

**BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME**

**EUROPEAN STUDIES**

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

**MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY**

QANU  
Catharijnesingel 56  
PO Box 8035  
3503 RA Utrecht  
The Netherlands

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

Project number: Q0722

© 2020 QANU

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



# CONTENTS

<b>REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME EUROPEAN STUDIES OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME.....	5
ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION.....	5
COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	5
WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL .....	6
SUMMARY JUDGEMENT.....	9
DESCRIPTION OF THE STANDARDS FROM THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK FOR LIMITED FRAMEWORK ASSESSMENTS.....	11
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>21</b>
APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES .....	23
APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM .....	24
APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT .....	25
APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL .....	26

This report was finalised on 14 April 2020





# REPORT ON THE BACHELOR'S PROGRAMME EUROPEAN STUDIES OF MAASTRICHT UNIVERSITY

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

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE PROGRAMME

### Bachelor's programme European Studies

Name of the programme:	Europese studies
International name:	European Studies
CROHO number:	56051
Level of the programme:	bachelor's
Orientation of the programme:	academic
Number of credits:	180 EC
Specialisations or tracks:	not applicable
Location(s):	Maastricht
Mode(s) of study:	full time
Language of instruction:	English
Submission deadline NVAO:	01/05/2020

The visit of the assessment panel History and International Relations to the Faculty of Arts and Social sciences of Maastricht University took place from the 11<sup>th</sup> of December until the 13<sup>th</sup> of December 2019.

## ADMINISTRATIVE DATA REGARDING THE INSTITUTION

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

## COMPOSITION OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

The NVAO has approved the composition of the panel on the 4<sup>th</sup> of February 2019. The panel that assessed the bachelor's programme European Studies consisted of:

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

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

## WORKING METHOD OF THE ASSESSMENT PANEL

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

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

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

### *Panel members*

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

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

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

### *Preparation*

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

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

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

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

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

### *Site visit*

The site visit to Maastricht University took place from the 11<sup>th</sup> until the 13<sup>th</sup> of December 2019. During the site visit, the panel studied the additional documents provided by the programmes. An overview of these materials can be found in Appendix 4. The panel conducted interviews with representatives of the programmes: students and staff members, the programme's management, alumni and representatives of the Board of Examiners. It also offered students and staff members an opportunity for confidential discussion during a consultation hour. Two students asked to speak to the panel and the chair and secretary had conversations with them at the start of the site visit.

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

### *Consistency and calibration*

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

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

### *Report*

After the site visit, the secretary wrote a draft report based on the panel's findings and submitted it to the project coordinator for peer assessment. Subsequently, the secretary sent the report to the panel. After processing the panel members' feedback, the project coordinator sent the draft reports to the Faculty in order to have these checked for factual irregularities. The project coordinator



discussed the ensuing comments with the panel's chair and changes were implemented accordingly. The report was then finalised and sent to the Faculty and University Board.

#### *Definition of judgements standards*

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

#### **Generic quality**

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

#### **Meets the standard**

The programme meets the generic quality standard.

#### **Partially meets the standard**

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

#### **Does not meet the standard**

The programme does not meet the generic quality standard.

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

#### **Positive**

The programme meets all the standards.

#### **Conditionally positive**

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

#### **Negative**

In the following situations:

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



## SUMMARY JUDGEMENT

### *Standard 1*

With the combination of a broad profile and problem-based learning, the bachelor's programme European Studies at Maastricht University has created its own niche. The panel commends this as something of which to be proud. The panel recommends the programme making its 'unique selling points' more visible in order to attract new students. The intended learning outcomes are a good reflection of the programme's profile, in the panel's view, and they are of the proper level and orientation for an academic bachelor's programme. The panel is convinced that with the increasing importance of Europe as a political, legal, cultural and economic entity, the knowledge and skills that are taught in this programme are relevant for future professional careers. That the intended learning outcomes remain relevant is guarded by the External Advisory Board. During its site visit, the panel recommended to the programme management to rethink, reformulate and reposition the concept of interdisciplinarity within the programme, which it accepted.

### *Standard 2*

The panel has a very favourable impression of the teaching-learning environment within the bachelor's programme. It finds the curriculum is effectively structured, with a balanced combination of mandatory courses giving solidity to the programme, and electives and problem-based learning method offering students the flexibility to pursue their own learning path. The problem-based learning method seems to work well. The tutor groups are already international, but in the panel's view could be made even more diverse. The panel encourages the programme in its plans to apply flexibility in the problem-based learning method for the skills courses. It also agrees with the idea of honouring student requests for more free space in the curriculum, if this can be achieved without a loss of quality.

