

**MASTER'S PROGRAMME
GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP IN
EUROPEAN PUBLIC HEALTH**

FACULTY OF HEALTH, MEDICINE AND LIFE SCIENCES

MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

QANU 



MASTER'S PROGRAMME
GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP IN
EUROPEAN PUBLIC HEALTH

FACULTY OF HEALTH, MEDICINE AND LIFE SCIENCES

MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

QANU
Catharijnesingel 56
PO Box 8035
3503 RA Utrecht
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0738

© 2019 QANU

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



CONTENTS

REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP IN EUROPEAN PUBLIC HEALTH OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	8
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
APPENDICES	26
APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE	28
APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES	31
APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM	35
APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT.....	36
APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL	37

This report was finalised on 1 October 2019.





REPORT ON THE MASTER'S PROGRAMME GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP IN EUROPEAN PUBLIC HEALTH OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

This report takes the NVAO's Assessment Framework for Limited Programme Assessments as a starting point (September 2016).

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

Master's programme Governance and Leadership in European public Health

Name of the programme:	Governance and Leadership in European Public Health
CROHO number:	60379
Level of the programme:	master's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	60 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	-
Location(s):	Maastricht
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/11/2019

The visit of the assessment panel International Health to the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences of Maastricht University took place on 3 and 4 June 2019.

ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

Name of the institution:	Maastricht University
Status of the institution:	publicly funded institution
Result institutional quality assurance assessment:	positive

COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on 7 January 2019. The panel that assessed the master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health consisted of:

- Dr. ir. H. (Harro) Maat, associate professor at the Department of Social Sciences of Wageningen University [chair];
- Dr. C. (Cristiana) Bastos, senior researcher at the Instituto de Ciências Sociais of Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal);
- Prof. dr. med. M. (Manfred) Wildner MPH, professor in Public Health Policy & Administration at the Institute for Medical Information Processing, Biometry, and Epidemiology of Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München (Germany);
- Dr. K.J. (Kor) Grit, assistant professor at the Erasmus School of Health Policy & Management of Erasmus University Rotterdam;
- J. (Jessica) Michgelsen BSc, research master's student in Global Health at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (student member);

The QANU project manager for the cluster assessment was P.H. (Petra) van den Hoorn MSc. She also acted as secretary in the site visit.



WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health is part of the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences of Maastricht University (FHML). The faculty's mission is to educate academics at a high level, to conduct high-quality, multidisciplinary scientific research and to valorise knowledge within the domains of Health Sciences, Medicine and Biomedical Sciences. FHML wishes to educate competent, independently thinking and adaptive academics, who can perform well within the healthcare domain, in practical areas as well as in research. The focus of the faculty's courses extends over the entire continuum from sickness to health, from molecules and people to society. It involves not only the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of diseases, but also rehabilitation, public health and social aspects. Students will be prepared to continuously acquire up-to-date knowledge and to assess new developments in the field of healthcare.

The assessment of the master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health is part of the assessment of the cluster International Health. In addition to this programme, the cluster consists of the bachelor's programme European Public Health and the master's programme Global Health, also located at Maastricht University. On 3 – 4 June 2019, the assessment panel visited all programmes within the International Health cluster. The cluster has asked QANU to support the assessment of their programmes. Petra van den Hoorn MSc acted as the project manager and secretary from QANU.

Preparation

On the 2nd of April 2019, the panel chair was briefed by the project manager on the tasks and working method of the assessment panel and more specifically his role, as well as use of the assessment framework.

A preparatory panel meeting was organised on the 2nd of June 2019. During this meeting, the panel members received instruction on the tasks and working method and the use of the assessment framework. The panel also discussed their working method and discussed the domain specific framework. In addition, the system of higher education in the Netherlands was discussed.

A schedule for the site visit was composed. Prior to the site visit, representative partners for the various interviews were selected. See Appendix 4 for the final schedule.

Before the site visit, the programme wrote a self-evaluation report of the programme and sent it to the project manager. She checked these on quality and completeness and sent them to the panel members. The panel members studied the self-evaluation reports and formulated initial questions and remarks, as well as positive aspects of the programmes. The project manager combined these findings in a document, which served as the point of departure at the beginning of the site visit.

The panel also studied a selection of theses. The selection consisted of 15 theses and their assessment forms for the programmes, based on a provided list of graduates between 01-02-2017 and 31-08-2018. A variety of topics and a diversity of examiners were included in the selection. The project manager and panel chair assured that the distribution of grades in the selection matched the distribution of grades of all available theses.

Site visit

The site visit to Maastricht University took place on 3 and 4 June 2019.

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

During the site visit, the panel studied additional materials about the programmes and exams, as well as minutes of the Education Programme Committee and the Board of Examiners. An overview of these materials can be found in appendix 5. The panel conducted interviews with representatives

of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners and the Education Programme Committee.

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

Report

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to a colleague for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project manager sent the draft report to the faculty in order to have it checked for factual irregularities. The project manager discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences and University Board.

Definition of judgements standards

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

Generic quality

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

Unsatisfactory

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard and shows shortcomings with respect to multiple aspects of the standard.

Satisfactory

The programme meets the generic quality standard across its entire spectrum.

Good

The programme systematically surpasses the generic quality standard.

Excellent

The programme systematically well surpasses the generic quality standard and is regarded as an international example.



SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

Intended learning outcomes

The master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health (GLEPH) aims to educate students into all-round public health professionals, researchers and leaders ready to improve systems and policies related to European public health. The students are trained to compare (international) health systems, determine best practices and stimulate the implementation of these practices in new settings. Additionally, graduates become acquainted with the knowledge and competencies essential to take the lead in implementing change.

The panel is very satisfied with the programme's profile. Especially by including leadership as a direct focus and remaining aware of recent developments within the field, the programme shows it is preparing the students for future challenges, ultimately benefitting the domain of public health. It therefore innovatively contributes to the field. In order to provide students with this same positive image, the panel recommends the management to communicate the programme's focus and its added value to the field more explicitly to the students.

The panel is satisfied with the intended learning outcomes of the programme: they are in line with the Dublin descriptors and therefore reflect the academic level and orientation of the programme. In its opinion, they are also in line with the profile and the domain-specific framework of the programme and therefore fit the ambition of the programme very well. Although the programme focusses on Europe, the panel acknowledges that the knowledge and competencies acquired are generic and globally applicable, which will help the graduates when they enter the labour market.

Teaching-learning environment

The panel is positive about the PBL concept, since it helps students familiarise themselves with skills essential to becoming leaders in the professional field, such as critical thinking and argumentation. Additionally, the multilingual and multicultural diversity of the student population adds to the educational context of the programme.

The panel is satisfied with the overall curriculum and applauds the way the programme decided to focus on Europe, while at the same time not losing sight of the global health perspective. It appreciates the revision of the first module which diminished the overlap with the matching bachelor's programme and applauds the plans to improve the module further. The panel suggests reinstating the electives in the curriculum. Overall, as the programme progresses, there is a gradual build-up of knowledge and skills. The panel specifically appreciates the leadership strand, because it helps the students to develop 'soft skills' which they will need later in their professional career. The programme facilitates networking opportunities and acquaints students with stakeholders and their professional future through an annual symposium and a field trip. This is appreciated by the panel.

Students conclude the programme by doing a research placement and writing a master's thesis. The panel was very impressed with the number of options at which the students could do their placement. It discovered that the added value of the placement is dependent on the institution at which the placement takes place and urges the programme management to demand that all institutions provide students with ample time and support to be able to carry out their research plan.

The panel ascertained that the programme is feasible. For some students, the programme is not demanding enough. The panel applauds the initiatives to increase the study workload, for instance by making assignments more challenging. The panel encourages the programme management to reflect further on possibilities of developing a more challenging and tailored programme for students.

The panel is very satisfied with the programme's staff. A large portion of the staff is involved in the European public health arena. The programme also attracts external experts from universities or organisations related to public health issues, to help keep the programme's content up-to-date and give students an idea of job opportunities after graduation.

The panel regrets the alumni's uncertainty about entering the labour market and it encourages the initiatives of the programme and the faculty to address this issue.

Student assessment

The panel ascertained that the programme has a varied programme of assessment in place. It saw an assessment matrix which demonstrates that all intended learning outcomes of the programme are being assessed throughout the separate modules.

The BoE-H adequately handles all of its legally mandated tasks. All exams are subject to its thorough check. Since the previous re-accreditation, it has adopted a more proactive attitude, and the panel encourages the board to continue taking concrete steps to review the assessment plan of the programme as a whole, in order to check for the robustness and the difficulty level build-up of the assessments.

