not establish whether a double grading procedure would be used for the assessment of the final examination (i.e. master's thesis). Representatives of the programme stressed that the final examination will be assessed by two examiners, each coming from a different partner university. After the site visit, the programme provided additional information on the double grading procedure for the assessment of the final examination. After the master's thesis is completed, the first supervisor will grade the thesis and the practical implementation of the research project. At the same time, the second supervisor grades the thesis. If the research project is done at one of the Partner Universities, both supervisors are two senior staff members from different Partner Universities. In case of a research project in an institution other than one of the Partner Universities, the student will be supervised by a qualified external supervisor and a supervisor from one of the Partner Universities not residing in the country where the student is conducting the research. Both supervisors determine a grade based on the fixed set of grading criteria that is published in the Handbook Writing Skills. When both grades differ by more than one point after grade conversion, or if one of the examiners gives a fail grade, both examiners will discuss their scores on the fixed set of grading criteria and will reach an agreement. If they fail to reach agreement, the joint board of examiners will appoint a third assessor, who will accept one of the two grades as final.

The panel wondered what would happen if a student fails both the regular exam and the re-sit of a course. The Examining Board expressed that such an event would be very rare. If it does happen, the Examining Board will have to study the case and decide what the following steps are. After the site visit, the programme provided additional information on its procedure with regards to what happens if a student fails both the regular exam and the re-sit of a course. The Partner Universities have all agreed to a maximum of six attempts within four academic years. If the student fails both the first attempt of the exam and the re-sit, and the type of exam lends itself to be taken at a proctored location, the student can take the following attempts at the partner university at which he/she is studying at that time. Both the Education and Examination Regulations (article 4.2) and the Rules and Regulations (article 8) will be adjusted to include this procedure.

The panel had several questions concerning the general thesis trajectory. For example, it was unclear whether students are able to propose their own topics for the master's thesis. Although the discussions on site were helpful in providing the panel with a better understanding of what the thesis trajectory entails, the panel was unable to extrapolate this from the application documentation. After the site visit, the programme provided a schematic overview of the master's thesis trajectory. The overview included what was expected of both the students and the supervisors during each semester of the programme. The overview will be presented to the students during the introduction week in semester one.

Considerations

The panel has established that the programme employs a great variety of assessments in accordance with the ILO's. For each course within the programme, the types of assessment are presented and they are consistent among the partner universities. The panel did notice that not all types of assessment are useful or coherent with the active learning methods that the programme employs. The panel therefore recommends to align the assessment types with the active learning methods.

Initially, the panel found insufficient evidence that the programme has all the necessary elements in place to guarantee the consistency of grading. The panel understands that grading will take place locally, according to local standards, and that the grades will be mathematically translated to the existing scales in the three respective countries. However, translating grades in other countries is not just a mathematical exercise. There are differences in grading cultures between countries that need to be taken into account. This might mean that students from the same master's programme receive different grades, depending on the partner university where they have completed their final examination. Although it is clear to the panel that the programme is aware of this complexity, formalized procedures to guarantee the consistency of grading still had to be established. In relation to this topic, the panel had initially formulated the following conditions that needed to be met:

1. The programme needs to establish shared grading criteria, in particular for the final examination. This is required to manage the expectations of students, to give feedback to students so they know what to improve on and most importantly, to increase the comparability of the grades;
2. The programme should formalize its double grading procedure ("four-eyes principle") for the assessment of the final examination so that grading is done by staff of two of the partner universities;

Additionally, the panel had some difficulties in understanding certain procedures, because they were not laid out in the application documentation. The panel had therefore formulated the following conditions:

3. The programme needs to clarify and formalize its procedure with regards to what happens if a student fails both the regular exam and the re-sit of a course;
4. The programme should clarify and outline the entire thesis trajectory in such a way that it is explicit and clear, especially to students so that they know what is expected of them at each of the partner universities.

On 26 October 2018, the programme sent the NVAO a letter in response to the four conditions that were set by the panel. This letter, which contained additional information on how the programme plans to meet said conditions, was provided to the panel by email on 30 October 2018. The panel was asked to review the additional information in order to assess whether or not the conditions have been met. The panel unanimously agreed that with the additional information the programme has adequately addressed all conditions.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 5.2, assessment of students.