The panel found that staff are sufficiently equipped for their tasks, and dedicated and welcoming, and so held in high regard by their students. Both students and staff experience a high workload in this bachelor's programme, but the panel found that programme management is well aware of this and committed to finding solutions. Student guidance is excellent, in the panel's view, and programme-specific services are satisfactory. All in all, the panel judges that the learning environment in the bachelor's programme European Studies is stimulating and well-managed. It enables students to realise the intended learning outcomes.

### *Standard 3*

The panel is unanimously impressed by the positive changes the programme has made in recent years. Assessment procedures have been redesigned and formalised, so that elements exhibit state-of-the-art practices that could serve as sources of inspiration and models of emulation for other programmes. The assessment calibration workshops are an example of such best practice, as is the role of the 'responsible examiner' in thesis assessment and the efficient and effective *modus operandi* of the Board of Examiners.

Quality of assessment is soundly assured, the panel found. The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences developed an assessment policy which specifies all roles and responsibilities and sets the standards for various assessment procedures. The programme's Education Plan explicitly connects forms of assessment to courses and intended learning outcomes. The Board of Examiners assures that the intended learning outcomes are realised by performing regular checks, screenings and audits. In addition to a recurring agenda of quality checks, the Board of Examiners chooses a specific focus point each year on which it advises the programme management. As such, the panel concludes that the Board of Examiners safeguards the quality of assessment and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes and thus carries out its formal tasks well.

At course level, the assessment methods are sufficiently varied and effective. Achieving consistency in the award of the extra half point for class preparation and participation in tutor groups still poses a challenge. The panel is convinced that this problem can and will be solved, as was already done



for the master's programme European Studies on Society, Science and Technology which has introduced a set of criteria. The panel notes that marks higher than eight are rarely given which is an issue that deserves consideration and discussion.

The panel considers thesis assessment on the whole satisfactory. It found the grading generally reliable, the procedures well-described and it appreciated the generous amount and high quality of feedback given to students. The panel also values that the responsible examiner is not the thesis supervisor, so that he or she can form a more independent judgement. For further improvement, the panel recommends explicitly differentiating the first and second examiner's judgement. It also recommends aligning the criteria on the thesis assessment forms more directly with the intended learning outcomes. In general, the panel concludes that the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments meet the standard.

#### *Standard 4*

The panel gathered from a sample of recently completed theses, alumni surveys and from its interview of alumni, that the bachelor's programme European Studies provides students with a broad knowledge base, adequate academic skills and valuable competences. It found the theses of variable quality, but even the weaker theses were of a sufficiently passable academic level. It has seen convincing evidence that students are accepted into a broad range of master's programmes and are trained in key skills such as teamwork, flexibility and creativity in problem-solving. The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

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

#### *Bachelor's programme European Studies*

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

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

Date: 14 April 2020

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

## **Standard 1: Intended learning outcomes**

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

## **Findings**

### *Profile*

The bachelor's programme European Studies at Maastricht University aims to train critical analysts of the political, legal, historic, economic and cultural aspects of Europe. Its graduates are able to understand complex contemporary European processes such as economic crises, international migration or the rise of populism. They acquire this skill by learning about European wars over the past centuries and how these have affected state-building and national identity formation, about different economic and social models, cultural traditions and political systems. Students are thus prepared for a range of master's programmes and eventually for professional careers in which Europe and the European integration process are important. The programme deals with Europe as a geographical entity, but also touches on the European Union as a political entity. In essence, the bachelor's programme European Studies is about the quest of a continent to 'manage' diversity through the process of European integration.

In order to understand Europe, the programme combines concepts, theories and methods from political science, history, international relations, law, economics, philosophy and sociology. Most courses involve several of these disciplines. It is the programme's ambition to combine them into an interdisciplinary approach of European phenomena. This is also what distinguishes it from comparable programmes. Most other European Studies programmes draw upon fewer disciplines and/or have a narrower focus. In addition, the bachelor's programme distinguishes itself by using problem-based learning as its method of instruction. In the bachelor's programme European Studies at Maastricht University, problem-based learning is a form of student-centred learning in which small groups of twelve to fifteen students team up to tackle real-life challenges under the supervision of a tutor.

The panel is enthusiastic about the programme's broad but distinct focus in combination with its problem-based learning strategy. They fit together well, since the field of European studies is full of complex challenges that can only be resolved by approaching them from different perspectives, which is exactly what happens in problem-based learning. Also, in the panel's view, the problem-based learning method fills a niche in the Dutch and even the European academic landscape. The panel concludes that the bachelor's programme European Studies at Maastricht University can be proud of these unique assets and encourages it to make them more visible to prospective students.

### *Intended learning outcomes*

The programme developed a set of intended learning outcomes that give expression to its profile and that is linked to the five categories of the Dublin Descriptors. The intended learning outcomes cover knowledge and understanding of (among other things) the cultural diversity of Europe since the nineteenth century, European institutions and policy making procedures, and Europe's place in a globalising world. They also cover the ability to examine European challenges and issues and connect them to their socio-political context, and the ability to present effective and convincing arguments in keeping with academic conventions both orally and in writing.