The panel is satisfied with the grading process of the thesis. The programme provides all thesis supervisors with information about the essential procedures for the assessment. Furthermore, thesis supervisors and students are provided with information on placement and thesis requirements.

According to the panel, the assessment form used for the thesis assessment is clear and insightful in terms of the final grade. It asks the examiner to assess different aspects of the thesis, which enhances the transparency and validity of the grading. The panel suggests elaborating on these criteria, for instance by adopting the already introduced rubrics, to allow for more consistent grading and more transparency towards the students with regard to the expectations of their thesis.

The panel was surprised to see that, in their sample of theses, many involved a literature review. It suggests that the programme examine how students could be better facilitated to perform other research methods, since that would substantially add to the skills and knowledge of the students, resulting in outstanding theses.

The panel applauds the programme's effort to secure consistent, transparent and fair grading. The calibration sessions deserve special mention in this respect. During these sessions, the examiners come to a better agreement on how to interpret the assessment forms and when a thesis or examination should pass or not.

Achieved learning outcomes

The panel is impressed by the overall quality of the master's theses. Many of the theses provide interesting findings on well-chosen topics. To allow students to capitalise on their potential, the panel would like the programme to stimulate the use of a variety of research methods applied during the thesis research period. Particularly, the use of research methods other than literature reviews should be further encouraged.

After reading the theses and speaking to alumni of the master's programme, the panel concluded that graduates demonstrated that they have met the intended learning outcomes at the expected level. Alumni are employed in a broad range of positions, reflecting the broad scope of the programme. Many students get a job offer in their placement institution when they graduate.

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



Master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health

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

The chair, dr. ir. Harro Maat, and the secretary of the panel, Petra van den Hoorn MSc, hereby declare that all panel members have studied this report and that they agree with the judgements laid down in the report. They confirm that the assessment has been conducted in accordance with the demands relating to independence.

Date: 1 October 2019.

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

Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes

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

Findings

Profile

The master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health (GLEPH) focusses on educating professionals specialised in improving the quality of healthcare, economic growth, and public health in Europe. The health-related challenges of today need to be faced by multidisciplinary professionals who are capable of innovating, implementing and monitoring interventions in systems and policies related to public health. Examples of these systems and policies include mechanisms for quality assurance, the tools to assess their effectiveness, the authorisation of administrative and supervisory bodies, and the consequences of legislations. To face present-day challenges, such as globalisation, an ageing society, and social and health inequalities, the programme aims to train students to become all-round public health researchers and leaders, working on improving the various systems and policies at different levels in the public health system. Graduates should be capable of comparing systems and policies related to health and healthcare in various settings. They are also trained to determine which interventions or policies could be identified as best practices, and stimulate change in settings where these best practices have not yet been implemented. Graduates are trained to work for hospitals, health insurance companies, health workers unions, or other professional associations related to health and healthcare. Within these organisations, they should be capable of reducing health inequalities at the local, national and/or European level and identifying possibilities for population-wide health improvement.

To prepare the students for this task, the programme fosters a thorough understanding of the complex European governance structures and equips them with the competencies needed to recognise and implement effective interventions in order to adequately respond to public health challenges. Apart from knowledge and competencies involving public health systems and policies, it encourages students to develop into leaders, who are able to implement change. Graduates need to be able to face new issues related to public health, and stimulate and support interventions. To that end, the programme aims to provide the students with knowledge and competencies in the field of governance and leadership: they learn about the processes and structures of European governance, understand how change on the local, national and international level is (or can be) achieved, learn to adopt a professional attitude when it comes to encounters with stakeholders, and eventually take the lead in implementing change.

The programme focusses on the New Public Health, a philosophy which aims to improve population-wide health and reduce health inequities. It also builds upon the domain-specific framework (appendix 1) created for all education programmes in the domain of international health in the Netherlands. Combining New Public Health with the domain-specific framework, the programme not only looks at societal groups at risk, by considering traditional disciplines such as epidemiology, socio-medical hygiene and prevention, it also includes topics related to health promotion, from disciplines such as psychology, sociology, political science and economics. Furthermore, it pays specific attention to comparing health and healthcare systems across Europe and exchanging best practices. The panel appreciates these principles and has seen that, as a result, the programme is aware of the need to incorporate recent developments in the domain of public health into the programme. For instance, the programme uses input from guest lecturers (see standard 2) to keep abreast of expectations of the field and to be able to incorporate the latest developments in Europe or the European agenda into the programme. Additionally, during the site visit, the panel spoke to the programme management and the programme's staff and learned that the programme reacts



effectively to several factors which are (or could be) influential on health, such as migration, climate change, open borders, or changes in public-private relationships, by incorporating these topics into the programme. The panel is pleased with the fact that the programme is constantly adjusting to recent developments (and corresponding needs) of the health care domain. This helps students significantly when they enter the labour market.

Overall, the panel is very satisfied with the programme's profile. In its opinion, this programme is innovative and has added value for the domain of public health. Especially by including leadership as a direct focus, and keeping abreast of recent developments within the field, it shows that it is preparing students for future challenges, ultimately benefitting the domain of public health. Nevertheless, the students indicated to the panel that they are unsure what the exact profile of the programme is. Both in the student chapter of the self-evaluation report and through conversations with alumni during the site visit, the panel learned that the students are not completely aware of what the programme entails and what kind of jobs they are being trained for. The panel finds this unfortunate, since during the site visit, the programme's staff and management painted a good picture of the programme and its aim. Therefore, it recommends the programme management to think about ways to communicate the programme's focus and its added value to the domain of public health more explicitly to its students. In this respect, the panel agrees with the comments in the student chapter of the self-evaluation report suggesting that alumni's career paths could be helpful in making the programme's profile more visible. By doing this, the students will better understand the programme's aims, grasp more fully the reasons why they are studying certain topics and practising certain competencies, and have a more specific idea of what they will be able to do after graduation.

Intended learning outcomes

The intended learning outcomes are focused on the systematic improvement of student competencies relevant to future professions in the realm of public health. The programme management formulated a competence profile for a GLEPH graduate, which resulted in corresponding intended learning outcomes (Appendix 2). By examining an overview of the intended learning outcomes (ILOs) presented to the panel, the panel ascertained that these are clearly tied to the Dublin descriptors. According to the panel, the ILOs adequately reflect the academic level and orientation of the programme.

The panel is satisfied with the formulation of the ILOs. In its opinion, they are in line with the programme's profile and the domain-specific framework of the field and therefore fit the programme's ambition very well. Several aspects of the programme's focus are recognizable in the ILOs. For instance, for the competence of being able to compare different nation's healthcare systems, the ILOs mention knowledge and understanding of issues of different European nations (ILO 1), differences between local, European and global policies and strategies (ILO 4b) and the interconnections between health problems and solutions at a global, European and local level (ILO 7). To enable the students to understand how various disciplines are connected to health and healthcare systems, the programme fosters their understanding of basic concepts within the field of economics, culture, politics, etc. (ILO4e). Next, it aims to teach them how to perform research, which can be used to develop new policies or health interventions (ILO 25 and 26). Finally, its aim to create leaders who can implement change in health-related issues is reflected in ILOs concerning knowledge, for example ILO 24 (graduates will be able to develop, plan, implement, monitor, evaluate and adjust international policies and interventions) and ILO 30 (graduates will be capable of analysing the social consequences of new developments in the field of study and integrating them into the scientific work). ILOs 37 through 40 address the communication skills necessary for an effective leader (speaking to confreres, stakeholders or the public; working in a team; acting as a project leader). The ILOs are mainly focussed on the development and acquisition of the students' competencies. They stimulate critical thinking and reasoning on an academic level. According to the student chapter in the self-evaluation report, the students appreciate this, since they feel this is essential for either an academic or a professionally oriented career. Although the programme focuses

on Europe, the panel and students agree that the knowledge and competencies acquired are generic and globally applicable.

Considerations

The master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health (GLEPH) aims to educate students into all-round public health professionals, researchers and leaders ready to improve systems and policies related to European public health. The students are trained to compare (international) health systems, determine best practices and stimulate the implementation of these practices in new settings. Additionally, graduates become acquainted with the knowledge and competencies essential to take the lead in implementing change.

The panel is very satisfied with the programme's profile. Especially by including leadership as a direct focus and remaining aware of recent developments within the field, the programme shows it is preparing the students for future challenges, ultimately benefitting the domain of public health. It therefore innovatively contributes to the field. In order to provide students with this same positive image, the panel recommends the management to communicate the programme's focus and its added value to the field more explicitly to the students.

The panel is satisfied with the intended learning outcomes of the programme: they are in line with the Dublin descriptors and therefore reflect the academic level and orientation of the programme. In its opinion, they are also in line with the profile and the domain-specific framework of the programme and therefore fit the ambition of the programme very well. Although the programme focusses on Europe, the panel acknowledges that the knowledge and competencies acquired are generic and globally applicable, which will help the graduates when they enter the labour market.