4.6 Standard 6: Student Support [ESG 1.6]

The student support services should contribute to the achievement of the intended learning outcomes. They should take into account specific challenges of mobile students.

Outline of findings

Differences in educational background and three to four dislocations require a strong support network. As is described in the application document, the programme is characterized by an open, social, collaborative, and friendly international team spirit among staff members. The introduction week and introduction course at Maastricht University will help students to get to know each other and will support community building. To this end, the programme will organise various team building activities and social events, such as a Welcome Party and a dinner with the programme coordinators. An overview of activities during the introduction week at Maastricht University was provided on site.

Administrative support related to visa applications, housing arrangements and travel information will be handled by the *Student Services Centre* of Maastricht University and the *International Relations Offices* (IROs) of all partner universities. Representatives of the programme explained that partner universities have established networks with housing organisations to assist new international students in finding adequate accommodation. A draft version of the pre-departure guide for each of the partner universities was provided on site.

Facilitating the move to Germany and Spain, two pre-departure orientation activities will allow first year students to gather information on living conditions, course work and the academic culture. The *Education Office* at Maastricht University will act as the central information point for all other organizational aspects of the programme.

Furthermore, the programme intends to recruit second-year students as personal coaches, who will offer peer-to-peer coaching to newly enrolled students. Since the second-year students will be in Valencia when a new cohort starts, the programme will develop a digital platform where students can ask questions and exchange information. The personal coaches will fulfil an important role in guiding the new students with regards to the workload of the courses. As such, they also have a signalling function and will be supervised by the staff members. Next to a personal coach, students can also approach academic advisors (at each partner university) for personal guidance in case they are unable to continue their studies or when experiencing a study delay.

Considerations

The panel considers the student support services to be sufficient. A wide variety of services is provided to a relatively small group of students, which allows to tailor the services and follow-up on individual cases. Although the panel is positive about the pre-departure guide that will be made available to students, it did notice that some practicalities concerning the mobility support still need to be developed, for example, ways to review exams when students have already left the country, or the implementation of a shared digital e-learning portal (also see 7.2). The panel therefore recommends the programme to further invest in student support mechanisms that are geared towards the transition of students between the various countries. The peer-to-peer coaching system is an excellent way to provide guidance to new students, but does presuppose some kind of proximity which is not possible due to the mobility scheme of the programme. The programme plans to solve this issue by providing students with a digital exchange platform. Whether this platform will work as planned remains to be seen, but the panel is convinced that the programme will closely monitor this.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 6, student support.

4.7 Standard 7: Resources [ESG 1.5 & 1.6]

4.7.1 Staff

The staff should be sufficient and adequate (qualifications, professional and international experience) to implement the study programme.

Outline of findings

According to the application document, IJMRWOP has sufficient and properly qualified staff to deliver the programme. The lecturer-student ratio is expected to be 1:18. Staff operating in the IJMRWOP belongs to the personnel of one of the consortium partners. The panel has received short CV's of all staff members and had an interview with several lecturers on the day of the site visit.

As is evident from the application document, all three universities will bring their own distinct profile to the programme:

- Maastricht University is known for its student-centered Problem Based Learning and Research Based Learning approach. All academic staff is trained to teach according to this approach. It is expected that staff members obtain the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ, in Dutch BKO).
- Leuphana University has a strong profile in the psychology of international business, and involved staff members are experts in international Human Resource Management and entrepreneurship. The programme will draw on their expertise for the teaching of intercultural and entrepreneurial competences.
- The University of Valencia has substantial experience with international research and teaching agreements, having developed an Erasmus Mundus Programme. Staff members involved in IJMRWOP will focus on the evaluation of interventions in organisations.

Considerations

The panel is enthusiastic about the highly motivated and committed team of very experienced and skilled researchers who have an excellent international reputation. The number of lecturers is sufficient. The panel considers the teaching staff to be well-equipped to implement the programme.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 7.1, staff.

4.7.2 Facilities

The facilities should be sufficient and adequate in view of the intended learning outcomes.

Outline of findings

IJMRWOP students have access to all facilities at the institutions of the consortium partners, including libraries and laboratories for research purposes. The University of Valencia and Maastricht University are planning to devote one common room exclusively to the students of the master's programme where they can study, prepare for lectures or work on (group) assignments. Leuphana University also wishes to create a common room, but has to deal with the limited capacity of its central building. Most study-related information can be found on the digital e-learning portal of the respective partner universities. The consortium partners are still deliberating whether they want to develop one shared portal.