The panel appreciates the intended learning outcomes: they are extensive, reflect the programme's profile well, and reflect knowledge, insights and competences that are in demand, given the growing importance of European integration. They are of the appropriate level and orientation for an academic bachelor's programme and demonstrate an ambition for a broad knowledge base and an investigative



approach. Alumni and the professional field are represented in the External Advisory Board, which convenes with the programme management every two years to discuss potential updates of the programme. The panel appreciates that in this way, the intended learning outcomes are firmly rooted in the professional field and are tailored to the needs of future employers.

There is one recommendation the panel made during its site visit, which in its view would strengthen the programme. According to the panel, the interdisciplinary character of the programme should be thought through better, described more explicitly and communicated more clearly. The programme advertises its intent to offer an interdisciplinary approach and implies that this is a skill that the students acquire for themselves. As indicated above, this is an admirable ambition. However, the panel was unsure of the extent to which this outcome was achieved. Furthermore, the intended learning outcomes display some ambiguity by prescribing that students should know and understand 'the appropriate analytical and methodological frameworks commonly used in the interdisciplinary field of European Studies'. The panel noted that staff and students differed in their views of the meaning of interdisciplinarity, with students tending to view it (minimally) as exhibiting an awareness that any problem was subject to different perspectives. The dissertations, moreover, overwhelmingly tended to be monodisciplinary in approach.

The panel therefore cautioned the programme management that, for a bachelor's programme, striving for interdisciplinarity is a very high benchmark. It suggested that interdisciplinarity might be set as a goal, while explicitly stipulating that being able to do interdisciplinary research is not a condition for graduation. Inculcating an awareness that complex problems need a combination of different disciplines (i.e. multidisciplinary) may be sufficient. The programme management was open to these recommendations and promised to take them into account while, as is planned, revising the intended learning outcomes in relation to the courses.

### **Considerations**

With the combination of a broad profile and problem-based learning, the bachelor's programme European Studies at Maastricht University has created its own niche. The panel commends this as something of which to be proud. The panel recommends the programme making its 'unique selling points' more visible in order to attract new students. The intended learning outcomes are a good reflection of the programme's profile, in the panel's view, and they are of the proper level and orientation for an academic bachelor's programme. The panel is convinced that with the increasing importance of Europe as a political, legal, cultural and economic entity, the knowledge and skills that are taught in this programme are relevant for future professional careers. That the intended learning outcomes remain relevant is guarded by the External Advisory Board. During its site visit, the panel recommended to the programme management to rethink, reformulate and reposition the concept of interdisciplinarity within the programme, which it accepted.

### **Conclusion**

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

### **Standard 2: Teaching-learning environment**

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

### **Findings**

#### *Programme language and name*

Given the objective to prepare specialists in European affairs for professions with an international orientation, the programme's courses are taught in English. According to alumni, the fact that they have mastered the English language is invaluable for their employability. The panel endorses the decision to teach the programme in English and use an English title, since this indeed fits its purposes.

### *Curriculum content and structure*

The academic year at the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University consists of three periods per semester, with an 8-8-4 week model per semester, where the last period in each academic year is used for independent study. For the bachelor's programme European Studies, three learning trajectories run through the three years. They respectively focus on knowledge, research skills, and language and professional skills. During each period, students typically follow one substantive course and one skills training course, which supplements the substantive courses.

For the *substantive courses*, each bachelor year has its own overarching theme. The central theme in the first year is 'cultural diversity in Europe', which addresses key moments and developments in Europe starting from Antiquity. The second year focusses on 'European Unity and the European integration process', through which students are introduced to the main ideas, concepts and theoretical debates in EU law, EU policy analysis, international relations, comparative political science and international economics. In the first year, all courses are obligatory. In second year, most courses are obligatory, but for the course in international relations students choose between 'Contemporary issues and actors' and 'Placing Europe'. In the third year, students make more choices. The first half of the third semester is intended for either studying abroad, taking electives in the Netherlands, doing an internship or taking a minor. The second semester of the third year is themed around 'Europe on the global scene' and offers electives focussing on international relations, the lifting of the Iron Curtain, effects of globalisation, and language policies of the EU. Students take two electives. The *research skills courses* train students in generic research skills during the first two bachelor years, such as setting up a research design and using qualitative and quantitative social science research methods. In the third bachelor year, they learn to conduct research in European Studies. Finally, the *language and professional skills trajectory* provides those students who need it with training in academic English writing and presentation skills in their first year, and all students with training in negotiation and a second European language in the following year. A mandatory mentor programme is also part of this trajectory.