Conclusion

Master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health: the panel assesses Standard 1 as 'good'.

Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment

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

Findings

Didactic concept

The faculty's education is based on the principles of Problem-based Learning (PBL). Specific characteristics of PBL include a student-centred approach and collaborative learning. Compared to more traditional ways of education, the students attend far fewer lectures. Instead, they work in small tutorial groups of ten to twelve students that meet weekly to tackle a real-life issue (a case) within the domain of health. They work on the case by looking at the issue from different perspectives and completing an assignment. The results of the group work depend on the knowledge and experience already present within the group, combined with the skills of the group members to gather the necessary information. Therefore, the students bear the primary responsibility for their own study progress. The programme contributes to the development of the students' knowledge and skills to be able to handle that responsibility: every group of students is guided by a tutor: a teacher who can explain the assignment, help those who experience difficulty in understanding the material they retrieved, and guide the group in choosing the right path. This working method, combined with the regular feedback students receive on their progress, helps them to develop skills that are essential for the labour market.

The panel is positive about the PBL concept and how it is implemented in the programme. During the site visit, many students indicated that the PBL concept was one of their reasons to apply, because it offers them the opportunity to play an active role in their own learning process. The panel



has seen the programme's course material and appreciates the fact that the programme uses real-life problems as point of departure in many of the courses. This stimulates students to think and talk critically about health issues in modern-day society. In its opinion, the concept of PBL serves as added value (on top of the curriculum), preparing the students to become leaders in the professional field of health, by letting them practise their argumentation, formulate questions, critically analyse information, and reflect on the social consequences of new developments in the field of study.

Diversity of the student population

About one-third of the students who enrol for the master's programme graduated from one of FHML's bachelor's programmes (of which B-EPH graduates form the large majority, followed by alumni of the bachelor's programme in health sciences). Another third graduated from a bachelor's programme outside the Netherlands. A handful of students graduated from a master's programme or from a programme at a university of applied sciences, in- or outside the Netherlands. On average, 49 percent of the students (annual intake of 25-30 students per year) is Dutch. About 13 percent of the students is German. The remaining students come from various countries, such as Belgium, Italy, Egypt, Australia, and Colombia. To help students without prior experience in PBL, specific training is organised during the week prior to the start of the programme.

According to the panel, this multilingual and multicultural diversity adds to the educational context of the programme and serves several of the programme's intended learning outcomes. For example, it helps students to learn to debate in diverse and international groups of people. Additionally, it fosters an understanding of the influence of culture on the perception of health problems and solutions.

Curriculum

The one-year master's programme consists of eight modules. Each one concerns a different topic related to public health and its governance. For example, in the first module, current issues in the EU are discussed (like vaccination programmes and migration). The third module teaches students how to assess the effectiveness of prevention and care interventions and how they should use several criteria in order to select good and best practices. The seventh module focusses on strategic management and organisational behaviour by different health care providers across the globe. The panel is satisfied with the overall curriculum and applauds the way the programme decided to focus on Europe, while at the same time not losing sight of the global health perspective. This is especially the case in the eighth module, which asks students to look beyond the European Region, and to examine the role and contribution of Europe from a global health point of view. However, the panel wants to make a remark about the first module. Both in the self-evaluation report and during the site visit, the students expressed their discontent with this module. Those who graduated from the bachelor's programme *European Public Health* indicated that the content of the first module shows a substantial amount of overlap with the bachelor's programme, which made the master's programme not challenging enough for them. The panel wonders if the first module serves as a tool to make sure all students (especially those who did not follow the matching bachelor's programme) have the same set of prior knowledge. According to the panel, the students should be adequately qualified before the programme starts: gaps in prior knowledge can be resolved through premaster programmes or individual courses. In the self-evaluation report, students expressed their concerns about the first module in terms of its content and length. During the site visit, the first module was discussed with the programme management. The panel feels the programme management is fully aware of the first module's issues. As of the academic year 2018-2019, the module was revised, to diminish the overlap with the bachelor's programme. Additionally, the programme management expressed their future plans for further improvement of the first module: providing a clearer narrative on alignment between the programme modules, exploring the programme's three focal areas in greater depth and explaining in more detail what the public health discipline entails. The programme's intention to offer more parallel modules as a first module to choose from is also applauded by the panel. The panel is assured that, after these adjustments are put in place, the first module will be improved substantially.

The panel appreciates the coherence of the programme's content: it is evident that the modules build on each other. For example, the sixth module, just like the third, discusses the effectiveness of interventions, but goes a step further. The module takes a closer look at the fact that over time, the effectiveness of a newly implemented health intervention could change. The students explore how interventions need to be continuously re-assessed, and, if necessary, modified or replaced. Several modules pay attention to the interplay between politics, society and the economy on the local, national and international level, analysing the social consequences of new interventions. To strengthen the programme's coherence even more, a 2-hour 'umbrella' lecture is provided (on top of the regular lectures of each module) in the midst of each module.

Every year, all programmes related to international health (the current master's programme along with the bachelor's programme European Public Health and the master's programme Global Health) organise a symposium on one current international health issue. Experts from the field (business, policy, civil society, etc.) present their perspective on the issue. The students are able to compare the views of different organisations on health issues and discuss them with professionals. In the third module, a trip to Luxembourg is arranged, where students visit the Directorate-General for Health and Food Safety (DG SANTE; an organisation responsible for the implementation of European Union laws on public health) and Chafea (Consumers, Health, Agriculture and Food Executive Agency; an organisation which monitors activities concerning the public health programme formulated by the European Commission). The panel is pleased with the symposium and the field trip, since they facilitate networking opportunities and acquaint the students with stakeholders and their professional future.

The assignments throughout the programme show good variety. In most modules, the students examine a health-related issue in close detail and present the findings through individual assignments and/or group work, like essays, literature reviews, or research project proposals. In the fifth module, thesis groups are formed, in which a group of 3-5 students shares and discusses their research proposals. This group continues in the placement and thesis period, as students share their placement experiences (because of placements abroad, this usually takes place via online meetings) and present drafts of thesis chapters for peer review. The panel appreciates the different learning opportunities provided by these educational activities and thinks they contribute to the student's 'soft skills': they learn to collaborate, communicate, utilise each other's expertise and critically evaluate everyone's individual contribution. To help them gain self-confidence in speaking in public, the programme even provides a media training, in which students practise performing an 'elevator pitch'.

Strands

To serve the programme's aim, a governance strand and a leadership strand are present. These learning trajectories contribute to the consistency and coherence of the programme and teach the students the knowledge and skills to take on a pioneering leadership role and bring a positive change in European public health.

Broadly speaking, the governance strand lets students familiarise themselves with the processes in which societies make decisions concerning public health and how change is implemented through healthcare policies. Throughout the programme, all of the modules pay attention to the governance of healthcare. For example, some modules deal with issues concerning the law and ethics when it comes to healthcare decision-making; other modules focus on how the different levels of policy making interact (European, national, regional and local level). Students learn about 'good governance': making cost-effective and humane decisions which adequately solve public health-related issues. The panel appreciates this strand, because it offers students a glimpse of the world of political and other decision-making, reflecting the students' possible future career. In addition, the strand lets students practise applying a varied set of models and methods to identify best practices. Once they graduate, they are fully equipped to make evidence-based suggestions to improve prevention and care practices.



The aim of the leadership strand is to foster the students' personal and professional growth. They develop critical thinking skills and self-evaluation abilities. In addition, they become acquainted with different leadership styles and learn about important aspects which are relevant to an effective and sustainable change in public health. As of the academic year 2018-2019, more guest speakers (i.e. professionals, leaders) are invited, to talk about their work experiences on a European public health-related topic. The students are expected to discuss and reflect upon the challenges presented by the speaker. In this way, they build on their knowledge about the responsibilities, barriers and dilemmas leaders face and get the opportunity to relate the discussed political or societal challenges to their own professional ambitions. Just like the governance strand, this strand is also present throughout the programme, but particularly during the first semester, where it represents 6 ECTS. The panel is very enthusiastic about the leadership strand. In its opinion, it helps the students to develop 'soft skills' which they will definitely need in their professional career. For example, students fill in self-assessment questionnaires to discover their strengths as a leader and their personal leadership style. Assignments and role-playing serve to develop communication and political leadership skills. Students also collect 360-degree feedback (from peers and teachers) on their performance and leadership behaviour. A professional HR coach together with the programme coordinator provide coaching for every student in terms of personal and professional development, and help them develop into potential future leaders. The students have indicated that they really appreciate these coaching sessions. The panel is certain that, through all these activities, the students adopt an attitude of lifelong learning: they will stay motivated to keep their knowledge and skills sharp throughout their professional life.