Considerations

Based on the information in the application, the tour of the facilities (on site in Maastricht and digitally for the other two locations) and the discussions with staff members, the panel considers that the facilities made available by / for IJMRWOP are adequate. The panel does recommend to implement a shared platform where students can find all the materials required for the programme from all the partner universities.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 7.2, facilities.

4.8 Standard 8: Transparency and Documentation [ESG 1.8]

Relevant information about the programme like admission requirements and procedures, course catalogue, examination and assessment procedures etc. should be well documented and published by taking into account specific needs of mobile students.

Outline of findings

IJMRWOP programme intends to set up a digital platform on which students can find relevant documents (e.g. pre-departure guides) and share exchange experiences. All documents specific to one partner are published on the website of the individual institution.

During preparations for the site visit, the panel had several questions regarding the examination and assessment procedures (see standard 5.2). To a large extent, these questions were addressed during the site visit, but the panel was unable to extrapolate this information from the application documentation. After the site visit, the programme provided additional information on the master's thesis trajectory and examination and assessment procedures.

Considerations

The panel considers certain procedures to be very well documented and transparent, such as the admission requirements and procedure, the pre-departure guides and the course catalogue. Other procedures, specifically those related to the examination and assessment as well as the thesis trajectory, needed to be clarified and formalized in writing. The panel therefore considered this standard to be related to standard 5.2 and had initially decided to formulate the following four conditions, which are the same as those listed under standard 5.2:

- 1) The programme needs to clarify and formalize its procedure with regards to what happens if a student fails both the regular exam and the re-sit of a course;
- 2) The programme needs to establish shared grading criteria, in particular for the final examination. This is required to manage the expectations of students, to give feedback to students so they know what to improve on and most importantly, to increase the comparability of the grades;
- 3) The programme should formalize its double grading procedure (“four-eyes principle”) for the assessment of the final examination so that grading is done by staff of two of the partner universities;
- 4) The programme should clarify and outline the entire thesis trajectory in such a way that it is explicit and clear, especially to students so that they know what is expected of them at each of the partner universities.

On 26 October 2018, the programme sent the NVAO a letter in response to the four conditions that were set by the panel. This letter, which contained additional information on how the programme plans to meet said conditions, was provided to the panel by email on 30 October 2018. The panel was asked to review the additional information in order to assess whether or not the conditions have been met. The panel unanimously agreed that with the additional information the programme has adequately addressed all conditions.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 8, transparency and documentation.

4.9 Standard 9: Quality Assurance [ESG 1.1 & part 1]

The cooperating institutions should apply joint internal quality assurance processes in accordance with part one of the ESG.

Outline of findings

The internal quality assurance system of IJMRWOP builds on existing quality assurance and control processes of the three consortium partners. All partner universities have a unit responsible for quality assurance, either at faculty level, or at institutional level. The partner universities have developed a systemic approach to quality assurance, which entails that:

- Each partner university will make sure that the quality of the programme will be assessed in accordance with the national quality assessment protocols;
- Each partner university will assess the quality of their courses, the teaching staff, and the examinations by using a joint assessment protocol;
- The partner universities agree to participate in any academic review, inspection or audit of the programme as required by the accreditation organisation.

The responsibilities for quality assurance are defined at three organizational levels: Consortium Board, Quality Assurance Committee and the (international) Advisory Group. At consortium level, the Consortium Board is the ultimate decision-making body and is responsible for managing the study programme.

The Quality Assurance Committee, consisting of three staff members and three students, is responsible for monitoring and stimulation the quality of education. The Quality Assurance Committee offers advice on the implementation of, and amendment to the Education and Examination Regulations. It annually assesses the implementation of the Education and Examination Regulations and offers advice to the Consortium Board on all matters concerning the programme. During the site visit, the representative of the Quality Assurance Committee explained that both first and second year students will be represented in the committee. Additionally, student members will also receive a training concerning their legal tasks at Maastricht University. Student members will be selected by the Consortium Board. Next to their representation in the Quality Assurance Committee, students will also contribute to quality assurance through yearly course evaluations (including staff appraisal, workload, assessment).