In the second half of the third year – parallel to taking electives – students conduct their own small-scale research and write their findings in an 8,000 words bachelor's thesis, worth 12 EC. The programme director and the thesis coordinator jointly appoint the supervisor, who guides the student through the thesis writing process. A few other facilitating features are optional: supervised thesis circles of six to ten students; additional lectures on research design, theoretical framework and methodology; writing support and a skills café where students can discuss their methodological approach with experts; and a student conference where students can present their draft thesis.

For various reasons, the panel admires the curriculum. Firstly, it is marked by clear and complementary learning trajectories that run through the full bachelor's programme. Secondly, the panel found that the curriculum displays a clever combination of solidity on the one hand and flexibility on the other. Solidity takes the form of mandatory courses for the first and second year, flexibility is provided by the electives as well as problem-based learning, where students may increasingly add their own focus or choose their own literature. Thirdly, the panel appreciates that students learn an additional European language. Although worth only 3 EC, students told the panel that the two-month language course is very intensive and they find it extremely useful. Fourthly, the panel learned during its site visit that the substantive courses are updated each year, which is time-consuming, but keeps them up to date, which is necessary for a European Studies programme working with real-life cases. Finally, the programme management told the panel that each course is tweaked to the research interests of the staff members teaching it. This the panel also appreciates, since it maintains a close connection between research and education, as is proper for an academic programme.

The panel does find that the already impressive curriculum may be further strengthened in two ways. Firstly, the panel notes that in order to become skilful interdisciplinary researchers, it may be extremely useful for all students first acquire a monodisciplinary toolkit, so that they acquire a firm grasp of the principles underlying the methodologies used. Secondly, students and alumni mentioned



to the panel that they would like more free space in the curriculum in order to prepare themselves for certain master's programmes, such as in Law or Economics, for which they may otherwise lack the necessary credits. The panel finds this a reasonable request and recommends honouring it if this can be done without undermining the quality of the programme. Students already discussed it with the programme staff who, as they also confirmed to the panel, promised to take it into account when revising the curriculum.

#### *Teaching methods*

All courses follow the problem-based learning method, which encourages students to take charge of their own learning process. Each course consists of one lecture and two tutorial group meetings per week. These group meetings hinge upon assigned texts introducing a relevant problem, which is based on complex, real-life cases. In small tutor groups, twelve to fifteen students go through seven steps: 1 discuss the case, 2 identify the questions, 3 brainstorm and identify potential solutions, 4 analyse and structure, 5 formulate learning objectives, 6 do independent study, 7 discuss the findings. One of the students leads group discussions and a tutor is present in the background to monitor the process, share his or her knowledge, ask critical questions and intervene in group dynamics if necessary. The idea behind problem-based learning is that students not only acquire new knowledge, but also skills, such as working towards a solution, doing research, collaborating in groups and receiving feedback. Moreover, as research has shown, since the students remain active throughout the whole learning process, the knowledge they acquire will be more deeply rooted.

The panel is extremely positive about the way problem-based learning is implemented in the bachelor's programme European Studies at Maastricht University. It is consciously and consistently done – all new lecturers are given a specific training, for instance – and students told the panel that they experience a stimulating learning environment. Moreover, the panel is impressed that in a programme with an influx of around 300 new students each year, students speak of a 'small-scale' educational experience. The panel believes that the method would work even better with a truly diverse classroom, as this brings different cultural backgrounds to the table. Currently, the majority of students come from Germany (32%), the Netherlands (20%) and Belgium (14%). It would be worth trying to attract students from Eastern and Southern European countries in the programme, as their experiences would enrich the tutorial groups. Students write in their chapter of the self-evaluation that for the skills courses, problem-based learning is less suitable: discussions are not so relevant there, and a step by step learning path is required. The panel discussed this with the programme managers and they said that for the skills courses the problem-based learning method is implemented flexibly, which the panel wholeheartedly encourages.

#### *Feasibility and student guidance*

Students perceive the general workload as high. The programme management is very aware of this, the panel found, and monitors carefully what can be done. For instance, the Board of Examiners identified which courses achieve a pass rate of less than 50 per cent after the second sit, and is currently subjecting to review. At the time of the site visit, plans for 'reflection/anticipation weeks' in periods 2, 4 and 5 were in the making. During such weeks, the lecturers and tutor groups aim to contextualise the content of next period's courses, and preparation time is kept to a minimum. Students told the panel they were looking forward to such an arrangement, for this would give them breathing space. The panel also finds the reflection/anticipation weeks a good solution for the work pressure the students experience. It appreciates the responsiveness and creativity of the programme management.