The students indicated both in the student chapter of the self-evaluation report and during the site visit that they highly value the strands. The strands challenge them to think critically about health-related issues and come up with solutions to presented cases. Because of the skills the students acquire, the strands also support their personal and professional growth. Altogether, the strands help the students prepare for a future career. The panel would like to make a suggestion with regard to the content of the leadership strand. During the site visit, alumni indicated that more attention could be paid to the topic of ethics. At the moment, ethics is briefly touched upon in the programme, and the panel agrees with the students that a good sense of ethics is necessary for becoming a good leader. Moreover, the panel thinks it is important to insert more knowledge about different types of leadership. This enables students to think critically about the leaders of different types of organisations (such as the government, non-governmental organisations, or research institutes working on public health) and reflect on their own leadership style. The panel thinks ethics and reflection on what leadership means deserve a more substantial place in the programme and suggests including it in the leadership strand.

Students' options

Throughout the programme, the students are offered a couple of choices to diversify or deepen their knowledge and skills. For example, in several modules, students may write a paper on a health-related topic of their choice, select a European Public Health project funded by the EU and discuss whether it can serve as a role model for other projects, or discuss a Regulation or a Directive of the EU legislation and present its impact on public health. In the fifth module the student is mostly in charge. This module prepares the student for the execution of research and writing a thesis: they gain knowledge concerning selecting research designs, using methods for data collection and analysis, handling issues of research validity and reliability, and properly reporting the results. In the end, the students write a research proposal which will be executed during the placement and thesis period. They can introduce the topic of the thesis (in consultation with their thesis supervisor) and decide on the theoretical framework, research design and research methodology. In relation to this module, students have the possibility to enrol in additional skills trainings in using e-tools, like EndNote (to organise citations and references) or SPSS (to perform qualitative data analysis).

The panel is dissatisfied with the fact that, as of the academic year 2018-2019, the programme offers no electives. The self-evaluation report indicates that this decision was taken in order to have ample time to provide students with in-depth knowledge on all topics related to the field of the programme.

During the site visit, the panel discussed the absence of electives with the students, who indicated that they would have liked to have had the opportunity to use electives to specialise in one or two programme-related topics. According to the panel, the programme covers a rather broad spectrum of topics related to public health. However, for a master's programme, one would expect a narrower focus, in which students can specialise. The panel understands that leaders in the field of public health should be able to work in all kinds of organisations, with different people, and so they need to be familiar with a variety of topics. Nonetheless, the panel agrees with students who do wish to specialise in one or more topics, and recommends the management to investigate whether electives could be facilitated for those students. The programme could offer students a pre-set list of electives, varying in subject and level of difficulty, so that they will experience a more challenging and tailored programme, while at the same time, the focus on programme-related topics is maintained. Moreover, the panel feels that electives could benefit the graduates from the matching bachelor's programme, who experience an overlap between the two programmes (discussed earlier in this report).

Feasibility

The panel ascertained that the programme is feasible. Looking at the cohorts of 2013-2014 to 2016-2017, 80 percent of the students finishes the programme in one year; 95 percent graduates within two years. Once enrolled, few students drop out: 2-3 per cohort. For students who did experience study delay, there were many different causes of it (the placement period was more time-consuming than expected, students wished to add more work and research experience before they graduated, or personal reasons), but no main reason stood out.

As stated in the student chapter of the self-evaluation report, some students feel the programme is not demanding enough: the programme's study load is around 25-35 hours per week and could be increased in their opinion. In response, as of the academic year 2018-2019, the programme management revised the assignments to make them more challenging and included more group and individual assignments in the programme, especially in the leadership strand. As of the academic year 2019-2020, preparatory assignments for the leadership strand will be mandatory, and the governance strand will be expanded with additional lectures and assignments. The panel applauds these initiatives.

In addition, the students indicated (in the student chapter and during the site visit) that they feel the study load is unevenly distributed across the week. Because all contact moments are scheduled on Thursdays and Fridays with classes from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., students feel overwhelmed by the things they have learned and the activities they have done during these two days. They feel that this does not stimulate self-study behaviour, as they first need to unwind before they are ready for next week's classes. At the same time, some students indicated during the site visit that the scheduling of the programme was the exact reason they enrolled, since it enables foreign students to travel back and forth to their home country or combine the programme with a job. The panel believes that an even distribution of contact moments would let students make more use of what the programme has to offer. Students feel more at ease following lectures and doing assignments and will be more motivated to employ self-study behaviour. The panel is happy to see that the programme management is considering a rearrangement of the programme's schedule in order to distribute study load evenly. The panel advises the management not to lose track of the students who enrolled precisely because of this Thursday-Friday schedule. Perhaps the management can come up with alternative options for them, for instance allowing them to attend tutorials virtually or providing lectures online.

Placement and thesis

The students finish the programme by doing a research placement and writing a master's thesis. During the placement (a 10-week internship), they prepare, plan and conduct academic research. With the results of the research, they are able to write their master's thesis. Every placement institution provides a host supervisor, who supports the student daily and monitors their progress. A staff member of the university acts as the primary supervisor, who will eventually grade the thesis. If the students experience practical problems concerning the preparation and execution of the



placement, the programme's placement coordinator provides guidance and support in finding a solution to the issue (e.g. by contacting the host institution).

The programme offers students a list of placement institutions. The list is updated every year by the placement coordinator and provides a short description of every institution. If there are additional requirements (e.g. with regard to language proficiency) or accompanying tasks for the student (e.g. performing administrative or supporting tasks for the institution, not related to the research topic), these are specified on the list. The students apply for a placement institution, by preparing a CV and writing a letter of motivation. In many cases, the host institution decides which student is granted the placement. If the student cannot find a suitable placement, and instead wishes to perform his/her placement at an institution which is not on the list, the placement coordinator verifies whether the quality of research and guidance of that particular institution are up to standard and the student's research plans are feasible. The students indicated that they appreciated this amount of freedom to choose a placement which best fits their interests and ambitions. The programme stimulates students to perform a placement abroad, but an internal placement at the university or at an institution elsewhere in the Netherlands is also allowed. In the cohort of 2017-2018, 79 percent of the students performed the placement outside the Netherlands.

The panel saw the placement lists of two academic years (2016-2017 and 2018-2019) and was very impressed by their magnitude, the numerous possibilities to do a placement abroad, and the diversity of the research assignments presented by the placement institutions. To name a few, institutions from Belgium, Germany, the UK, Portugal, Switzerland and Finland offer several placements on diverse topics such as reforms in healthcare for older people, the effectiveness of management strategies regarding public affairs, drug addiction among refugees, e-cigarettes as a tool to stop smoking, autism and disability policy across Europe. In addition, the panel is pleased with the fact that the students need to motivate their placement's choice. This encourages them to reflect on their own future career plans, choose a research topic/institution that fits those plans, and officially apply for it. By taking these steps, they are better prepared to enter the labour market once they graduate. The panel discovered that the added value of the placement is dependent on the institution where it takes place. During the site visit, alumni indicated that several institutions only wanted them to carry out administrative tasks as a fulltime job and provided no time, support or facilities to do research. In the end, the student was left to perform the thesis on his/her own. Although the panel thinks the students should gain experience in conducting a research project individually, it is also of the opinion that they still need to be supervised and guided in their choices. With a placement that merely provides a place to gain work experience, this is not achieved. The panel urges the programme management to engage in a constructive dialogue with institutions to adjust the conditions of the placement in a way that they provide ample time and support for students to carry out their research plan. It also advises the programme to think about including placements at institutions of a smaller scale. In the list of placement institutions, the panel could only detect well-known institutions, which play major roles in research and global policy making regarding public health. The broad professional field of the programme, where issues on a national level are also considered, should be reflected in the placements provided, in its opinion.

Staff

The panel is very satisfied with the programme's staff. As a result of the previous reaccreditation in 2015, the panel advised the programme management to encourage more staff members to take the University Teaching Qualification (UTQ). According to the panel, the programme's staff has been greatly improved. More staff now have acquired the UTQ (82 percent, as opposed to 55 percent in 2015). The panel could clearly see that education and research are strongly connected to each other: most staff have both educational and research-related tasks, and all core staff is connected to the research institute of the faculty (CAPHRI). Over 90 percent of the staff has obtained a PhD. To get acquainted with the PBL approach, staff members are required to follow introductory courses.