The Advisory Group, consisting of representatives from the professional field, will provide a means of keeping track of recent developments in the domain of Work and Organizational Psychology and the international labour market. So far, the Advisory Group has not been established yet. The representatives of the professional field interviewed by the panel indicated that they are eager to become involved in the further development of the programme.

Considerations

The panel considers that the IJMRWOP programme has an adequate quality assurance system in place. The quality assurance system explicitly foresees the involvement of different stakeholders, including staff, students, alumni and the professional field. The panel was pleased to hear that the representatives of the professional field are enthusiastic to become involved in the further development of the programme.

Conclusion

The panel assesses that the IJMRWOP programme **meets** standard 9, quality assurance.

4.10 Conclusion

According to the panel, the IJMRWOP programme meets each standard of the assessment framework. Consequently, the panel assesses the overall quality of the entire IJMRWOP programme as **positive**.

The application documentation, the programme materials on site and the discussions with delegations from all three universities, some of whom participated in the discussions via skype have provided the panel with a comprehensive view of the programme. It became clear to the panel that the programme is founded by a group of highly motivated scholars with a longstanding collaboration in research and teaching and a visible ambition to turn this joint master into a success.

The panel considers the new master's programme to be well-developed, ambitious and highly relevant. The panel has established that the IJMRWOP programme is a truly cooperative endeavour whereby the three consortium partners have indeed jointly developed the programme. The intended learning outcomes tie in with the level and orientation of the programme; they are geared to the discipline and international requirements. That being said, the panel is of the opinion that there is a bit of a gap between the expectations of the professional field and what the programme will actually offer. It recommends the programme to pay good attention to involving the professional field in the further development of the programme and keeping the ILO's up-to-date.

The curriculum, the teaching-learning environment and the quality of the teaching staff will enable incoming students to achieve the intended learning outcomes. The panel was particularly impressed by the highly motivated and committed team of very experienced and skilled researchers. The panel did have some difficulties in understanding the general underlying framework of the programme and strongly advises the programme management to further clarify the general structure and interrelatedness of the various modules in the curriculum.

The panel has established that the programme employs a great variety of assessments in accordance with the ILO's. However, the panel found insufficient evidence that the programme has all the necessary elements in place to guarantee the consistency of grading. Although it is clear to the panel that the programme is aware of this issue, formalized procedures to guarantee the consistency of grading still needed to be established. In addition, certain procedures, such as the thesis trajectory, could not be extrapolated from the application documentation and still needed to be clarified and formalized in writing. The panel had initially formulated four conditions, related to standard 5.2: Assessment of Students and standard 8: Transparency and Documentation. On 26 October 2018, the programme sent the NVAO a letter in response to the four conditions that were set by the panel. This letter, which contained additional information on how the programme plans to meet said conditions, was

provided to the panel by email on 30 October 2018. The panel was asked to review the additional information in order to assess whether or not the conditions have been met. The panel unanimously agreed that with the additional information the programme has adequately addressed all conditions.

The panel concludes that it is convinced of the quality of this joint master's programme in Work and Organizational Psychology, taking into account the comments as described above. Given these considerations, the panel advises NVAO to take a positive decision regarding the quality of the proposed joint master in Work and Organizational Psychology as offered by Maastricht University, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg and Universitat de València

The panel has also made some recommendations, which are meant for further improvement of the quality of the programme.

- The panel is of the opinion that the consortium agreement could be more specific on certain aspects, in particular the financial arrangements, examination regulations and the mobility support of students. It therefore advises the Consortium Board to re-evaluate the information provided in the consortium agreement upon its renewal.
- The panel recommends the programme to consider the quality criteria of the German Society of Psychology and to take a deliberate decision whether they want to comply with these criteria or not.
- The panel recommends the programme management to further integrate the innovative elements (e.g. big data, AI and digitalisation) in the ILO's, as well as making them explicit in the content of the curriculum.
- The panel recommends the programme to pay good attention to involving the professional field in the further development of the programme and keeping the ILO's up-to-date.
- The panel thinks that the programme could benefit from clarifying the general structure and interrelatedness of the various modules in the curriculum and thus strongly advises the programme management to do so.
- Although it is clear to the panel that research ethics and moral dilemmas will sufficiently be addressed in the curriculum, it strongly recommends the programme to make this explicit in the course descriptions.
- The panel noticed some inconsistencies with regard to the description of the modules. It therefore recommends the programme to further standardize the course descriptions, as this would enhance their transparency.
- The panel recommends to align the assessment types with the active learning methods.
- The panel recommends the programme to further invest in student support mechanisms that are geared towards the specific challenges of mobile students.
- The panel recommends to implement a shared platform where students can find all the materials required for the programme from all the partner universities.