In their first bachelor year, students follow a mentor programme. The kick-off is a two-day introduction to problem-based learning. After this, a personal mentor will meet with each student once in a group and three times individually in their first bachelor year, plus at the student's request. During these meetings, mentor and student discuss the student's behaviour during group meetings and self-study, and identify competencies that the student may want to improve. The aim is to help students develop into 'self-regulated learners'. At the time of the site visit, a comparable mentor system for the second and third bachelor year was in preparation. In the second year, the focus of



this mentor programme will be on preparing the graduation trajectory, selecting electives and discussing options for the open space in the third bachelor year. In this final year, the mentor programme will coach students in reflecting about their future. Mentors are staff members who are trained every year. In addition to the mentor programme, student advisors are available at the faculty level. This amounts to extensive and satisfactory student support, in the panel's view.

### *Staff*

The team of lecturers and tutors in the bachelor's programme represents a broad range of expertise (political science, society studies, literature and art, history, philosophy) and over twenty nationalities. They have been trained in interdisciplinary programmes or have an affinity with the idea of interdisciplinarity. All course coordinators possess a university teaching qualification, as do two thirds of the teaching staff. New staff have to demonstrate proficiency in the English language at an advanced level (C1) and receive a mandatory introductory course to problem-based learning. All staff members have the opportunity continually to update their skills through the university-wide educational and innovation centre EDLAB. Courses in law and economics have been outsourced to the Faculty of Law and the School of Business and Economics.

Monthly staff meetings keep lecturers and tutors up to date on new developments and provide opportunities to exchange ideas and good practices in teaching and assessment. Further exchanges take place during two annual 'education days', one at faculty level and one organised by the bachelor's programme. A digital platform provides information about rules and regulations and practical documents such as draft e-mail texts, exam schedules etc. As in most programmes at most universities, staff workload is an issue. In response, the programme management was at the time of the site visit revising the curriculum. One of the aims is to identify redundancies and reduce the number of courses taught. Furthermore, the envisaged reflection/anticipation weeks are expected to give staff as well as students a breathing space.

The panel found that staff is of the appropriate professional level, both in their didactic skills and in their(interdisciplinary) research. It was struck by the candour with which they discussed issues during the site visit, and the amount of thought and creativity that had already been given to most of these issues. This has convinced the panel that critical points in the programme are in the main quickly identified and openly debated and worked out. The panel finds this admirable. Students are also positive about the performance and quality of lecturers and tutors, whom they characterise as knowledgeable, easily approachable and eager to help.

### *Programme-specific services*

For bachelor students who want and can do more, Maastricht University offers a number of talent and honours programmes. These are geared towards deepening existing knowledge or adding new knowledge. The panel finds this a good provision for talented and ambitious students.

### **Considerations**

The panel has a very favourable impression of the teaching-learning environment within the bachelor's programme. It finds the curriculum is effectively structured, with a balanced combination of mandatory courses giving solidity to the programme, and electives and problem-based learning method offering students the flexibility to pursue their own learning path. The problem-based learning method works well. The tutor groups are already international, but in the panel's view could be made even more diverse. The panel encourages the programme in its plans to apply flexibility the problem-based learning method for the skills courses. It also agrees with the idea of honouring student requests for more free space in the curriculum, if this can be achieved without a loss of quality.

The panel found that staff are sufficiently equipped for their tasks, and dedicated and welcoming, and so held in high regard by their students. Both students and staff experience a high workload in this bachelor's programme, but the panel found that programme management is well aware of this and committed to finding solutions. Student guidance is excellent, in the panel's view, and



programme-specific services are satisfactory. All in all, the panel judges that the learning environment in the bachelor's programme European Studies is stimulating and well-managed. It enables students to realise the intended learning outcomes.

## Conclusion

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

### **Standard 3: Student assessment**

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

## Findings

### *Assessment system and Board of Examiners*

Steered by the findings of the latest re-accreditation panel, the programme adjusted and formalised its assessment practices, in particular the assessment regulations regarding theses. Also, over the past four years, the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Maastricht University has redefined and enhanced its assessment policy. This policy currently specifies all roles and responsibilities related to assessment within its programmes, and sets the standards for the organisation of exams, procedures to counter fraud etc. At the programme level, the Education Plan specifies the relationship between the intended learning outcomes, the teaching and the assessment methods. It does so for each course and for the curriculum as a whole. The management and teaching staff ensure the overall quality of assessment based on the Education Plan, the faculty regulations, and guidelines by the Board of Examiners. Throughout the year, the programme director monitors the implementation of the Education Plan by checking the exam results and student evaluations, discussing courses and assessment during meetings of the teaching staff, and annually meeting with course coordinators to talk about past performance and possibilities for improvement.

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

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

### *Assessment at course level*

Every course is concluded with a final examination. For this, a wide range of assessment methods is used, including written and oral exams, take-home exams, research papers, individual and group presentations and debates. Gradually during the course of the bachelor's programme, exams are



increasingly replaced by research papers, culminating in the bachelor's thesis. Formative assessment is considered important. Wherever possible and feasible, a first round of feedback is given on drafts, prior to the summative assessment. Students receive the results of their formative assessment within fifteen workdays, accompanied by feedback and an explanation of the grade.