A large portion of the staff is involved in the European public health arena. Staff members are working on consultancy assignments or research projects concerning European public health and/or

participate on WHO boards. This gives the students a unique position to stay informed of the latest developments in the European agenda. Some staff members also shape the European Health agenda as consultants to European institutions and NGOs. As a result, the staff regularly receives cutting-edge information on international health issues. The programme also attracts external experts from universities or organisations related to public health issues, to deliver lectures and/or provide workshops on specific topics regarding their personal expertise. According to the panel, this provides added value, since it helps to keep the programme's content up-to-date and forward-looking. This is also confirmed in the student chapter of the self-evaluation report, where the students indicated that they appreciate the up-to-date 'real-life' examples the lecturers provide. This helps them get an idea of job opportunities after graduation.

During the site visit, the panel talked to several teachers of the programme and concluded that the staff is enthusiastic and engaged. Teachers continuously take into account the various backgrounds of the students, by providing background literature and self-assessments for them to see whether their prior knowledge is sufficient, and offering extra sessions for instruction before the module starts. The student chapter also indicates that the students appreciate how the small cohort size facilitates a personalised approach, with which they receive personal feedback and are able to easily communicate with the staff members in an informal way.

However, both in the student chapter and during the site visit, the students indicated that some courses and modules could be better aligned. For example, some of the external teachers' lectures showed a slight overlap with other courses. Next, tutors do not always seem to be aware of the content of the educational activities outside their tutorial group meetings and the students' prior knowledge. The panel appreciates the monthly meetings of the staff, where this is already an important focal point, and advises the programme to look into ways to effectively streamline essential information on what students already know, and what they should be learning in the next course/module. For instance, a more elaborate mentoring system would be helpful in this respect. During the site visit, the students indicated that the programme's current mentoring sessions show a high degree of overlap with the sessions they had in their bachelor's programme and therefore provided little added value. On the other hand, they appreciated the coaching sessions provided in the leadership strand. The panel thinks that a comprehensive mentoring system, with sessions complementing those in the leadership strand, can benefit not only the students, by guiding them through the programme and helping them with their professional and personal development, it can also benefit the programme. During the mentoring sessions, staff members can question students about the issues they have encountered, such as overlap between courses or modules or high expectations of teachers. Putting those issues on the agenda of the staff's monthly meeting can help fine-tune the programme.

Labour market

The panel ascertained that the programme adequately facilitates students to obtain information about the labour market. For instance, an annual career event offers students information about possible career paths and workshops to help them identify their best employment skills. They can get their CV checked and practice a job interview. Furthermore, alumni of the programme are invited to speak about their current work as a professional on health issues and how the programme has helped them in their career.

During the site visit, the panel spoke to alumni of the programme who indicated that they were hesitant prior to entering the labour market. Although they felt the programme did help them develop several skills such as writing, performing research, problem solving, critical thinking and communicating, they were uncertain whether these skills would be helpful in the professional field. The panel regrets the alumni's uncertainty about their employment opportunities. As stated under standard 1, the programme claims to address the growing demand in the field of having professionals able to interpret and transfer scientific knowledge, identify best practices and support or lead the implementation of those practices in new settings. The students however, seem unaware of the field's demand. According to the panel, the programme can invest more effort in communicating which



specific skills the students develop over the course of the programme, and how these are relevant for what kind of jobs, in order for them to realise that the labour market will welcome them with open arms. It appreciates the guest lectures in this respect. Provided by professionals working in relevant organisations within the public health domain, these lectures give students an idea about what kind of jobs they could be doing once they graduate. Additionally, the field trip to Luxembourg facilitates several networking opportunities. The panel is also pleased to see that the faculty has appointed a taskforce on Employability and Post-graduate Education to further intensify the programme's contact with alumni and make career paths more visible to the students.

Considerations

The panel is positive about the PBL concept, since it helps students familiarise themselves with skills essential to becoming leaders in the professional field, such as critical thinking and argumentation. Additionally, the multilingual and multicultural diversity of the student population adds to the educational context of the programme.

The panel is satisfied with the overall curriculum and applauds the way the programme decided to focus on Europe, while at the same time not losing sight of the global health perspective. It appreciates the revision of the first module which diminished the overlap with the matching bachelor's programme and applauds the plans to improve the module further. The panel suggests reinstating the electives in the curriculum. Overall, as the programme progresses, there is a gradual build-up of knowledge and skills. The panel specifically appreciates the leadership strand, because it helps the students to develop 'soft skills' which they will need later in their professional career. The programme facilitates networking opportunities and acquaints students with stakeholders and their professional future through an annual symposium and a field trip. This is appreciated by the panel.

Students conclude the programme by doing a research placement and writing a master's thesis. The panel was very impressed with the number of options at which the students could do their placement. It discovered that the added value of the placement is dependent on the institution at which the placement takes place and urges the programme management to demand that all institutions provide students with ample time and support to be able to carry out their research plan.

The panel ascertained that the programme is feasible. For some students, the programme is not demanding enough. The panel applauds the initiatives to increase the study workload, for instance by making assignments more challenging. The panel encourages the programme management to reflect further on possibilities of developing a more challenging and tailored programme for students.

The panel is very satisfied with the programme's staff. A large portion of the staff is involved in the European public health arena. The programme also attracts external experts from universities or organisations related to public health issues, to help keep the programme's content up-to-date and give students an idea of job opportunities after graduation.

The panel regrets the alumni's uncertainty about entering the labour market and it encourages the initiatives of the programme and the faculty to address this issue.

Conclusion

Master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health: the panel assesses Standard 2 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 3: Student assessment

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

Findings

The programme uses the PBL approach as a point of departure to design the various modes of assessment. The concepts of the PBL system, such as contextual learning and collaborative learning, serve as basic principles in designing the programme's assessment plan. The panel ascertained that the programme has a varied programme of assessment in place. Throughout tutorials, students are asked to conduct assignments to make sure they develop the competencies that fit the intended learning outcomes. Written exams test their knowledge, while paper assignments assess their skills to integrate and apply their knowledge. A combination of individual or group papers and presentations is used to make pass/fail decisions on modules. The panel viewed an assessment matrix which demonstrated that all intended learning outcomes of the programme are being assessed throughout the separate modules. For each module, the assessment is described, along with the conditions for passing the module. Not only is a sufficient grade needed for every separate part of the exam, teachers also check for the student's active participation in all educational activities. At the start of the programme, the students formulate a Personal Development Plan (PDP) which pays attention to their personal and professional development, such as performance in a group and other skills related to leadership/student-led activities. During the course of the programme, the students continuously receive constructive feedback from peers and teachers on their individual and group performance, using a 360-degree feedback questionnaire. And fitting the programme's aim, specific attention is paid to leadership and group skills. This supports them in their personal and professional development.

The panel appreciates the thorough check of all assignments. All module exams and assignments are composed by the module coordinator in collaboration with 3-5 group members. Before the students take any written exam, it is presented to an Exam Review Committee, which provides advice on the wording of items and assignments, test length, relevance/content of test items, quality of assessment criteria and answer keys. This is especially the case when multiple choice exam questions are used. The Board of Examiners checks all course assessment plans to ensure the method of grading is correct and transparent.

Board of Examiners Health

The Board of Examiners Health (BoE-H) acts for all programmes related to the domain of Health. In total, it serves 1700 students. The Board consists of a daily Executive Board (chair, vice-chair and a secretary) which meets every week. The full BoE-H (the Executive Board accompanied by four members from the educational programmes in the health domain plus an external member) meets every six weeks. The Board regularly meets with the programme management, to hear about current issues or changes in the programme.

The panel was able to ascertain that the BoE-H adequately handles all of its legally mandated tasks and has adopted a more proactive attitude since the previous re-accreditation of the programme. It appoints examiners who administer and determine the results of examinations and checks the assessment plans of the modules every year to see whether the intended learning outcomes matched to the modules are indeed assessed. The panel was pleased to see that the BoE-H is aware of the need to review the programme-wide assessment plan and it decided to discuss the Board's plans in that respect in more detail during the site visit. Both parties agreed that investigating the content of the programme's assessment from beginning to end could be beneficial in many ways. For instance, the Board would be able to examine the number of modules in which particular intended learning outcomes are assessed, thus controlling the robustness of the programme. It would also be able to investigate whether the programme's assessment shows a gradual build-up over time in terms of difficulty. The panel appreciates the Board's plans to become more proactive in this respect, and encourages it to continue to take concrete steps in that direction.