5 Overview of the assessments

Standard	Assessment
1. Eligibility	
1.1 Status	Meets the standard
1.2 Joint design and delivery	Meets the standard
1.3 Cooperation Agreement	Meets the standard
2. Learning Outcomes	
2.1 Level	Meets the standard
2.2 Disciplinary field	Meets the standard
2.3 Achievement	Not applicable
2.4 Regulated Professions	Not applicable
3. Study Programme	
3.1 Curriculum	Meets the standard
3.2 Credits	Meets the standard
3.3 Workload	Meets the standard
4. Admission and Recognition	
4.1 Admission	Meets the standard
4.2 Recognition	Meets the standard
5. Admission and Recognition	
5.1 Learning and teaching	Meets the standard
5.2 Assessment of students	Meets the standard
6. Student Support	
	Meets the standard
7. Student Support	
7.1 Staff	Meets the standard
7.2 Facilities	Meets the standard
8. Transparency and Documentation	
	Meets the standard
9. Quality Assurance	
	Meets the standard
Conclusion	Positive

Annex 1: Extension of Duration

In addition to the assessment of the programme according to the standards of the European Approach for Quality Assurance of Joint Programmes, Maastricht University has requested an extension of duration to a two-year master's programme (120 EC). The panel took this request into consideration and advises to grant the programme the right to offer a two-year master's programme.

Findings

According to the Dutch regulatory framework, the duration of regular master's programmes in The Netherlands is one year (60 EC). The IJMRWOP consortium proposes that the master's programme has a duration of two years (120 EC). To substantiate their request for the extended duration of the programme, several arguments were listed in the application documentation. First, the programme management argues that the intended learning outcomes of the proposed joint master cannot be guaranteed in a one-year programme. For instance, the intercultural competence development that the master's programme intends to afford by immersion in academic and organizational cultures in The Netherlands, Germany, and Spain, should be given sufficient time. Second, it is the opinion of the programme management that a one-year programme will not suffice to reach the intended research competence levels. The programme made the explicit choice to follow the standards of the ENOP reference curriculum model for Advanced European Certificate in Work and Organizational Psychology, which has a minimum duration of 120 EC. Finally, EuroPsy, the European quality standard for education in psychology, requires a five-year university education in psychology. The IJMRWOP programme would need a two-year duration to allow graduates to meet the requirements of EuroPsy and national requirements of all three countries involved.

During the site visit, the panel members also learned that the German and Spanish consortium partners would not have wanted to engage in a cooperation agreement with Maastricht University if it had been a one-year (60 EC) programme.

Considerations

The panel was asked to advise on the extended duration of the programme, using the criteria put forward in the Protocol for programme extension of NVAO, published on 8 October 2003. It is stipulated that in order to advise positively on the extended duration, it should be convincingly shown that the learning outcomes that enable students to compete on an equal basis with their peers from other countries cannot be attained in a one-year programme or that the extended duration is necessary in light of the international requirements for master's programmes in the relevant domain. At least one of these two criteria should be met.

The panel has based its advice on the second criterion and has received ample evidence that a two-year master's programme is necessary for students to attain an international comparable level. The international standard for programmes in Work and Organizational Psychology according to EuroPsy is five years and offering an education of four years, implying a one-year master's programme, would put graduates of the IJWRMOP programme in an unfavourable position compared to their peers, regarding the knowledge and skills they would acquire. The panel concludes that graduates of the proposed programme should follow a two-year master's programme to achieve the learning outcomes, set at an international level. Furthermore, the panel takes into consideration that students will need to cope with an intensive mobility scheme that will only be possible in a two-year programme. Lastly, the panel feels strongly about the fact that a consortium agreement would not have been possible without the extended duration of the programme. Given these strong arguments in favour of a duration of two years, the panel advises to grant the programme the right to offer a two-year master's programme (120 EC).