In addition to their performance in exams, students may also be assessed on their participation in tutor groups. The programme applies a so-called +/- 0.5 rule, which raises or decreases the final course grade with half a grade point depending on student class preparation and involvement in group discussions. The panel heard during its site visit achieving consistency in grading participation is challenging. As it is, the criteria for what is expected from students in tutorial groups are vague. Students have the impression that different tutors divide the half grade points in different ways, or not at all. The issue, the panel found, is on the management's agenda. In its dialogue with students, the panel heard that it is still in favour of this grading mechanism since it keeps students 'on their toes' during group interaction.

The panel is largely satisfied with course assessment practices. The assessment modes are varied and well thought-out and the panel appreciates that students receive timely and useful feedback. It is pleased to learn that the criteria for group participation have the programme management's attention, as these should be unambiguous, transparent and applied consistently.

The panel noticed that both in exams and papers as in the theses, few high grades are awarded. Given the size of the cohort one would expect more. When the panel discussed this with the programme managers, they suggested that lecturers are concerned about grading too high, particularly lecturers from abroad who are not familiar with the Dutch grading system. The panel however notes that a fair, clear and consistent differentiation in marks is important: excellent work deserves excellent grades, while mediocre work merits only mediocre grades. In the panel's view differentiation is moreover stimulating for students and should not be withheld from them. The calibration workshops (see below) could very well serve to enhance clarity on fairness and consistency and help lecturers mark with confidence.

#### *Thesis assessment*

Contrary to the procedure six years ago, the current procedure demands that not one but two examiners assess the bachelor's thesis. Moreover, it is not the first examiner or supervisor, but the second – or 'responsible' – examiner who takes primary responsibility for the assessment of the thesis. He or she is matched with the supervisor by the programme director, who takes into account that the grading pairs should be diverse and vary as much as possible. The responsible examiner is not involved in the thesis trajectory before the final assessment. He or she independently fills out a designated thesis assessment form that explicitly specifies the grading criteria. These include 'structure', 'contribution' (the degree to which the paper outlines the relevance of the research topic and engages with the main literature), 'analytical framework' (the use of appropriate methods), 'analysis', 'conclusion' and 'language and rhetorical skills'. On the basis of these categories, the responsible examiner proposes a grade. The first examiner or supervisor can then add feedback or propose revisions of the feedback and grade. If the two examiners disagree, the programme director appoints a third examiner.

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

The panel noticed that compared to the situation of 2013, the thesis assessment procedure has shown great improvement. Not only is there a second examiner, but he or she is in the driving seat. The panel finds this an excellent idea, worthy of emulation, since it guarantees an independent and fresh look at the thesis. Equally impressive are the calibration workshops which stimulate a shared



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

### **Considerations**

The panel is unanimously impressed by the positive changes the programme has made in recent years. Assessment procedures have been redesigned and formalised, so that elements exhibit state-of-the-art practices that could serve as sources of inspiration and models of emulation for other programmes. The assessment calibration workshops are an example of such best practice, as is the role of the 'responsible examiner' in thesis assessment and the efficient and effective *modus operandi* of the Board of Examiners.

Quality of assessment is soundly assured, the panel found. The Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences developed an assessment policy which specifies all roles and responsibilities and sets the standards for various assessment procedures. The programme's Education Plan explicitly connects forms of assessment to courses and intended learning outcomes. The Board of Examiners assures that the intended learning outcomes are realised by performing regular checks, screenings and audits. In addition to a recurring agenda of quality checks, the Board of Examiners chooses a specific focus point each year on which it advises the programme management. As such, the panel concludes that the Board of Examiners safeguards the quality of assessment and the achievement of the intended learning outcomes and thus carries out its formal tasks well.

At course level, the assessment methods are sufficiently varied and effective. Achieving consistency in the award of the extra half point for class preparation and participation in tutor groups still poses a challenge. The panel is convinced that this problem can and will be solved, as was already done for the master's programme European Studies on Society, Science and Technology which has introduced a set of criteria. The panel notes that marks higher than eight are rarely given which is an issue that deserves consideration and discussion.

The panel considers thesis assessment on the whole satisfactory. It found the grading generally reliable, the procedures well-described and it appreciated the generous amount and high quality of feedback given to students. The panel also values that the responsible examiner is not the thesis supervisor, so that he or she can form a more independent judgement. For further improvement, the panel recommends explicitly differentiating the first and second examiner's judgement. It also recommends aligning the criteria on the thesis assessment forms more directly with the intended learning outcomes. In general, the panel concludes that the validity, reliability and transparency of the assessments meet the standard.