Thesis assessment

The panel is satisfied with the thesis grading process. The thesis is graded by two examiners independently. The primary thesis supervisor, a UM staff member, acts as the first examiner. The second examiner can be either a staff member or the host supervisor at the research placement institution. When the latter is the case, the BoE-H checks this person's credentials (e.g. having obtained a PhD) in order to ensure the examiner's professional quality. Both examiners grade the thesis' content. When the examiners differ in grading by more than two points, a third examiner is consulted. The primary thesis supervisor also grades the student's work on collecting the data during the research placement and writing the thesis (on criteria such as ability to work independently, finding solutions to problems, processing the supervisor's feedback). Both grades need to be at least a 6.0 to pass the placement and thesis period; the grade on content determines 75 percent of the final grade. The panel was pleased to see that all thesis supervisors are provided with information about the thesis assessment by the placement coordinator, so that they are informed about the procedure and the digital assessment environment. In addition, the supervisors receive a document with information on the placement and thesis requirements. This document is also provided to the students.

Prior to the site visit, the panel read a selection of theses and the accompanying assessment forms. In general, the assessment forms were clear and insightful in terms of the final grade. For some of the theses, the panel considered the grade to be a bit too generous. The panel was satisfied with how the form asks the examiner to rate different criteria (i.e. problem statement, chosen method, results, discussion of the results, and overall structure and lay-out). Although the panel suggests using a grading system rather than minus and plus signs for the criteria, assessing different aspects of the thesis enhances the transparency and validity of the grading. The panel would like to suggest a further elaboration of these criteria though. Right now, the criteria only state the aspects on which the grading is done. If the assessment form would elaborate more, by stating clearly what is expected in terms of the use of literature, methodological choices, and the interpretation of the data, this would enhance the objective grading even further. Prior to the site visit, the programme presented rubrics at the panel's request, which are currently being used as a test to try to support the examiners. According to the panel, the rubrics greatly elucidate the assessment's criteria, and so it advises the programme management to make the rubrics a permanent component of the assessment process. Additionally, it would like to suggest more tailored rubrics, to make them reflect the master's level. For instance, the rubrics can state the desired complexity of the research question or the difficulty level of research methods. This will enhance not only consistent grading, but will also allow for an optimal transparency towards the students with regard to the expectations of their thesis.

On some forms, the examiner's explanation was very short. In addition, there were sometimes large differences in grading between the first and second examiner. Although there is a good system in place to resolve issues concerning differences in grading (a third examiner is appointed), the panel agrees with the programme that further action need to be taken to safeguard fair and reliable grades. It therefore applauds the programme's calibration sessions, which started in the spring of 2019. During these sessions, the teachers are asked to grade the same two theses and discuss their differences in grading. The aim of the session is to come to a better agreement on how to interpret the assessment forms and when a thesis or examination should pass or not. The result is a higher inter-examiner reliability. The panel is pleased to see that these sessions have started discussions on grading. Although inter-examiner reliability can never be 100 percent, it is very satisfied with the effort of the programme to secure consistent, transparent and fair grading.

The panel would like to make a comment on the character of the theses. In the sample it studied, many theses involved a literature reviews. During the site visit, the panel asked students and staff why this is the most commonly chosen research method. In its opinion, a literature review befits a bachelor's programme well, but in the master's programme, students should be expected to set up their own research, gather data, and analyse and interpret the results. Although thesis supervisors set higher standards for master's theses than bachelor's theses, the panel thinks performing a research method other than a literature review would substantially add to the skills and knowledge

of the students. In its opinion, the choice for a literature review seemed to be related to the sometimes limited support provided by the placement institution (see standard 2). In these cases, setting up a research plan and gathering and interpreting raw data would most likely result in study delay, since the student has to face all this on his/her own. Therefore, choosing a literature review seems a good solution to prevent this from happening. The panel suspects that when the programme asks the institutions to support students with their research, the students will be more inclined to set up a research plan in which they will be collecting their own data in the field.

Considerations

The panel ascertained that the programme has a varied programme of assessment in place. It saw an assessment matrix which demonstrates that all intended learning outcomes of the programme are being assessed throughout the separate modules. The panel appreciates the thorough check of all exams of the programme.

The BoE-H adequately handles all of its legally mandated tasks. Since the previous re-accreditation, it has adopted a more proactive attitude, and the panel encourages the board to continue taking concrete steps to review the assessment plan of the programme as a whole, in order to check for the robustness and the difficulty level build-up of the assessments.

The panel is satisfied with the grading process of the thesis. The programme provides all thesis supervisors with information about the essential procedures for the assessment. Furthermore, thesis supervisors and students are provided with information on placement and thesis requirements.

According to the panel, the assessment form used for the thesis assessment is clear and insightful in terms of the final grade. It asks the examiner to assess different aspects of the thesis, which enhances the transparency and validity of the grading. The panel suggests elaborating on these criteria, for instance by adopting the already introduced rubrics, to allow for more consistent grading and more transparency towards the students with regard to the expectations of their thesis.

The panel was surprised to see that, in their sample of theses, many involved a literature review. It suggests that the programme examine how students could be better facilitated to perform other research methods, since that would substantially add to the skills and knowledge of the students, resulting in outstanding theses.

The panel applauds the programme's effort to secure consistent, transparent and fair grading. The calibration sessions deserve special mention in this respect. During these sessions, the examiners come to a better agreement on how to interpret the assessment forms and when a thesis or examination should pass or not.

Conclusion

Master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health: the panel assesses Standard 3 as 'satisfactory'.

Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

Findings

To assess whether graduates have achieved the programme's intended learning outcomes, the panel studied 15 recent theses to verify the achievement level of the graduates. The performance level of graduates in the professional field was taken into consideration.

Theses

According to the panel, the theses of the master's programme meet the appropriate academic master's level. The panel saw many theses with well-chosen, relevant topics, reflecting the broad



scope of the domain of European public health. A couple of theses even presented ground-breaking work on unknown territory. In general, many of the theses provide interesting findings which the students analysed extensively on a mature level. On the other hand, the way the thesis' results were related to the professional field could have been better elaborated in some cases. The panel is impressed by the overall quality of the master's theses, however.

As previously mentioned, the thesis sample of the panel involved many literature reviews (see standard 3). The panel would like the programme to invite students to (also) perform other research methods for their thesis. This will make students capitalise on their full potential, which will most likely result in theses that stand out even more.

Career

After reading the theses and speaking to alumni of the master's programme, the panel concluded that graduates demonstrated that they had met the intended learning outcomes at the expected level. During the site visit, the panel talked to alumni about their career path after graduation. Many alumni indicated being insecure about entering the labour market (see standard 2). However, once they found a job, they realised the added value of the programme: they were able to do research, write scientific papers, and collaborate in an interdisciplinary team very easily. Alumni are employed in a broad range of positions such as PhD-candidate, project manager or policy advisor, and in a variety of organisations such as NGOs, consultancies, universities and pharmaceutical or medical device companies. Many students get a job offer in their placement institution when they graduate.

The career paths of alumni are varied, which reflects the broad scope of the programme and indicates the programme surpasses a mere focus on educating students for future leadership positions. This is appreciated, since the panel feels it is unrealistic to expect that alumni can apply for or will be offered a leading position in an organisation or company right at the beginning of their career. This may explain the expressed uncertainty. Additionally, the panel is of the opinion that the programme currently uses a somewhat narrow definition of 'leadership'. As stated under standard 2, the panel suggests further improving the curriculum by addressing different forms of leadership, reflection on what leadership means, and ethics. This can benefit the alumni when entering the job market.

Considerations

The panel is impressed by the overall quality of the master's theses. Many of the theses provide interesting findings on well-chosen topics. To allow students to capitalise on their potential, the panel would like the programme to stimulate the use of a variety of research methods applied during the thesis research period. Particularly, the use of research methods other than literature reviews should be further encouraged.

After reading the theses and speaking to alumni of the master's programme, the panel concluded that graduates demonstrated that they have met the intended learning outcomes at the expected level. Alumni are employed in a broad range of positions, reflecting the broad scope of the programme. Many students get a job offer in their placement institution when they graduate.

Conclusion

Master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health: the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'good'.

GENERAL CONCLUSION

The panel assesses standards 1 and 4 of the *master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health* as 'good'.

The panel assesses standards 2 and 3 of the *master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health* as 'satisfactory'.

According to the NVAO's Assessment Framework 2016, the overall assessment of the programme is therefore 'good'.

Conclusion

The panel assesses the *master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health* as 'good'.



APPENDICES



APPENDIX 1: DOMAIN-SPECIFIC FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE

In order to make its ruling, the committee will draw on the same general referential framework used during the self-evaluations of the different academic programmes. Each of the points outlined herein broadly demonstrate the relevance of these items. While this scheme will be applied to all academic programmes, the programmes themselves differ from one another in several ways: the academic content, structure, level (i.e. bachelor/master) and the future career prospects of each programme help determine the layout and design of the individual curricula.