Annex 2: Composition of the panel

Prof. dr. Jozien Bensing, chair

Jozien Bensing is emeritus Professor of Health Psychology at Utrecht University and the former director of NIVEL (the Netherlands Institute for Health Services Research). As SPINOZA-winner 2006, she is an acknowledged expert in the theory of doctor-patient communication and in the application of psychological knowledge in health care settings. She supervised 30 PhD-theses and wrote over 300 publications. As member of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Science (KNAW) she participated in several committees on the quality assessment of the Social Sciences and on scientific integrity. Furthermore she participated in numerous national and international visitation committees in research as well as academic education. At the moment she is Governance Board member of several public institutions, in particular in the fields of health care and science & innovation.

Prof. dr. Guido Hertel, member

Guido Hertel is full professor of Organizational and Business Psychology, and chair of the department of psychology at the University of Münster, Germany. His research addresses emerging trends and challenges in organizations and society, such as the digitalization of work, demographic changes and migration, and synergy effects in teamwork and negotiations. He has published more than 100 chapters and journal papers, for instance, in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *Journal of Management*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, and *Psychological Bulletin*. Guido Hertel is Associate Editor and member of the Editorial Boards of various scientific journals. In 2013, he was host and program chair of the 16th Congress of the European Association of Work and Organizational Psychology (EAWOP), and received the Innovation Award of the German Association of Psychologists, Section Work, Organization and Business Psychology in 2015.

Dr. José Navarro, member

José Navarro is an Associate Professor of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behaviour at the University of Barcelona, and currently the chair of the Department of Social Psychology and Quantitative Psychology. His research activity is concentrated on the topics of work motivation and team behaviour, especially in the application of temporal approaches and non-linear dynamic al systems to understand the motivation and team dynamics over short periods of time. His research has been published in journals such as *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *Human Relations*, *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *Small Groups Research* or *Nonlinear Dynamics, Psychology and Life Sciences*. He has experience in the preparation of the proposal of the Erasmus Mundus program in Work, Organizational and Personnel Psychology, jointly with the universities of Valencia, Paris VII, Bologna and Coimbra, and as assessor in the Spanish National Agency of Assessment and Prospectives (ANEP) and other international agencies as well in Holland and Belgium (Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek - Vlaanderen, FWO).

Paul Kop, MSc, member

Paul Kop is a former talent management lecturer, a registered psychologist and a successful multi-entrepreneur. For the past forty years, Paul has combined both theory and practice in leveraging the power of people, and as a result has been a frequent speaker on the topic of work and organizational psychology . Paul enthusiastically couples his boardroom experience with the latest developments in psychology. He continuously focuses on the development of individual talents and bringing the right people together. Currently, he is particularly interested in areas of sustainable employability, authentic leadership, identity management and successful collaborations.

After finishing his studies, Paul worked at the Dutch National Psychological Service, where he also had his first management experience leading a team within a care organisation. At PA Consulting Group he led the psychology team in the Benelux, before becoming an entrepreneur, creating the consultancy firm Kop & Heemstra. At the same time, Paul was board member and chairman of Jeugdformaam , an grand organisation working to drive improvement of youth care services in the The Hague region.

At present, Paul is owner and top consultant at Lagerweij, a HR Consultancy firm with a focus on furthering organizational goals through people. He coaches and advises senior executives and managers in business as well as top representatives of municipal and national governing bodies. He also serves as chairman of the Work and Organizational Psychology section of the Dutch Institute of Psychologists.

Mary Hayrapetyan, student-member

Mary Hayrapetyan is an Erasmus Mundus Joint Master Degree Scholar in Development Economics. She is a member of the quality assurance pool of the European Students' Union and used to be a Head of Social Affairs Committee of the Armenian National Students' Association till 2017. While in Association, Mary co-authored the first student manual for quality assurance for Armenian students. She drafted and conducting projects addressing higher education reforms In Armenia, including a nationwide survey devoted to reveal the students' perceptions on higher education reforms in Armenia with collaboration of OSCE office in Yerevan. Mary was a Higher Education Reform Expert by the joint agreement of the Erasmus+ office in Yerevan and the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Armenia from 2015 to February 2018. She provided consultation to higher education institutions and students and participated in the development of higher education policies and reforms in Armenia.

The panel was assisted by ir. Lineke van Bruggen, policy advisor at NVAO, and by a secretary, Aurelie van 't Slot MA, policy advisor at NVAO.