### **Conclusion**

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

**Standard 4: Achieved learning outcomes**

The programme demonstrates that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

**Findings***Bachelors' theses*

The panel learned that assuring the academic quality of the theses is a priority for programme staff. In the self-evaluation report, the programme states that the interdisciplinary character of the programme in which students can make use of a broad and varied set of methodological and theoretical approaches poses a challenge to stating clear and consistent quality standards. However, after due deliberation the programme has identified a shared quality framework and practises its implementation during the calibration workshops. The panel acknowledges this effort.

Of the theses sampled, the panel found that the quality varied from weak to outstanding. It did find all of the sampled theses of passable academic quality. Topics were often original, societally relevant, and ambitious in scope. Many students gathered their own original data. The theoretical analysis in some theses was sophisticated and well judged, although in others superficial, with little or no critical reflection. The standard of written English also varied. The panel was moreover struck by the fact that all of the sampled theses were monodisciplinary and exclusively used social science methodologies. In itself, this is acceptable, as the intended learning outcomes do not specifically require students to conduct interdisciplinary research. Yet it does underscore the panel's plea for care and caution in using the term 'interdisciplinary' in the intended learning outcomes, as noted under Standard 1.

*Alumni success*

The programme conducted a survey among its graduates of the past three academic years. This shows that most graduates enrol in a master's programme, either in the Netherlands (38%) or abroad (23%). The remaining students find a job (19%), do an internship (12%), or take a year off (7%). The most popular master's programmes for European Studies graduates are International Relations, International or EU Governance, Political Science, Public Policy and International Law. This proves that the programme is successful in its intention to prepare its students for a broad range of master's programmes.

From 76 evaluation forms filled in by host organisations that provide internships to European Studies students, it can be deduced that the competences rated by potential employers as 'above average' or 'superior' are motivation (91%), flexibility (91%), team spirit (88%), self-discipline (86%), quality of delivered work (86%), professional attitude (84%) and analytical ability (77%). This proves that European Studies graduates have developed professionally relevant qualities. That is also what alumni told the panel. They feel that the bachelor's programme has trained them in valuable skills such as collaborating in a team, taking the lead when necessary and solving problems in a creative manner.

The panel concludes that, as is the programme's ambition, graduates leave the programme with a broad base in knowledge and skills. It discussed with the programme management that if students have used the free space and choice of research topics in the programme to develop their own specialisation – such as European public health, European law or European entrepreneurship – it would help them if this specialisation is explicitly identified on their bachelor's certificate. From its dialogue with alumni, the panel understood that this small gesture would mean much to some students and underscore the already strongly individualised character of the programme. The programme management promised seriously to consider this suggestion.

**Considerations**

The panel gathered from a sample of recently completed theses, alumni surveys and from its interview of alumni, that the bachelor's programme European Studies provides students with a broad knowledge base, adequate academic skills and valuable competences. It found the theses of variable quality, but even the weaker theses were of a sufficiently passable academic level. It has seen



convincing evidence that students are accepted into a broad range of master's programmes and are trained in key skills such as teamwork, flexibility and creativity in problem-solving. The panel concludes that the intended learning outcomes are achieved.

**Conclusion**

*Bachelor's programme European Studies:* the panel assesses Standard 4 as 'meets the standard'.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

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

**Conclusion**

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

## APPENDICES



# APPENDIX 1: INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

The intended learning outcomes are summarised as follows:

1. *Knowledge and understanding.* Upon completion of the BA ES, graduates are able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of ideas, concepts, methods, and theoretical debates related to the history and development of Europe since the 19th century, the European integration process, as well as Europe's place in the globalising world. In addition, they gain knowledge and understanding of the appropriate analytical and methodological frameworks commonly used in the interdisciplinary field of European Studies.

2. *Applying knowledge and understanding.* BA ES graduates have the ability to apply their knowledge and understanding to historical and contemporary issues related to the interdisciplinary field of European Studies. They can examine European challenges and issues by drawing upon knowledge and methods from the interdisciplinary field of European Studies and are able to integrate these perspectives in an advanced analysis of complex societal issues. They know how to address and formulate a research problem and they can develop an appropriate methodological framework to address their research problem.

3. *Making judgments.* Upon completion of the BA ES, graduates can diagnose academic and societal problems related to the study of Europe, and connect them to their socio-political and historical context. BA ES graduates can also critically use insights, approaches and methods from the interdisciplinary field of European Studies to develop reasoned judgments in relation to the diagnosed problems.

4. *Communication.* BA ES graduates have the skills to present effective and convincing arguments to academic and non-academic audiences both orally and in writing while keeping with academic conventions. They are also able to defend their research findings in keeping with the conventions of the relevant disciplines, through fair and balanced argumentation and taking into account alternative explanations. Furthermore, BA ES graduates have a basic understanding of another language (beyond their native language and/or their language of study, i.e. English).