Domain

The international programmes at stake are rooted firmly in the notion that health issues are not confined within the borders of the traditional nation state. Travel, open borders, migration, brain drain, export of technologies and know-how, distribution of international protocols guidelines and standards, and new forms of transnational and transdisciplinary collaboration, are all examples of the international dynamics of health, health risk, and health care. Furthermore, the arrival of new actors in the international arena challenges the traditional distribution of economic and political power and reshapes or dissolves existing public-private relationships. Resulting in new inequalities, impacting existing health care systems and strategies, and adding new dimensions to notions of environment, these international dynamics require new forms of governance and accountability. They also require new approaches to programme management and policy making in order to ensure equity and quality in the distribution of health services.

Obtaining understanding of the complexities involved in those changing international dimensions of health and health risk is core to both international programmes. Looking for ways to tackle these new complexities, both international programmes turn to current approaches and strategies to critically assess their adaptability in diverse and dynamic settings across Europe and across the globe.

Seeking to add analytical tools to help grasp international dimensions to current approaches and strategies, the programmes focus on actions and interventions that require collective, collaborative or organised actions for sustained population-wide health improvement. Highlighting the need to embed "healthy" research, policies and practice not only in the area of health and health care policymaking but in other relevant policy fields (e.g. market, food, regional and global developments) as well, the FHML's international programmes identify the goals of public health as population-wide health improvement and the reduction of health inequities.

European Health

The programme in European (Public) Health bridges the gap between public health science on the one hand and European, national, and global public health developments and policies on the other hand. The programme is not limited to academic and theoretical notions only, but concentrates also on the activities of European and global public health institutions.

The mission of the programme is to train students to become specialists in European (Public) Health. These specialists should be capable of appreciating, analysing and comprehending the impact of European and transnational integration on public health, health systems, health services. They should be skilled at conducting and applying comparative research on European epidemiology and public health care systems. Also, they should have an understanding of the important historical and health implications of the Cold-War Era (e.g. the 'East-West split') with its implications for modern-day, unified Europe.

The overall aim of the European (Public) Health programme is to provide students with cutting-edge knowledge, academic insights and entrepreneurial skills, in the field of public health and health care systems within a broad international and European perspective. Graduates will be able to make a positive and constructive contribution to dealing with the issues raised by a European agenda for public health and/or by intentions at national level to adopt or anticipate that agenda. They will be

able to take up employment within the wider public health field in an internationally oriented labour market.

Global Health

Globalisation itself is a phenomenon of all times. But whereas globalisation over the past centuries divided the world into South and North, i.e. a developing versus a developed world, current trends tend to erase these boundaries. Due to trade, migration, travelling, and the rise of broadly accessible communication and information technologies, new "virtual communities" come into being.

Communities are no longer restricted to geographical locations, and "North" and "South" and "local and global" are getting "mixed up". Along with disappearance of traditional boundaries, local settings are confronted with the introduction of technologies, knowledge, standards, guidelines, and protocols developed elsewhere, often based on alien but implicit notions of what is normal, what is wrong, what is needed, and what needs to be done. The introduction of these "alien" elements changes (health, health risks and health care in) those local settings forever. Moreover, confrontation with transnational issues such as pandemics, disaster and conflict require intensified collaboration and the arrival of private actors in the field and the rise of public private partnership require new formats for international relationships. Along with shifting power relations they change the meaning and the functions of the traditional nation state - and of national identity.

The global health programme aims at providing the tools to help understand these international dynamics and their impact on the health of individuals and populations across the globe. These tools do not only help to analyse transnational political economy of pandemics, disaster, pollution, and conflict, and the role of the international, national and local actors therein, but also help to grasp how global-local interaction helps to shape local health across the globe. The programme's critical reflection on the applicability of existing strategies, models and concepts, for action in the context of these dynamics does not only invite its students to rethink traditional solutions, but also challenges them to contribute to the invention of new ones.

Professional focus

A Global or European (Public) Health programme does not qualify one to become a doctor, psychologist or any other type of healthcare practitioner. Equipped with the analytical and critical tools described above, the international programmes' graduates will be ready to effectively function as project and programme managers, researchers, policymakers, lobbyists, consultants and innovators in the international health arena.

As the programmes are characterised by their broad, multidisciplinary perspectives, they also offer a wide array of future career prospects, allowing graduates to enter positions that enable them to contribute to this area in particular. Some of these graduates will enter into policy-making or management positions on a national or international level, in government institutions, trade organisations, patient organisations or insurance companies. Other graduates may choose to lend their expertise to healthcare institutions and international consultancy groups, working as staff members or managers. With career prospects like these, it is safe to assume that the academic programme pays sufficient attention to the skills that allow students to operate effectively within these settings. Some graduates may even choose to enter into academic professions and positions. These students are expected to have honed the necessary skills to successfully develop such a career in future.

Domain-specific knowledge and insights

Global or European (Public) Health graduates should demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the following:

- Have a robust interdisciplinary and advanced knowledge and understanding of health and healthcare issues;
- Have knowledge and understanding of the changing boundaries between nature-culture;



biomedical and social sciences and of the way these changes impact (international) health, health risk and health care, as well as society;

- Have knowledge and understanding of the changing and dynamic boundaries between North-South; East-West, local-global; private-public and of the threats and opportunities these changes pose for European and/or global collaboration, and national, European or global policy;
- Be able to analyse complex disciplinary, multi- and interdisciplinary health and healthcare problems, in terms of actors and factors;
- Have acquired a mind-set that is capable of analysis of complex global health problems by considering the different explanations, methods, and interventions from different paradigms;
- Have knowledge and understanding of populations health status including shifting health threats and health and disease patterns as well as developments in healthcare systems;
- Have advanced knowledge of qualitative and quantitative research methodology and of epidemiology, including comparative, cross-national and cross-cultural research methods;
- Have acquired conceptual tools which help to analyse and understand the impact of epidemiological, biological and social phenomena on health, health risks and healthcare;
- Have acquired a mind-set that is capable of considering the different explanations, methods, and interventions from different paradigms, thus informing complex and multiple approaches by drawing together different disciplines and avoiding fractional and ad-hoc conclusions;
- Be able to apply concepts, principles, and approaches pertaining to global and European health(care) problems to bridge the implementation gap;
- Be able to develop, plan, implement, monitor, evaluate and adjust international health policies and interventions;
- Be able to apply knowledge of methodology, epidemiology and statistics in designing, conducting, analysing and interpreting an empirical or bibliographical study into a subject relevant to the field of global or European health.

Formation of a judgement

Global or European (Public) Health graduates should demonstrate their formation of a judgement of the following:

- Be able to use conceptual knowledge and analytical tools acquired throughout the programme to assess policies, regulations, interventions, programmes and other initiatives related to Europe and/or global health (management);
- Be able to apply methodological, epidemiological and statistical knowledge to the assessment of the quality of scientific studies and scientific data.

Skills

Global or European (Public) Health graduates have good writing and communication skills (in English) by being capable of communicating about research and problem solutions with confreres, stakeholders, and the public.

Global or European (Public) Health graduates:

- Communicate effectively with a diverse and international circle of professionals in academia, politics, bureaucracies and field organizations;
- Function effectively in international, intercultural and interdisciplinary teams to provide leadership, create partnerships, and participate in professional networks;
- To act as a (project) leader or use basic leadership skills.

APPENDIX 2: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

A. Knowledge and understanding

Intended Learning Outcome		Module*								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	have a robust interdisciplinary and advanced knowledge in health and healthcare issues of different European nations and regions;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		
2.	be capable of understanding and interpreting the historic background of the field of study;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
3.	have knowledge and understanding of populations health status and national or regional healthcare arrangements and provisions within the WHO European Region including shifting health threats and health and disease patterns as well as developments in healthcare systems;		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
4.	have knowledge and understanding of the changing and dynamic boundaries between;									
a.	north and south and east and west in the European region;	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	
b.	local, regional, national, international, European and global policies and strategies with respect to health and healthcare;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
c.	private and public approaches and interests;		√			√		√	√	
d.	(bio-)medical and social sciences approaches of health problems and healthcare practices;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
e.	health and healthcare seen from various dynamic viewpoints like public health, economics, culture, politics, etcetera;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
5.	have knowledge and understanding of how these changes and dynamics have their impact on health and healthcare in the European Region and in a global perspective;			√				√	√	
6.	be able to analyse complex disciplinary, multi- and interdisciplinary health and healthcare problems, in terms of actors and factors;	√	√	√	√	√		√	√	
7.	have knowledge and understanding of the interconnection between health problems and solutions at a global, European, national, regional and local level;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√

1. Introduction to Governance and Leadership in European Public Health, 2. Measuring and Comparing Health in Europe: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches, 3. Identifying and Assessing Good and Best Practices in Health, 4. Europe as one Zone: European Health Law and Policies, 5. Research Methods, 6. Diffusion, Implementation and Quality Assurance of Health Innovations in Europe, 7. Global Health Management, 8. The EU, Enlargement and Global Health, 9. Research Project and Master's Thesis.