All members of the panel completed and signed a declaration of independence and confidentiality

Annex 3: Schedule of the site visit

On 3 October 2018, the panel visited Maastricht University as part of the external assessment procedure of the joint academic master programme International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology. The schedule of the visit was as follows:

08.30 – 09.15	Reception /preparatory meeting panel
09.15 – 09.30	Session 1 – Welcome by institutional management <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Anita Jansen- Rob Ruiten
09.30 – 10.15	Session 2 – Meeting with consortium/ programme management <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Michael Gielnik- José Ramos- Fred Zijlstra
10.30 – 11.15	Session 3 – Meeting with representatives of the work field <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ber Damen (Verbunt Advies)- Henny Mulders (UWV)- Antoon Vugths (UM)- Hans-Dieter Hoppe (R+V Allgemeine Versicherung AG; via skype)
11.30 – 12.30	Session 4 – Meeting with programme designers and (prospective) lecturers from all participating institutions <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Michael Frese- Michael Gielnik- José Ramos- Vicente Martinez Tur- Ute Hulsheger- Suzanne van Gils
12.30 – 13.15	Panel meeting, lunch (<i>confidential</i>)
13.30 – 14.00	Tour of the facilities <ul style="list-style-type: none">- José Ramos- Claudia Echelmeyer- Marie Thommes- Tobias Otto
14.15 – 14.45	Session 5 – Meeting with (prospective) members of examining board and programme committee <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Claudia Echelmeyer- David Loschelder (Skype)- José Maria Peiro- Vicente Gonzales Roma- Robert van Doorn- Herco Fonteijn
14.45 – 15.00	Second meeting with the programme management (optional)
15.00 – 16.30	Panel meeting (<i>confidential</i>)
16.45	Presentation of initial findings

Annex 4: Documents reviewed

Programme documents presented by the institution

- Application International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology (IJMRWOP), Master of Science, April 2018.
- Consortium Agreement
- Education and Examination Regulations
- Student Assessment Methods
- Curriculum map
- Course Descriptions
- Curricula Vitae from Teaching Staff
- Course evaluation questionnaire for students

Documents made available during the site visit

- Final programme
- List of Participants
- File of information and Appendices including the requested files by the panel:
 - Explanation about duration of the programme
 - Financial paragraph
- Academic Calendar 2019-2021
- Introduction Programme
- Course Manuals
 - PSY4961 Work Psychology
 - PSY4962 Human Resources
 - PSY4963 Organisation and Cognition
 - PSY4964 Human Performance
 - PSY4965 Statistics and Research Methodology
 - PSY4971 Critical Reading
 - PSY4972 International Human Resource Management
 - PSY4973 Negotiations in International and Intercultural Contexts
 - PSY4974 Research and Design
 - PSY4975 Group Research Project
 - Handbook Writing Skills
- Pre-Departure Guide
- Admission Procedure
- Education and Exam Regulations (EER) (updated)
- Exams
 - PSY4961 Work Psychology
 - PSY4962 Human Resources
 - PSY4963 Organisation and Cognition
 - PSY4964 Human Performance
 - PSY4965 Statistics and Research Methodology
 - PSY4975 Research and Design

Documents sent after the site visit

- Additional information with regard to the formulated conditions (dd. 26-10-2018)
- Formal request to change the name of the programme (dd. 29-10-2018)

Annex 5: List of abbreviations

AI	Artificial intelligence
BKO	Basiskwalificatie Onderwijs
EC	European Credit
EER	Education and Examination Regulations
EFPA	European Federation of Psychologists' Associations
ENOP	European Network of Organizational and Work Psychologists
ESG	European Standards and Guidelines
IJMRWOP	International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology
ILO	Intended Learning Outcomes
IROs	International Relations Offices
ma	master
NVAO	Dutch Flemish Accreditation Body
UM	Maastricht University
UTQ	University Teaching Qualification
wo	wetenschappelijk onderwijs (academically oriented higher education)

The panel report has been ordered by NVAO for the initial accreditation of the programme wo-master International Joint Master of Research in Work and Organizational Psychology (IJMRWOP) of Maastricht University.

Accreditation Organisation of the Netherlands and Flanders (NVAO)
Parkstraat 28
P.O Box 85498 | 2508 CD DEN HAAG
T 31 70 312 23 00
E info@nvao.net
W www.nvao.net

Aanvraagnummer 006881