5. *Learning skills.* Upon completion of the BA ES, graduates master the learning skills that allow them to continue studying with a high level of autonomy and to describe a course of action in order to continue their studies at Master level, and to perform a profession requiring a BA-level degree. They are able to manage their work and time effectively and efficiently and they can work actively and constructively in international teams. Furthermore, they can describe a course of action, related to their own generic skills and they have the competences to contribute to collective learning processes by being able to take up specific responsibilities, such as chairing a discussion, giving and receiving feedback, and taking minutes.



## APPENDIX 2: OVERVIEW OF THE CURRICULUM

Overview of the curriculum			
	Year 1: Substantive Courses	Year 1: Research Skills	Year 1: Professional Skills
Period 1 (8w)	The Idea of Europe (5 EC)	Introduction to Academic Research and Writing (5 EC)	Academic English Writing Skills (2.5 EC)
Period 2 (8w)	Bloody Diversity (9 EC)		Academic English Writing & Presentation Skills (3 EC)
Period 3 (4w)	Europe and Global Politics Since WWII (5 EC)	What is Good Science? (2.5 EC)	
Periods 3-4	Faultlines (6 EC)		
Period 4 (8w)	An Economist Point of View (4.5 EC) & Micro/Macro Economics (4.5 EC)		
Period 5 (8w)	EU Politics (9 EC)	Analysing Research Designs (4 EC)	
	Year 2: Substantive Courses	Year 2: Research Skills	Year 2: Professional Skills
Period 1 (8w)	EU Law (9 EC)	Back to the Sources (3.5 EC)	
Period 2 (8w)	Policy Domains (9 EC)		Negotiation Skills (3.5 EC)
Period 3 (4w)	International Relations (4.5 EC) OR Placing Europe (4.5 EC)	Developing your own Research Design (2.5 EC)	
Period 4 (8w)	Comparative Politics and Government (4.5 EC) & Area Studies (4.5 EC)	Introduction to Qualitative Methods (3.5 EC)	Second language training (3 EC)
Period 5 (8w)	Making a European Market (4.5 EC) & International Economics (4.5 EC)	Introduction to Quantitative Methods (3.5 EC)	
	Year 3: Substantive Courses	Year 3: Research Skills	Year 3
Period 1 (8w)	Elective Semester (24 EC): Study abroad, Minor, Electives, Internship		
Period 2 (8w)			
Period 3 (4w)			
Period 4 (8w)	Elective* (9 EC)	Two electives*** (2x3 EC)	Bachelor Thesis (12 EC)
Period 5 (8w)	Elective** (9 EC)		

\* EU Law II OR Lifting the Iron Curtain OR Culture and Identity in Globalising Europe

\*\* Power and Democracy OR After Babel OR External Relations of the EU

\*\*\* Two out of four: Survey Research OR Interviewing OR Advanced Document Analysis OR Second Language Training



## APPENDIX 3: PROGRAMME OF THE SITE VISIT

### Wednesday 11 December Dag 1

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

### Thursday 12 December Dag 2

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

### Friday 13 December Dag 3

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



## APPENDIX 4: THESES AND DOCUMENTS STUDIED BY THE PANEL

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

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

BA OER 19-20  
Rules & Regulations  
UM Strategisch programma 2017-2021  
FASoS Strategic Plan  
UM Language Policy 2018-2021  
Gedragcode Voertaal van de Universiteit Maastricht  
UM taalbeleid 2018-2021  
Assessment policy FASoS  
Assessment Support Team  
Annual Report BoE 2018-19  
Annual Report BoE 2017-2018  
Annual Report European Studies (ES) 2017-18  
Annual Report PC MTI 2017-18  
Annual Report PC MTI 2017-18 appendix 1  
Annual Report PC MTI 2017-18 appendix 2  
Annual Report 2018-2019 PC European Studies  
Annual Report 2018-2019 PC MTI  
Annual Report PC MTI 2018-19 appendix 1  
Annual Report PC MTI 2018-19 appendix 2  
Annual Report GPC Europe and a Globalising World 2019  
Minutes Meeting External Advisory Board  
Minutes Meeting EAB European Studies Programmes  
Notes EAB ES GDS  
Course Book ES Bachelor Thesis  
Mentor Programme  
Data on dropouts (all programmes)  
Keuzegids Ba (2019 and 2020)  
Distribution of thesis grades (all programmes)  
Plagiarism check report for one of the theses studies

Format Scripts voor calibration workshops

Minutes MA ES calibration workshop 2018/19

Format BoE audit

Instruction for auditors BoE audit

Full portfolios (study material, assignments, exams, evaluation forms) of the following courses:  
'Developing Your Own Research Design'  
'EU Politics'