Intended Learning Outcome	Module								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
8. have knowledge and understanding how to define indicators and establish indicator sets used to monitor and detect e.g. health determinants, populations' health status and health inequalities, different healthcare provisions and healthcare consumption;		√	√		√	√			
9. have knowledge and understanding of the history of European health and healthcare, of migration (from a population genetics point of view) and of the related indicators, data and statistics;	√	√	√			√			√
10. have conceptual tools at their disposal which help to analyse and understand the impact of epidemiological, biological and social phenomena impacts on health, health risks and healthcare;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
11. have conceptual tools which help to analyse and understand the interplay between local, national and international social, political and economic arrangements and institutions in relation to the formation and implementation of health strategies and the formation of healthcare systems and services;					√	√	√	√	√
12. have conceptual tools that help to appreciate and understand recent transformations and reconfigurations in health and healthcare in Europe;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
13. have knowledge and understanding of the interplay between developments in science and technology, and cultural, political, social and economic processes in the contemporary era and how the results of this interplay impact health, health risk and healthcare delivery in Europe;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	
14. have knowledge and understanding as well as appreciation of various research designs and techniques that make valid comparative studies possible of various aspects of health and healthcare on and between different levels;		√		√		√			√
15. have advanced knowledge of qualitative and quantitative research methodology and of epidemiology, including comparative, cross-national and cross-cultural research methods;		√	√			√	√		√
16. have knowledge and understanding as well as appreciation of various intervention study designs for intervening in and controlling behaviour, organisational and societal determinants of health;				√	√	√	√		
17. acquire a mind-set that is capable of analysis of complex health status, systems and services problems by considering the different explanations, methods, and interventions from different paradigms;		√	√		√	√	√		
18. have knowledge and understanding of the relation between cultural backgrounds on the one hand and the perception and framing of health problems and solutions on the other;	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
19. have knowledge and understanding of the structure and practice and governance of international institutions, i.e. European institutions, including regulations and incentives, as political and economic mechanisms;	√					√		√	
20. have knowledge and understanding of the potential benefits of research, academic research methods and techniques;	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	
21. Have knowledge, skills and attitudes related to the theory and practice of contemporary public health leadership.	√	√	√	√	√				

B. Applying knowledge and understanding

Intended Learning Outcome		Module								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
22.	acquire a mind-set that is capable of considering the different explanations, methods, and interventions from different paradigms, thus informing complex and multiple approaches by drawing together different disciplines and avoiding fractional and ad-hoc insights and conclusions;	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
23.	be able to apply concepts, principles, and approaches pertaining to international and European health (care) problems to bridge the implementation gap;	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
24.	be able to develop, plan, implement, monitor, evaluate and adjust international health policies and interventions;		✓		✓		✓			
25.	be able to apply knowledge of methodology, epidemiology and statistics in designing, conducting, analysing and interpreting an empirical or bibliographical study into a subject relevant to the field of international health;		✓	✓			✓			
26.	have experience with health analysis and interventions including research methods and techniques;	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
27.	have experience with regulations and incentives as the core basic political and economic mechanisms;			✓	✓	✓	✓			
28.	be capable of analysing the ethical and normative aspects of the consequences of scientific thinking and acting and discussing them with confreres and non- confreres and integrate these aspects into their own scientific work;	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
29.	be capable of analysing the consequences of scientific thinking and professional acting;		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
30.	be capable of analysing the social consequences (economic, social, political, cultural) of new developments in the field of study and discussing them with confreres and non-confreres and integrating these consequences into the scientific work;	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
31.	be able to critically reflect (independently) on their own thinking, decisions, competencies and actions and adjust them.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓



C. Making Judgements

Intended Learning Outcome		Module								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
32.	be able to use conceptual knowledge and analytical tools acquired throughout the programme to assess policies, regulations, interventions, programmes and other initiatives related to European health, Governance and leadership (management);	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
33.	acquire an original and critical style of scientific thinking and analysis and professional intervening;			✓	✓		✓	✓		✓
34.	be able to apply methodological, epidemiological and statistical knowledge to the assessment of the quality of scientific studies and scientific data;		✓	✓			✓	✓		✓
35.	be capable of anticipating and analysing the consequences of one's own professional decisions and actions and to be capable when necessary of reviewing their own professional knowledge;					✓		✓	✓	✓
36.	be able to choose a place as a professional in society.		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

D. Communicating

Intended Learning Outcome		Module								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
37.	be able to communicate and debate effectively with a diverse and international circle of professionals in academia, politics, bureaucracies and field organisations;	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		
38.	be able to work in a team, to create partnerships, and to participate in professional networks;	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
39.	have excellent writing and communication skills (in English) by being capable of communicating about research and problem solutions with confreres, stakeholders, and the public;		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
40.	be able to act as a (project)leader or use basic leadership skills.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓

E. Learning Skills

Intended Learning Outcome		Module								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
41.	acquire an attitude of life-long learning and to be able to use the acquired skills throughout professional life.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

APPENDIX 3: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Master Governance and Leadership in European Public Health 2018-2019				
Leadership Strand 6 EC				
1. Introduction to Governance and Leadership in European Public Health	2. Measuring and Comparing Health in Europe Quantitative and Qualitative approaches	3. Identifying and Assessing Good and Best Practices in Health	4. Europe as one Zone: European Health Law and Policies	5. Research Methods
4 weeks 5 EC	4 weeks 5 EC	4 weeks 5 EC	4 weeks 5 EC	4 weeks 6 EC
Governance Strand				
6. Diffusion, Implementation and Quality Assurance of Health Innovations in Europe	7. Global Health Management	8. The EU, Enlargement and Global Health	9. Research Project and Masters' Thesis	
4 weeks 6 EC	4 weeks 4 EC	2 weeks 3 EC	10 weeks - 15 EC	
Governance Strand			Governance and Leadership in European Public Health	



APPENDIX 4: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

Note: all programmes within the cluster International Health were visited by the assessment panel on 3 and 4 June 2019. Therefore, meetings with students, staff and alumni from other programmes not discussed in this report are also mentioned.

Monday 3 June 2019		
8.45	09.00	Welcome at Porter's desk UNS40
09.00	10.30	Initial panel meeting
10.30	11.30	Meeting with management IH
11.30	12.15	Lunch
12.15	13.00	Meeting with students BEPH
13.00	13.45	Meeting with staff BEPH
13.45	14.15	Break
14.15	14.45	Meeting with alumni MGH (6 alumni via Blackboard Collaborate)
14.45	15.30	Meeting with students MGH
15.30	16.15	Meeting with staff MGH
16.15	16.30	Break
16.30	17.00	Meeting with alumni MGLEPH (2 alumni via Blackboard Collaborate)
17.00	17.45	Meeting with students MGLEPH
17.45	18.30	Meeting with staff MGLEPH

Tuesday 4 June 2019		
9.00	10.00	Internal panel meeting
10.00	10.30	Meeting with members Education Programme Committee Health
10.30	11.15	Meeting with members Board of Examiners Health
11.15	11.45	Break
11.45	12.30	Concluding meeting with management IH
12.30	13.15	Lunch
13.15	14.45	Internal panel meeting
14.45	15.15	Development dialogue BEPH
15.15	15.45	Development dialogue MGH
15.45	16.15	Development dialogue MGLEPH
16.15	16.30	Break
16.30	16.45	Reporting provisional findings by panel chair: Tongerenzaal (UNS40), main floor
16.45		Reception Drielandenpunt (UNS40)

APPENDIX 5: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

Prior to the site visit, the panel studied 15 theses of the master's programme Governance and Leadership in European Public Health. Information on the selected theses is available from QANU upon request.

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

- Domain specific frame of reference
- Description of the content of all modules and trajectories
- Numbers on student intake (nationality, prior education) (2013-2018)
- Survival and completion rates (2013-2018)
- Results of course evaluation (2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018)
- Overview of staff
- Calibration sessions reports
- Education and Examination Regulations
- Rules and Regulations
- Rubrics on the assessment of the master's theses
- Lists of placement institutions (2016-2017 and 2018-2019)
- Annual report Board of Examiners Health 2017-2018
- Annual report Education Programme Committee 2017-2018
- All course information of the programme (2018-2019) was made digitally available via a laptop which was provided by the university during the site visit. For the following modules, the materials were also present in hardcopy:
 - Measuring and Comparing Health in Europe
 - Leadership Strand
 - Diffusion, Implementation and Quality Assurance of Health Innovations in Europe



